



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**IDENTITY DISPUTES AND POLITICS AT THE END OF THE 17<sup>th</sup>  
CENTURY**

**The Archbishop Meletios Typaldos and his conflicting relations with the Greek  
Confraternity of Venice**

\*\*\*\*\*

**THEODORE ROUSSOPOULOS**

**Ph.D**

**The University of Edinburgh**

**2014**



## DECLARATION

The present PhD thesis has been composed by myself alone and represents my own work, which has not been submitted for any other degree or qualification.

-----

Theodore Roussopoulos

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This thesis takes as a focal point an important Archbishop of the Greek community in Venice, Meletios Typaldos, who lived in the turbulent era of the late seventeenth-early eighteenth century (1651-1713). An enquiry into the course of his life was deemed worthy of scholarly research: first, because he had not been till now adequately investigated; second, because he is a multi-faceted personage who is highly representative of the ambiguities of that historical period but also clearly and sophisticatedly involved in them. In addition, a study of his life and work reveals a great deal about the religious and cultural beliefs and bias of the flourishing Greek Diaspora of Venice during this historical period.

The dissertation investigates initially the political background within which Venice played a crucial role. Moreover, it brings to the fore the religious conflicts of the era as well as the renewal of the theological and philosophical ideas related to scholastic Aristotelism, derived from the teachings at Padua University which spread to the territory of the city-state of Venice. The emphasis in the dissertation is to focus on the impact that these ideas had on the beliefs and views of Typaldos.

Principally, the thesis disambiguates the initiatives of Meletios Typaldos who, as head of the Orthodox Church in Venice, planned to convert the Orthodox Greeks to Catholicism without taking into consideration the church body, i.e., the Greek Orthodox clergy and congregation. In contrast to the prevailing view that his ambition to become a cardinal drove him to the acceptance of the Catholic doctrine, this dissertation argues that Typaldos' activities were inspired by his desire to play a crucial role in a Uniate Church under the Pope's auspices, with the ultimate ambition to convert all Greeks to it.

Finally, specific attention has been given to the resistance of the Greeks of Venice to Typaldos' plans. After examining the evidence, the thesis concludes that the will of the Greek Confraternity to maintain its social independence -that was guaranteed by the Venetian state - and its passionate desire to maintain unchanged the Confraternity's Greek ethnic and religious identity are the main causes that determined its reactions against Typaldos. The conflict between the Archbishop and leadership of the Greek community ended in Typaldos' excommunication by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and, with the loss of his leadership, the decline of the Greek Community of Venice.



## Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	V
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: TYPALDOS' BIOGRAPHY .....	15
1.1. The years before being Archbishop (1651-1685).....	15
1.1.1. Early years.....	15
1.1.2. Relations with the Venetian Authorities.....	19
1.2. From election to dethronement.....	22
1.3. Typaldos' will.....	31
CHAPTER TWO: POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONTEXT OF THE AGE OF TYPALDOS .....	35
2.1. The political context.....	38
2.1.1. The Sublime Porte and the West .....	38
2.1.2. The importance of the Mediterranean .....	43
2.1.3. Greeks between Ottomans and Venetians .....	45
2.2. The era of conflicts between Christian dogmas.....	50
2.3. Neo-Aristotelianism and Hellenist Humanism.....	67
2.3.1. Greek Forms of pre-Enlightenment.....	73
2.3.2 Intellectual stance of Typaldos .....	81
2.4 The relations between Venice and the Greek Confraternity.....	84
2.4.1. The Greeks in Venice up to the time of Typaldos .....	84
2.4.2. The establishment of the Metropolis of Philadelphia .....	91
2.4.3. Greek followers of the two doctrines .....	95
2.4.4. The professions of the Greeks in Venice.....	100
CHAPTER THREE: THE ETHNIC IDENTITY OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY IN VENICE .....	113
3.1. Preliminary argument .....	113
3.1.1 The literature .....	115
3.1.2 A Common Ancestry.....	119
3.1.3 Identity politics.....	122
3.1.4 Religion .....	123

3.2 The Greek ethnic identity .....	128
3.3. An overview of the educational system.....	135
3.3.1. The Greek schools in East and West .....	137
3.3.2. Greek schools in Venice .....	141
3.4. Preserving the Greek identity in Venice.....	146
3.4.1. The struggle for the preservation.....	146
3.4.2. The Greek Confraternity.....	153
3.4.3. Maintaining the Greek language.....	158
3.4.4. Relation of ethnic identity with social status .....	162
CHAPTER FOUR: THE YEARS OF TURMOIL .....	167
4.1. The turn towards the Catholic creed.....	167
4.2. Accusations of apostasy .....	184
4.3. Written documents .....	190
4.3.1. The “Lettera” .....	190
4.3.2. Typaldos’ apology to the Patriarch.....	200
4.3.3 Supporters’ letter to the Patriarch.....	202
4.3.4. Letters of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos.....	205
4.3.5. The legal dispute.....	214
4.3.6. The “Informazione” and the “Apologia” .....	224
CHAPTER FIVE: THE DECLINE OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY .....	231
5.1. The end of the conflict.....	231
5.2. “Flowers of Piety” .....	238
5.3. The Consequences .....	244
5.3.1. The vacancy of the ecclesiastical throne .....	244
5.3.2. The disputes for new ecclesiastical leaders .....	247
EPILOGUE: THE CAUSES OF THE FAILURE.....	253
WORKS CITED.....	267
A. Archival sources .....	267
B. Non-archival sources.....	271





## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- A.P.F.: Archivio Storico della Congregazione “de Propaganda Fide”
- A.S.V.: Archivio di Stato di Venezia
- A.U.P. Archivio Antico dell’ Universita di Padua
- A.E.I.B.: Αρχείο Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας (Archive of the Greek Institute of Venice)
- b.: Busta
- B.M.C.C.: Biblioteca del Museo Civico Correr di Venezia
- B.H.: Bibliographie Hellenique
- cod.: Codex
- Doc.: Documenti
- F.: Filza.
- fol.: Folio
- fols.: Folios
- M.I.E.T: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Εθνικής Τραπέζης (Cultural Institute of the National Bank)
- r.: Recto
- reg.: Registro
- Rif.: Riformatori dello studio di Padova
- v.: Verso



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

-----

Upon finishing up a research project, the researcher cannot but help looking back and bring to mind, interspersed in among the thousands of hours of research, those unique moments of transforming interventions and the assistance of others.

In remembering those times, I would like to thank the Academician, and former director of the Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, Professor Chryssa Maltezou, who in 2009, introduced me to Meletios Typaldos. She opened a book of the renowned researcher Manousos Manousakas and read the excerpt concerning Meletios Typaldos. The text concluded with the exhortation for an able scholar to be found to write about the work of Typaldos “There you are, you are capable and you're willing. You have the topic you are looking for” were her words. And she was right. To her, I owe the idea and her first observations in a handwritten note that she was kind enough to give to me.

In the welcoming embrace of the Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies I met with many young people who volunteered from the beginning and in the course of my research to show me the ropes in the rich archives of the Serenissima. I thank them. There, I met also Despoina Vlassis, head of the Library of the Institute, who, with great care tended to my research needs. She was always ready to lift the weight of bulky folders of the Greeks of Venice and to supply me with the dozens of books I was constantly asking from her.

Equally important was the help of Monsignor Andrea Palmieri, under-secretary of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of the Unity of the Christian Churches and to Monsignor Roberto Cherubini, Secretary General of the “Pontificia Università Urbaniana”, as well as of the archivist Monsignor Luis M. Cuña Ramos in delving into Vatican archives for documents regarding the activities of Meletios Typaldos. Staying with the domain of libraries, I would like to extend my appreciation to the director of the Library of the Holy Archdiocese of Athens, Sevastianos Andreadis for assistance in my research in the archives of Ionian Literature.

I feel deeply obliged to Dr. Stephen Bowd, Reader in the School of History, Classics and Archaeology of the University of Edinburgh, both for his constructive comments during the annual reviews, in which he was kind enough to participate, as for the rich literature he introduced me to during my research; to Constantine Petsios, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Ioannina, for supplying me with valuable information on the Codex 272 (2946) of the Monastery Docheiarion of Holy Mountain, and for his contribution to my better understanding of the medieval scholastic – Aristotelianism; to Ioannis Panagiotopoulos, lecturer in the Theological School of the University of Athens for helping me to understand the rich theological quarrels of time of Typaldos; to George Pelidis, PhD Aristoteleion University and resident of Venice, for his help in reading and translating from Italian the dozens of usually scribbled and worn – codices that I had to study in order to get a complete picture of the time.

From my close personal environment, I must acknowledge the help of Spanish Literature Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota, Anthony Zahareas, for general observations on some of the chapters of this Thesis as well as Professor Emeritus at Panteion University, Ioanna Tsviacou for bibliographic suggestions on the issue of ethnic identity.

I owe special gratitude to Professor Dory Scaltsas who holds the Chair of Ancient Philosophy in the Philosophy Department of the University of Edinburgh. His contribution to my Thesis was invaluable, both for substantive observations and for his constant encouragement.

Finally I am particularly and greatly indebted to my professor Thomas Ahnert for the unstinting supervision of my work and his kindly, but nonetheless effective, pressure during these years. His advice opened new avenues of research. The thoroughness that he taught me both in research and in the precise mapping of the results, and new ideas he introduced me to, were a great guide. I thank him very warmly for what he gave me on a journey through history that lasted six years and which was enthralling.

## INTRODUCTION

-----

This dissertation explores conflicting relations among Orthodox Greeks within their community of Venice that eventually led to the ex-communication of the group's religious leader, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, Meletios Typaldos. The unravelling of a plot to bring about religious changes within the Greek Diaspora -promoted by the Archbishop- involved communal religion, rituals and habits, along with a strong collective identity. All of the social, religious and political situations inside the Greek community were entangled with the sensitive issue of a religious leader's alleged apostasy. These events happened from the end of the seventeenth to the start of the eighteenth centuries. Against a background of a volatile state of affairs, the decisions, acts and eventual ex-communication of the Greek community's religious leader held centre stage.

The aim is to analyze the ambitions, attitudes, decisions and acts of the Greek Archbishop of Philadelphia in Venice not in isolation but in terms of the complex historical conditions in which his spectacular rise to religious prominence among Greeks and his equally spectacular fall as an apostate took place. It is obviously inadequate to give an historical account of an influential figure in the Greek community of Venice without examining various political, social and cultural factors. A number of them might have shaped the Archbishop's controversial decisions and acts. The biography of the Archbishop of Philadelphia, in particular his efforts to bridge some of the religious gaps in the on-going conflicts between the Orthodox and Catholics as well as the charges of apostasy up to his ex-communication, were obviously inseparable from the social, religious and cultural circumstances of late seventeenth century.

Consequently, when the Greek Archbishop, seemingly on his own rather than in consultation with members of the Greek Confraternity of Venice, slanted Orthodox doctrine toward Catholicism, the leadership of 5,000 Greeks opposed his efforts and

fought against his moves -as if they were those of an apostate. Obviously, an influential figure like the Archbishop of Philadelphia had reasons for what he did or said, no matter how odd or contradictory his acts might strike us today. Hence the needs to determine, first, what were these reasons and, next, explain and evaluate them. The purpose is to exhibit the Greek Archbishop's religious career as an integral part of the social life, and above all, the ethnic identity of the Greek community.

In order to highlight the relationship between a historical personage –Meletios Typaldos- and his social environment, the dissertation tries to relate a biography to the social, religious and cultural context in which the narrated person lived and worked. These relationships are viewed from the perspective of the “historiographical turn” of the last decades according to which the human being is no longer deterministically manipulated by abstract structures and models<sup>1</sup>. Without denying that a human being is entangled with collective entities such as social groups and classes, the new shift in historiography places emphasis, besides others, on the impact that individual activities of some distinguished figures have on the cultural values of their community, as well as on revealing the ways that these activities have been motivated by their community's culture<sup>2</sup>. It could be said, it is better to use biography as “a window to examine more complex problems in a very specific way, rather than in the classical sense of writing about the lives of prominent individuals”<sup>3</sup>.

Under the new historiographical perspective, the individual remains at centre stage; however, simultaneously, the biographical work focuses on the contextual factors within which the subject of the biography operates<sup>4</sup>. So, through this approach, the biography not only sheds light on the life and character of some historical figures,

---

<sup>1</sup>As it is well known, the school of Annales that prevailed in the 20th century was rather sceptical about biography. A good example is the way that Fernand Braudel *Philippe II*. Greek deals with the king Philip II, in his famous work *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Epoque de edition: H Μεσόγειος, και ο Μεσογειακός Κόσμος την Εποχή του Φιλίππου της Ισπανίας*, (Athens: MIET, 1997), where the large-scale socioeconomic factors make the history.

<sup>2</sup> The discourse about a historiographical turn regarding biography opened in 2004, when the GHI (German Historical Institute) organized an international conference in Washington DC, March 25–27, 2004, on “Toward a biographical turn?” [See Simone Lässig, “Toward a biographical turn? Biography in Modern History - Modern Historiography in Biography”, *GHI Bulletin*, 35 (2004): 147-155]. However eminent representatives of school of Annales, such as Jacques Le Goff, in recent years have been directed to biography while still highlighting the role of social variables. [See Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Louis* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996), and Jacques Le Goff, *Saint Francis of Assisi* (London: Routledge, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> Cited by Lässig, *Biographical Turn*, 148.

<sup>4</sup>Volker R. Berghahn, and Simone Lässig (Eds), *Biography between Structure and Agency, Central European Lives in International Historiography* (New York – Boston: Berghahn Books, 2008).

but also plays an important role for the self-consciousness of a given society about its history<sup>5</sup>.

Based on information gleaned from historical documents, the Archbishop of Philadelphia was a notable individual who participated actively in, and thus contributed to, the cultural self-consciousness of his Greek community. He was an ambitious Greek leader who rose to the highest rank of his community but who, believed in the superiority of Catholicism (in comparison to Orthodoxy), and also made crucial decisions about what he thought ought to be, practically, the situation of Orthodox Greeks in the midst of a powerful and often authoritative Catholic society: these moves on behalf of the Greek community ultimately led to a series of suspicions about his plans and a serious clash with his flock that, finally, led to his ex-communication from the Greek Patriarchate. The Greek Archbishop's hitherto successful career came to a crushing inglorious end.

In retrospect, it is evident that the Greek Archbishop's official initiatives accepted, even advanced, aspects of Catholic dogma, in the bosom of the Orthodox Greek church in Venice. For all that, however, Typaldos never defended openly his alleged efforts at integration nor did he offer any explanations about why he attempted the difficult task of mutually uniting two distinctly different practices of Christianity -Catholic vs. Orthodox. Inevitably, the Archbishop's motives for such a radical step have been subject to sweeping verdicts and facile or confused interpretations. However, through our research, a clearer idea about the motives behind his decisions and actions has emerged. Nevertheless, it should be taken into account that during those years, the Greeks of Venice lived under contradictory conditions as there were important imbalances: on the one hand, between their economic concerns and their social status as they were considered inferior, or in some cases middle-class, citizens<sup>6</sup>; and, on the other, between their collective, ethnic - mainly religious - identity inherited from a distant past, and their needs for a secular, efficient representation and negotiation before the Venetian authorities. In such conflicting circumstances, the activities, vision and motives of Typaldos for his alleged “apostasy” require some caution regarding their interpretation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Michael Keren, “Biography and Historiography: The case of David Ben-Gurion”, *Biography*, 23/2 (2000), 332-351.

<sup>6</sup> For the social structure in Venice see Frederic C. Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973), 20, 90-92, 104; 151-152, 418.



Therefore, the present thesis is not only motivated by the ambition to combine the dispersed data available about the ups and downs of Typaldos' career. By examining Typaldos' biography as an exemplary case for demonstrating the interaction between a socio-cultural history and a biography, it finds the opportunity to reconstruct and present the way of living and thinking of the Greeks in Venice –and mainly of those in the upper classes, formed by the members of the Presidency of the Greek Confraternity- at the end of seventeenth century. Archbishop Typaldos was the leading protagonist in a series of episodes that were for a considerable time of deep concern to the Greek Confraternity of Venice. Not only, because the Venetian authorities, the powerful Catholic Church and the Orthodox Patriarchate, among other major political forces, were also deeply concerned. The case of Typaldos in particular was discussed by the “Avogador di Comun”; the “Provveditori di Comun”; the “Senato”; the “Collegio”; and the “Consiglio dei dieci”, that means the most important institutions of the Venetian state. Even Peter the Great intervened by letter to the Venetian authorities in favour of the Orthodox Greek community, taking a stand against Typaldos.

Most historical writing about Typaldos (for example, by Gedeon, Bobou-Stamati, Karathanasis, Koukou, Birtachas, Tsitselis, Petsios, and some others<sup>7</sup>), is limited more or less to descriptions of events about his life or have concentrated on how, in late seventeenth to early eighteenth century, the Archbishop persisted in

---

<sup>7</sup> Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati “Ανέκδοτα κείμενα του Μελετίου Τυπάλδου: Η Lettera και η Informazione. Η Apologia του Abate Fardella”, *Εώα και Εσπέρια* 2 (1994-1996), 135-227; Manouil Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία. Σημείωμα περί των εν Βενετία θρησκευτικών ταραχών 1686-1712*, (Constantinople: Πατριαρχικό Τυπογραφείο, 1913); Athanasios Karathanasis, *Ανθη Ευλαβείας* (Athens: Ερμής, 1978); Also Athanasios Karathanasis, *Η Φλαγγίνειος σχολή της Βενετίας* (Thessaloniki: Kiriakides, 1986); Eleni Koukkou, “Η ανέκδοτος διαθήκη του αρχιεπισκόπου Φιλαδελφείας Μελετίου Τυπάλδου”, in *Πρακτικά Τρίτου Πανιωνίου Συνεδρίου 23-29 Σεπτεμβρίου 1965*, V.1, (Athens: 1967); Efsthathios Birtachas, “Στα χνάρια ενός ‘υποψήφιου Βησσαρίωνα’ ή Θρησκευτικές και πολιτικές ζυμώσεις στη Ρώμη και στη Βενετία στα χρόνια του Μελετίου Τυπάλδου”, *Περί Ιστορίας*, 4 (2003), 167-182; Elias Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα. Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορίαν και Λαογραφίαν της Νήσου Κεφαλληνίας*, V.1 (Athens: Π. Λεωνής, 1904); Elias Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα. Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορίαν και Λαογραφίαν της Νήσου Κεφαλληνίας*, V.2, (Athens: Μ. Μυρτίδη, 1960); Chryssa Maltezu, *Δημοσία Ιλαρία, 500 χρόνια από την Ίδρυση της Ελληνορθόδοξης Κοινότητας Βενετίας 1498-1998* (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών, 1999); Ioannis Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία εν Βενετία* (Venice: Φοίνιξ, 1893); Constantine T. Petsios, *Η περί φύσεως συζήτηση στη Νεοελληνική σκέψη: Όψεις της φιλοσοφικής διερεύνησης από τον 15<sup>ο</sup> ως τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα*, (Ioannina: Κ. Πέτσιος, 2006); also Constantine T. Petsios, “Ο μεσαιωνικός – σχολαστικός αριστοτελισμός ως πλαίσιο της φιλοσοφικής διδασκαλίας στη Βενετία κατά τον 17<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα: το παράδειγμα του Ματθαίου (Μελετίου) Τυπάλδου. Μια (ανα)σύνθεση του Υπομνήματος του Νικολάου Κούρσουλα στο Περί Φυσικής Ακρόασης του Αριστοτέλους”, in *Πρακτικά του Συνεδρίου Βυζάντιο-Βενετία-Νεότερος Ελληνισμός. Μια περιπλάνηση στον Κόσμο της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Σκέψης*, ed. Georgios N. Vlachakis and Thymios Nikolaidis (Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2004), 245-281.

introducing the Greek community of Venice to Catholicism. Historians like M. Gedeon have dealt with the excommunication of Typaldos but at the same time seem to condemn him for attempting to forge relations between the Orthodox Greek and Catholicism.

Some modern historians, on the other hand, have produced scholarly articles in which they analyze and comment on specific acts and works by Typaldos as well as his students. (These are the cases of V. Bobou-Stamati who has made a critical review of the Archbishop's theological subjects or A. Karathanasis who deals with poems composed by his students.) A solid study by Birtachas delves into a critical analysis of the dispute between Typaldos and the Greek community. Yet despite his valuable insights about the religious dispute, ultimately Birtachas does not deal with the Archbishop's entire life nor provide a thorough analysis of the socio-religious problems faced by the Greek Diaspora. In sum, most of the scholars who have investigated aspects of the life of Typaldos have not dealt with his controversial activities in terms of the political and religious conditions of his age. As a result, they have not interpreted adequately either the reasons or motives behind the religious and political attitudes that propelled the Greek Archbishop into his course of questionable actions.

It is now indispensable to refer to the two written texts attributed to Typaldos: the one page *Theses Philosophicae*<sup>8</sup>, written in 1681, and the longer work *Synthesis*<sup>9</sup>, the contents of which have been examined thoroughly by the Professor of Philosophy at Ioannina University K. Petsios<sup>10</sup>. These texts are the only known works written

---

<sup>8</sup> See in the Αρχείο Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας (A.E.I.B), Εκπαιδευτική ... δραστηριότητα, 1.1, θ1. Also, Constantine T. Petsios, "Theses Philosophicae", Venetiis, 1681. Ένα τεκμήριο φιλοσοφικής διδασκαλίας κατά τον 17<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα", *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Βελλάς*, V.2 (2003), 233-251.

<sup>9</sup> See subsection 2.3.2. The *Synthesis* (Σύνθεσις) is a multipage work, which interprets the work of Aristotle *Physics* (or *Lectures on Nature*). In Latin *Physicae Auscultationes*. It is included in a code of Docheiarion Monastery and Iviron on Holy Mountain (known also as Mount Athos), Code 272 (2946). The code consists of 239 sheets and includes three different parts. Only the last sheet of the first part includes a bibliographical note that attributes such part to Matteo Typaldos (Archbishop of Philadelphia Meletios). The first part consists of numbered sheets from 1a to 121b. The whole text is entitled "Εἰς τα οκτώ περί Ἀριστοτέλους βιβλία περί Φυσικῆς Ἀκροάσεως. Διαλέξεις, Ζητήματα και Θεωρήματα". As referred in subsection 2.3.2, *Synthesis* is actually nothing more than a re-composition of Koursoulas' text *Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους Φυσικὴν Πραγματείαν Ὑπομνήματα και Ζητήματα*<sup>9</sup>, Typaldos' participation is exhausted in having prepared the *Preamble*.

<sup>10</sup> Petsios, *Μεσαιωνικός-σχολαστικός αριστοτελισμός*, 254. For details about the content of the manuscripts see Spyridon Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), 264.

exclusively by Typaldos. Petsios' analysis of them helps us arrive with confidence at certain reasonable conclusions regarding Typaldos' intellectual and spiritual orientation. The study of Petsios, however, is limited to an exposition of, or commentary about, the views of Typaldos; that is, he examines these views in the context of the philosophical pursuits and known symbols used by Greeks in the seventeenth century. As such, he is not overly concerned to what degree such viewpoints might have shaped the Archbishop's suspect pro-Catholic stance and his ambivalent attitudes toward Orthodox Christianity.

Meletios Typaldos did not write much outside the already mentioned texts plus the notes he used for his teaching at the Flanghinian School -the Greek school in Venice- which are essentially a reconstruction of the text of Koursoulas for “*την του Αριστοτέλους Φυσικὴν Πραγματείαν. Υπομνήματα και Ζητήματα*”<sup>11</sup>. Typaldos was certainly considered among the most influential personalities of his generation, an ambitious and energetic man who, at least according to the available biographical data, was primed to lead an active life, have a successful career and attain high positions. Furthermore, he was a knowledgeable and open-minded theologian. At the University of Padua, he followed closely the Neo-Aristotelian viewpoints. It is not mere coincidence that some of the recognized Greek intellectuals of the era (some of whom are today considered among the precursors of the Greek Enlightenment<sup>12</sup>) were in fact students or protégés of Typaldos.

According to data about his courses, he taught Aristotelian philosophy following the hermeneutic methods of medieval scholasticism. This could indicate that the Aristotelian scholastic philosophy as it is inspired by the theology of the

---

<sup>11</sup> See subsection 2.3.2.

<sup>12</sup> Some of them are: Georgios and Ioannis Patousas (the latter wrote the first Greek literary encyclopaedia); Elias Meniates, an important theologian (bishop of Kernike and Kalavryton 1710-1714); John Chalkeia, an Aristotelian philosopher, director of Flanghinian School who published the poetry collection “*Graeciae Obsequia* (1696/1716); the priest Georgios Sougdouris (1683-1714), and many others. Also in the immediate circle of influence of Typaldos, was the group of students who published a collection with poems of literary and national content, the known “*Flowers of Piety*” (“*Ανθη Ευλαβείας*”), in the early eighteenth century.

Church Fathers<sup>13</sup> was considered most appropriate for the education of young students.

Based on available information mentioned above, the dissertation examines closely, first, the life of Typaldos from an early age on and, next, his clash with the Greek Confraternity of Venice. In the light of this serious conflict, the study investigates the personal correspondence of Typaldos as well as that of the Orthodox Patriarchate or other contemporary Greek and Italian officials. The records of the long-lasting legal battles between the Greek Confraternity, Archbishop Typaldos and Venetian authorities are also examined.

These important documents are available in archives located in the Greek community of Venice, in the Venetian Republic itself and the Vatican. Based on a research and scrutiny of pertinent data this investigation attempts to explain and, within reason, interpret the troublesome inconsistencies of Typaldos' actions. The social impact of the changes sought by the Archbishop has been examined, not in isolation, but in the light of religious and political conflicts of that period.

The study of an important Archbishop's controversial decisions gains added historical significance if they are examined side by side with on-going conflicts and clashes (open or hidden) between Papal Catholicism and the Orthodox Patriarchate. After all, Typaldos was involved both directly and indirectly in these conflicts. It should be noted here that, during the late seventeenth century the conflicts between the Pope and the Ecumenical Patriarch were taking place both in public life and the private sphere. From the end of the seventeenth century on, the Papacy was continually attempting to promote from Rome (under the name of "Unia"<sup>14</sup>) a new

---

<sup>13</sup> Christian or Holy Fathers are mediaval Christian theologians, writers or great bishops, who wrote in Latin or Greek. Therefore they are usually distinguished in Latin or Western Church Fathers and Greek or Fathers of the Eastern Church. Famous Latin Fathers are Ambrose of Milan, Jerome of Stridonium, Augustine of Hippo, and Saint Gregory the Great; known Greek Fathers are Athanasius of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, the Cappadocian Fathers (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzus, Peter of Sebaste, Gregory of Nyssa), Maximus the Confessor, and John of Damascus. In the Roman Catholic Church, John of Damascus, who lived in the 8th century, is generally considered to be the last of the Church Fathers and at the same time the more influential theologian of the next period of church scholastic writers, particularly of Thomas Aquinas. See Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Retrieving the Tradition: The Fathers, the Scholastics, and Ourselves* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997); Helen Prokopiou, *Το Πρόσωπο ως Υποκείμενο Δικαίου στο Έργο του Θωμά Ακινάτη* (Athens: Ηρόδοτος, 2013), 123.

<sup>14</sup> See section 2.2.

“Ecclesiastical regime” among the Orthodox populations of different countries, particularly those located in Eastern Europe.

In the Greek populations, however, the influence of “Unia” was limited, either because most Greeks lived under Ottoman rule, or because in Western Greece and its Ionian Islands people were already living under the political sovereignty of a more tolerant Venice. Venice was for a long time distinguished for its religious tolerance toward various religious doctrines but, also for its relative independence from Rome. In this sense, the success of Venice at that time is today proof that a political system may confront potential religious and cultural troubles (usually provoked by a minority within its populace) but at the same time have the ability to absorb them without disturbing the core functions, peace and coherence of its society.

From the in-depth enquiry into Typaldos’ life and actions, emerged a picture of the political and cultural conditions under which an ethnic minority –such as the Greek minority of Venice- managed to persist and maintain its cultural-religious identity, despite the fact that this minority lived and operated within a foreign culture. The Greeks of Venice resisted efforts made by Typaldos and his alliances to introduce cultural-religious changes, which were perceived as motivated by ‘foreign’ and adversary forces.

Typaldos' fall from grace and the official end of a brilliant religious career was to a large extent determined by the fact that he attempted to alter the Greek-Orthodox orientation of his community: long-established attitudes promoted by the Greek Orthodox faith and its ecclesiastical practices could not suddenly change and impel Greeks to turn towards Catholicism, especially without having secured first the open or tacit consent of the community itself. The Archbishop's career therefore provides, at least by contrast, a fairly clear view of what was involved in the formation and persistence of the religious and ethnic identity among Greeks in their community of Venice.

The interest of this thesis in the ethnic identity of the Greek community of Venice is not inspired by a conservative traditionalism. Despite the fact that other interpretations -social and political- are also investigated in the analysis of the reactions of the Greek Confraternity of Venice towards the Typaldos’

excommunication, the possible threat to the Confraternity's ethnic identity seems the most significant reason for these reactions.

In pre-modern societies, when the nation state was not yet established, collective identities were forged mainly by religion, cultural elements –such as language for example- and a sense of common ancestry. The myth of common ancestry is also connected with the idea of a common territory of origin. Even if the members of a community migrated from the land of their ancestors, they continue to be emotionally tied with their homeland, particularly if this land is enslaved and their habitants suffer from a foreign occupation. This was the case for all Greek emigrants in the European countries. The combination of representations related to origin and culture constituted in many ethnicities a repertoire of their tradition and therefore, of their collective identity. This repertoire is not only composed of cultural representations; it also embodies a structure of “legitimate authority”<sup>15</sup>. What is suggested by this term is that, as politics requires representation, those who govern need to convey a sense of authority and legitimacy for their activities. These requirements -authority and legitimacy- are particularly important for pre-modern ethnicities because social changes were slow, so that, the same structures of social relations and authority remained unchanged for long periods of time. According to the historical data, in the Greek Diaspora the legitimate authority was embodied in, and represented by, the Orthodox Church, as in their country of origin. The ecclesiastic practices of Orthodoxy managed to hold its power through the repeated use of rituals and specific identity politics.

One should also consider that in traditional societies, religion not only was inseparable from the culture but it was also the main factor for its constitution<sup>16</sup>. Only after the secularization of modern national states, could religion be viewed as separated from the culture of society. In the pre-modern societies, cultural elements of religion, that is its symbols and rituals, have reference to beliefs in mystical entities<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Jonathan Friedman, *Cultural Identity and Global Process* (London: Sage, 1995), 92; James O. Freedman, *Crisis and Legitimacy: The Administrative Process and the American Government* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

<sup>16</sup> Kasper von Greyerz, *Religion and Culture in Early modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Bronislaw Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays* (N.Y.: Doubleday, 1948).

<sup>17</sup> Victor Turner in *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1967), 19, prescribes rituals as “formal behavior for occasions not given to technical routines, having

All of them constitute a “web of significance”<sup>18</sup>, through which a pre-modern, traditional community views and interprets the world around it. However religious rituality transcends the role of culture as web of significance because it suggests the sacred behind the phenomenal aspects of things and for that reason is more deeply embedded in the soul of the people.

Following this hypothesis regarding the notion of collective identity of pre-modern societies (i.e. issues connected with religion, the feeling of common descent and identity politics practiced for centuries), it has been confirmed that it has not been easy to find meaningful help in the published works of known historical and political scholars. Such works have dealt rather successfully with the emergence of national identity and nationalism in modern nation-states.

Some of the best known and influential contributions to the debates over “nation” and “nationalism” (such as those by Gellner, Hobsbawm or Anderson<sup>19</sup>) have provided helpful sources in the preparation of the dissertation. Nevertheless, too much emphasis is usually placed by these scholars on the forces of production (e.g., print capitalism - Anderson<sup>20</sup>) and relations of production (e.g., unequal development - Gellner<sup>21</sup>). In such historical approaches, the impact of tradition is rendered secondary. This, even though, religion and the sense of common origin were dominant factors in pre-modern societies. These scholars take for granted that nationalism and, evidently, national identity are a product of the rise of nineteenth century industrial society; their analysis cannot always provide the necessary conceptual tools for understanding the crucial role of ethnic identity as it manifested itself before the advent of capitalism.

Some historians, like Kidd, have argued that “nationalist thinking was alien to

---

reference to beliefs in mystical beings or powers”. On the same page Turner defines symbol as “the smallest unit of ritual which still retains the specific properties of ritual behavior”.

<sup>18</sup> The term “web of significance” is used in Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, Basic Books 1973), 5. According to Geertz, culture is a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols which need interpretation.

<sup>19</sup> Ernst Gellner, *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965); see also Ernst Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983); Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

<sup>20</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>21</sup> Gellner, *Thought and Change*.

the early modern era”<sup>22</sup>. This is a major reason why, in order to interpret the attitudes and feelings of the Greeks in Venice about their ethnic identity, it was necessary to rely on another, somewhat different current of historical perspective, supported mainly by anthropologists. Their view is characterized as “primordial”, because “nation” is considered to be the outcome of a long-historical process. Under this historical scheme, nation started as a “race”, began its common descent, passed through the phase of “ethnic group” and ended up as the nation. Supporters of this historical perspective<sup>23</sup> deny the so-called discontinuity of “nation” proposed by a number of historians and political scientists who have traced the evolution of Western countries<sup>24</sup>.

Now, however, the model of ethnicity (or “ethnie” according to the terminology proposed by Anthony Smith<sup>25</sup>) has contributed to a better understanding of the ethnic feeling manifested among Venetian Greeks. Smith does not reject the important process of “national identities” during the modern era nor does he accept the notion that nations are invented; instead, he argues that modern nations have deep roots in older forms of ethnic identity. In particular, Smith underlines the antiquity and longevity of “ethnicism” that “pre-modern ethnies” had developed: it is on the basis of ethnicism that what emerged later, during modernity, was nationalism.

In addition, the connection between ethnic identity and human experience of individuals<sup>26</sup> has led analysts to give a phenomenological understanding of identity as they connected it to the everyday experience or the “life world”<sup>27</sup>. In sum, the

---

<sup>22</sup> Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5.

<sup>23</sup> Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969); Thomas H. Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives* (London: Pluto, 1993); Richard Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations* (Sage: London, 1998); Bernard Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).

<sup>24</sup> See subsection 3.1.1.; also, David Miller, *On Nationality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Josep R. Llobera, *The God of Modernity: The Development of Nationalism in Western Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1994).

<sup>25</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

<sup>26</sup> Thomas H. Eriksen, “Ethnic Identity, National Identity and Intergroup Conflict”, in *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, ed. Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, David Wilder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 42-70.

<sup>27</sup> “Lifeworld” is a term invented by Husserl in order to describe a world that subjects may experience together [see Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of the European Sciences* (Evanston: Northwestern University, 1936), 108-109]. Here the term is used rather with the meaning given by Habermas. According to Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, V.2 (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), 119, the lifeworld is more or less “a horizon within which communicative actions are always



intimate, experiential world of the everyday, not only contributes to the awareness of the individuals in regard to their personal and social identification, but connects them simultaneously to a particular group of people. In this way, everyday life and communication can be viewed as a foundation for building a collective identity. Without denying the fluid character of ethnic identity, as it is a product of historical conditions and of human experience, it could be said that as long as it is valid, it is internalized by the members of a community, and in this way acquires solid consistency which contributes to the standing of these members in the eyes of other human beings and social groups.

During the long period of the Ottomans occupation, the Orthodox Patriarchate, as well as the Greek intellectuals and historians, played an important role in consolidating and preserving a Greek ethnic identity within the Greek communities of the Western Diaspora<sup>28</sup>. Cultivating the Orthodox religious dogma, historical memories, customs and habits, using religious rituals and well elaborated educational politics, obtained to keep alive a sense of common ancestry and memories expressed by the term “genos”<sup>29</sup>.

This term is found in most oral folk-songs and writings of Greeks, whether they lived in the major areas of Greece or in cities of Western Europe. It demonstrates that they had been aware of their ethnic identity and used it as a symbolic, cultural

---

already moving...” As Habermas claims in the page 125, “language and culture are constitutive for the lifeworld itself” as both, create common patterns of interpretation for a mutual understanding between the participants of a communicative action.

<sup>28</sup> Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); Christos Patrinelis, “Η Εκκλησία και η Ορθοδοξία”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.10 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1974), 92-113; Also his Patrinelis Ch. “Εκκλησία”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1974), 123-134; Ioannis Melisseidis, *Η Επιβίωση. Οδοιπορικό σε χρόνους μετά την Αλωση της Βασιλεύουσας, 1453-1605 περίπου* (Athens: Vergina, 2010).

<sup>29</sup> “Genos” derives from the verb “ginomai” which can be translated as becoming or bringing forth. The translation of “genos” in the Latin languages is Nation, a word which arises from the Latin verb “nascor”. “Nascor,” has almost the same meaning with “ginomai”. More concretely, it means giving birth to, or bringing forth. The word “genos” is a synonymous of the word “Ethnos”. “Genos” or “Ethnos” are used by the Greek people in order to refer to a community of people who share a common religion, culture, ethnicity, descent, and history. [See Dimitrios Darvaris, *Μικρή Κατήχησις, ήτοι Σύνοτος Ορθόδοξος Ομολογία της Ανατολικής Εκκλησίας των Γραικών ή Ρωμαίων* (Vienna: 1791); Constantine T. Dimaras, *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος* (Athens: MIET, 2006), 78-80]. This term is not used only in modern times but found in texts of ancient Greek philosophy, such as Plato, and the ancient Greek historiography, as in Herodotus. Specifically, Plato in *Πολιτεία* 470, 10 c, ed. Nikolaos M. Skouteropoulos (Athens, Πόλις 2002)], writes: “Φημί γάρ το μὲν ἐλληνικὸν γένος αὐτὸ αὐτὸ οὐκείον εἶναι καὶ συγγενές, τὸ δὲ βαρβαρικὸ ὀθνεῖον τε καὶ ἀλλότριον”.

category for their self-recognition<sup>30</sup>. Under this perspective, the strong and adamant reaction of the Greeks of Venice against Typaldos initiatives should be understood.

According to the above, the dissertation is structured in five chapters and an epilogue as follows:

Chapter one, is an overview of the life of Meletios Typaldos.

Chapter two describes the political context of the era and the key historical role of Venice within it. It gives also an extensive description of the establishment of the Greek community of Venice and its relations with the Venetian authorities. As for the theological conflicts that took place between the different Christian creeds during the seventeenth century, they are also briefly discussed. The thesis purports to demonstrate that Typaldos' initiatives toward a rapprochement with Catholicism were not an exception. Similar efforts at establishing friendly relations between religious adversaries had been made by earlier Orthodox theologians and intellectuals for two reasons: either because they discerned that, in Western countries, a strong political power could oppose the Ottoman Empire, or because, by living daily in European cities, Catholicism had a profound religious and cultural impact on them. Regardless of the ambition of certain Orthodox individuals who also adhered to Catholicism, even if they were often guided by personal aspirations, we can no longer bypass, at least in some cases, their awareness and sensitivity in the face of emerging political and spiritual changes. Typaldos thus emerges as an exemplary figure: a Greek intellectual and religious leader who lived in one of the most culturally and politically advanced countries of the West, in the city-state of Venice, absorbing all the intellectual trends and conflicts of power that occurring during that time.

Chapter three explores issues of collective identity within the Greek community in Venice. The reason for this investigation is that the hostile reactions of the Greek community toward Typaldos' initiatives, which ultimately led to his excommunication, were due to the justified fear of risking destabilization usually brought about by changes in the community's religious and ethnic identity. Therefore,

---

<sup>30</sup> Anthony Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (London: Routledge, 1989), 53-54, argues extensively about the efficacy of symbolism in boundaries maintenance of a social group and thus to the creation of a sense of belonging and identity.

the examination of the question of identity is crucial to the fundamental arguments of this Thesis.

Chapter four supplements the basic information about Typaldos that were briefly presented in the Chapter One. Here, new and older information (drawn from Greek and foreign literature and original documents) regarding the plans and activities of the Archbishop of Philadelphia are compared and contrasted; they touch on the possible causes of his apostasy.

Chapter five discusses the reasons for the failure of Typaldos' apostasy.

The epilogue of the Thesis consists of concluding remarks, based on the arguments of the previous chapters. In this final part of the Thesis it becomes clear that while the dissertation accepts that Typaldos' turn to Catholicism could be viewed as a result of his thirst for recognition, fame and power, however this view (promoted mostly by the Orthodox Church<sup>31</sup>) is rather monolithic. Taking into consideration that he was not alone in this shift but rather a link in a long chain of eminent figures of the Orthodox clergy and scholarship, as well as the philosophical-theological debates of his period, allows for the analysis to not attribute his aspirations only to gain a personal benefit and to approach them as widely as possible to arrive at a greater understanding of the motives of such a complex personality. Moreover, putting on the stage of Typaldos's story the reactions of the Greek Confraternity, the dissertation suggests that when conditions are favourable, the collective identity of an ethnicity which acts subconsciously comes to the surface when such an ethnicity, or its beliefs, are endangered. In this case, this ethnicity is struggling for the preservation of its identity by any means, a fact underestimated by Typaldos, and so resulted in his destruction.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ioannis Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα των Οικουμενικών Πατριαρχών: ανήκοντα εις τους Φιλαδελφείας Μητροπολίτας υπερτίμους και εξάρχους Πατριαρχικούς και Προέδρους Πνευματικούς της ενετήσι των Ορθοδόξων Κοινότητος* (Venice: Φοίνιξ, 1893); Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V.1.

## CHAPTER ONE: TYPALDOS' BIOGRAPHY

-----

**1.1. The years before being Archbishop (1651-1685)****1.1.1. Early years**

Meletios Typaldos, later Archbishop of Philadelphia, was also called “Arcivescovo di San Giorgio dei Greci”, named after the Greek Orthodox church in Venice, which still exists by the “Ponte dei Greci”, the bridge of the Greeks. He was the spiritual leader of the Greeks who lived in Italy. He was the Ecumenical Patriarchate’s quasi ambassador in Western Europe. He was born in 1651, in the island of Cephalonia, which since 1500 had been under Venetian rule. Most of the references to Typaldos give as his birth date the year 1648. However, according to the book of deaths of Saint Antonin church in Venice<sup>1</sup> he died at the age of 62, the 6<sup>th</sup> of May 1713<sup>2</sup>. Thus it will be reckoned in this Thesis that he was born in 1651 and not in 1648. In our opinion this is the closest to the truth because in 1665 when he became a pupil in Flanghinian School he would have been 14 years old instead of 17 that he would have been, had he been born in 1648. In those times, a 17 year old would not be a pupil at a School but a student at the University.

His father was Antonius and his mother was Cornelia Perliggi. Typaldos’ secular name was Matteo. The name Tipaldo or Teodebaldo is met for the first time in 522 AD. There is a possibility that Thiband, Tipaldo, Tipaldi, Tibaldo, Teodebaldo, Tebaldo and Debaldo, are one and same family. Scholars disagree on the origin of the family<sup>3</sup>. Some argue for a French ancestry. There is evidence to demonstrate that the French wing of Typaldos’s family participated in campaigns of the Royal House of France, as well as in the crusades. Other scholars argue that the family has roots in a noble German House and some members descended to Rome in the eighth century to

<sup>1</sup> The information is given by Eleni Koukkou in Koukkou, *Ανέκδοτος Διαθήκη*, 137. The Saint Antonin church was also the head office of the Greek Catholic Confraternity of Saint Spyridon (see Georgios Ploumidis G. “La Confraternita Greco-Cattolica di Santo Spiridione a Venezia-1708”, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 1 (1972), 51-70; Birtachas, “Στα χρόνια ενός ‘υποψήφιου Βησσαρίωνα’”, 176).

<sup>2</sup> Erroneously Marino Pignatorre and Nicoló Pignatore in their work *Memorie storiche e critiche dell’ isola di Cefalonia, dai tempi eroici alla caduta della repubblica Veneta*, V.2 (Corfu: Nacamuli, 1899), 282-283, consider 1728 as the year of Typaldos’ death.

<sup>3</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V.1, 632-633.

be baptized by Pope Gregory II. The most probable is that the Typaldos families of Cephalonia originate from Naples<sup>4</sup>.

Typaldos took his first lessons in his homeland, taught by priests<sup>5</sup>. It should be taken into consideration that at that time the orthodox clergy (from the bishop to the ordinary clergymen), as well as the Orthodox followers both were obliged under threat of punishment, to celebrate the major Christian holidays in Catholic churches without allowing their celebration in the Orthodox churches. The same was also true for other religious rituals, as for example, funerals<sup>6</sup>. This and other such obligations had created in the minds of people, and obviously in the soul of a young child, the impression of servility of the Orthodox clergy to the Catholic one<sup>7</sup>. If one combines that feeling with the Italian origin of Typaldos, one can easily conclude that Catholicism to his young eyes was seen as something superior and more desirable than Eastern Orthodoxy. Typaldos himself in a conference with the Venetian Nuncio in June 1690 confessed that he “maintained his Catholic beliefs with which he was educated in his childhood”<sup>8</sup>.

The first written information for Typaldos appears in 1665 at the Flanghinian School of Venice where he was listed among the registered students. His registration number was “5”<sup>9</sup>. Matteo studied at the Flanghinian School for four years. In 1669, age 18, he enrolled at the University of Padua, where he studied medicine and philosophy. The Flanghinian graduates could continue their studies at the University of Padua, to obtain the title of Doctor<sup>10</sup>. He continued his studies for a second year in 1670. On August 16<sup>th</sup>, 1671, Typaldos was selected by the Greek Confraternity of Venice as a teacher at the Flanghinian School. After teaching for two years, he returned to his native island of Cephalonia.

<sup>4</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V.1, 633.

<sup>5</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V.1, 756.

<sup>6</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V. 2, 51, subnote1.

<sup>7</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, V.2, 49-51.

<sup>8</sup> Archivio Storico della Congregazione “de Propaganda Fide” (A.P.F.), Miscelanea Diverse V.35, fols.80v-81r; Congregazioni Particolari, vol.31, fols. 216r-216v, the same, Acta, vol.56, fols. 52v-53r. For details see section 3.1.

<sup>9</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 159.

<sup>10</sup> Manoussos Manousakas, “Επισκόπηση της ιστορίας της Ελληνικής Ορθοδόξου Αδελφότητας της Βενετίας”, *Τα Ιστορικά*, 11 (1989), 256; Constantine D. Mertzios, “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης και ο μικρός Ελληνομνήμων”, *Πραγματεία της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 9 (1939), 97. Mertzios published the decision of the Venetian Senate that gave the privilege of Flanghinian students to study at the University of Padua: “et in Padova patricolarmente adottorasi”.

At the age of 22, with studies under his belt in Venice, Typaldos was already considered an experienced teacher; and back home, teaching was the profession he chose to follow. During his stay in Cephalonia, Typaldos became also a preacher. Every Sunday, for example, he was preaching the Holy Bible in the churches of Kastro and Lixouri<sup>11</sup> of the Ionian island while, during the week, he was teaching Greek, Italian and Latin to children. In 1677, the bishop of Cephalonia, Paisios Choidas appointed him as deacon<sup>12</sup>, while later in Venice he was appointed as Presbyter by the Metropolitan of Philadelphia, Gerasimos Vlachos (1679-1685), as well as, upon the request of the Greek community, as a preacher in the church of Saint George<sup>13</sup>.

Until 1677, his life seemed rather uneventful, quiet and proper. In the beginning of that year, however, things started to change: Typaldos received an official letter from the directors of the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova” informing him that they had voted to appoint him as the “Headmaster” of the Flanghinian School in Venice -the same college where only eleven years earlier, at the age of 14, Typaldos had entered as a pupil<sup>14</sup>. “Riformatori dello studio di Padova” was a powerful directorate of the Venetian state, which was responsible for the functioning of the Flanghinian School, according to the last will and testament of the founder, Thomas Flanghinis<sup>15</sup>.

In order to understand better the relationship that Typaldos had already developed with the Venetian authorities during his stay in Venice and Padua one should focus on the strength of the institution of the “Riformatori dello Studio di Padova” among the Venetian authorities. As an institution it started by supervising the University of Padua; a role which had been assigned initially by the Bishops. Since 1516, though, the institution of the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova”, consisted of three representatives of the Serenissima, who took over the role from the Bishops. The jurisdiction of this institution was wide: it dealt with the methods of teaching, the bibliography, and the writings that were taught. It also decided on the professorships,

<sup>11</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 81.

<sup>12</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 756.

<sup>13</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 7.

<sup>14</sup> Archivio di Stato di Venezia [hereafter A.S.V.]. Riformatori dello studio di Padova [hereafter Rif] b.3, fol. 412r.

<sup>15</sup> Mertzios, “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης”, 48; Andrea da Mosto, A. *Archivio di Stato di Venezia: Indice generale, storico, descrittivo ed analitico*, V.1 (Rome: Biblioteca D’Arte, 1937), 175.

the curriculum and the times of teaching. It proposed professors and was opposed to private teaching. Gradually the Riformatori dello Studio controlled the whole spectrum of teaching. They gave permission for or forbade the printing of books. They controlled what books were imported and printed so as to avoid the circulation of books or scripts that were forbidden in the “Serenissima” Republic of Venice. Among other things they supervised the National Library, as well as the historians that the authorities had officially assigned to write the Venetian history. It is evident that Meletios Typaldos had very good relations with the Riformatori. It was the Riformatori that had assigned him the management of the Flanghinian School and from 1684 until his death the censorship<sup>16</sup> of all Greek books published in Venice.

Typaldos was obviously moved by the honour of the invitation and excited over the new prospects of his career. He immediately (April 7<sup>th</sup>, 1677) notified by letter the local supreme council (“Σύνδικοι της Κεφαλονιάς”) about the Venetian invitation. In his letter he expressed gratitude to his own compatriots for trusting him as a teacher. He ended by comparing his case -and also his decision- to the situation of famous historical figures like Miltiades, Themistocles and Alcibiades who in the past, ostensibly like himself in the present, had been forced to abandon their country.

Meletios’ comparisons about imposed exiles were somewhat presumptuous, surely unfortunate: after all, it was he himself who chose to accept the invitation of the Riformatori; nobody forced him to leave his island and move to Venice. In fact, perhaps unexpectedly, the Syndikoi of Cephalonia pressured him not to abandon his post: on April 16<sup>th</sup> 1677 Typaldos’ resignation was rejected while his contract in Cephalonia was renewed. In addition, the Syndikoi of Cephalonia contacted the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova”, demanding confirmation of Typaldos’ new appointment. Among other comments, the letter pointed out the value of Typaldos to his own community and praised him as “a second Hercules who could hold the heavy burden of such a duty [...] this devoted Atlas tirelessly carried (the sphere of duty) with glory and profit, even more so than Homer did, for the good of this island”<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> A.S.V., Rif, 370 [(1/1/1684) Venetian year 1685]; and A.S.V., Rif, 293 fasc. (1707-1709).

<sup>17</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 97: “altro Alcide che possi sostenere la sfera di quest’ opera ben premorosa...che con tanta sua Gloria e con tanto profitto di quest’ isola questo Religioso Atlante sopra gl’ Homeri del suo valore ha instancabilmente portato”.

The conflict over the Venetian invitation to Meletios took place at the end of April 1677. Typaldos was urged to “fly” to Venice as suggested to him by the Archbishop of Philadelphia Meletios Hortatsis, who was then close to the Catholic Church and the Venetian Authorities<sup>18</sup>. Hortatsis had played a crucial role in the selection of Typaldos as the headmaster<sup>19</sup>. On April 28<sup>th</sup>, 1677, Typaldos wrote to thank the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova”<sup>20</sup>. Although Typaldos leapt at the opportunity of the academic headship extended to him, he nevertheless (perhaps with a grain of false humility) wrote that “Fata volentem ducunt, nolentem trahunt” (“Fate guides the willing, but drags the unwilling”)<sup>21</sup>. Even before his departure for Venice, a letter by the “Proveditor General da Mar,” Andrea Corner, to the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova” had recommended Typaldos for his successful tenure as teacher in Cephalonia<sup>22</sup>. And Typaldos seemed ready to face the challenges in his new home. The following year Typaldos left Cephalonia and in July 1678, aged 28, he took over the headship of the Flanghinian School.

### ***1.1.2. Relations with the Venetian Authorities***

It is therefore now important to understand the political context within which Typaldos tried to cultivate sound relations with the Venetian authorities. Cephalonia had been occupied in the early sixteenth century and hence Typaldos was born under a Venetian regime<sup>23</sup>. He knew well that the maintenance of good relations with his formal masters, the Greeks of Venice who selected him, was crucial but, from a practical point of view, not enough to help him advance within the power structure of the Republic. In all matters involving Greek resources and decisions, it was necessary to secure first the consent or approval of the Venetian authorities (represented, in his case, by the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova”). Their judgments were decisive at every step of his plans. For example, Typaldos had to obtain permission on behalf of

<sup>18</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 97.

<sup>19</sup> Meletios Hortatsis (1600-1677), Archbishop of Philadelphia (1675-1677). A man of letters who played a crucial role during the first years that the Flanghinian School founded in Venice. The origin of Hortatsis’ family was from Crete and the family was well known for its friendly feelings regarding Venice.

<sup>20</sup> A.S.V., Rif.b.179.

<sup>21</sup> A phrase used by Seneca in a letter sent to Lucilio.

<sup>22</sup> A.S.V., Rif, b. 179.

<sup>23</sup> Cephalonia and Ithaca became Venetian colonies in 1500.



any Greek who sought to enter and study at the Flanghinian School<sup>24</sup>. The need for permission by the Venetian authorities extended even to the salary he received at the Flanghinian School.

Being a practical man, Meletios pursued and obtained a raise in his salary: it was increased to 120 ducats per year<sup>25</sup> as soon as he took over as the College's headmaster, while a few months later, on July 2, 1679, it was raised to 130 ducats, and by 1680 it had reached 150 ducats<sup>26</sup>.

Typaldos himself has provided us with ample proof of his ambition to succeed: barely a few months after his arrival in Venice, at the young age of 28, he declared his candidacy for nothing less than the prestigious Episcopal throne of "Archbishop of Philadelphia". Predictably, the youthful Matteo was not elected, losing as expected to the more experienced candidate, Gerasimos Vlachos<sup>27</sup>. What mattered was his daring attempt to move up the ladder so rapidly. His failure to be elected was the first significant drawback to his ambition. Nevertheless, what was difficult at first would some years later become easier.

In his role as headmaster and teacher at the Flanghinian School, Typaldos was exceptionally well prepared. He graced the college with his presence: a man with philosophical concerns, a teacher open-minded to the new currents of Western thinking and quite willing to bring about changes. His teaching was marked by the introduction in his classes of ancient Greek philosophers, especially the teachings of Aristotle. His writings reveal a deep interest in ancient Greek philosophy -witness works such as his one-page *Theses Philosophicae* and the much longer *Synthesis*<sup>28</sup>. As will be shown in the following chapters, it seems that Typaldos belonged intellectually to the school of Neo-Aristotelianism, which had emerged in the University of Padua<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> This kind of letters was kept in the archive of the Greek Confraternity in Venice.

<sup>25</sup> A.S.V., Rif, b. 3, fol. 412r, where the "Riformatori's" decision of the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 1678; A.S.V., Rif, b. 125, filza of the year 1678.

<sup>26</sup> A.S.V., Rif, b. 3, fol. 512r + A.S.V., Rif, b. 129, filza of the year 1680.

<sup>27</sup> Manoussos Manousakas, "Συλλογή ανεκδότων εγγράφων, 1578-1685, αναφερομένων εις τους εν Βενετία μητροπολίτας Φιλαδελφείας", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 6 (1969), 95.

<sup>28</sup> See Introduction, subnotes 8 and 9.

<sup>29</sup> For more details see section 2.3.

The Flanghinian School flourished during Typaldos' tenure<sup>30</sup>. He was a man interested in a variety of subjects and problems while, on the practical side, he was willing to solve problems related to the Venetian authorities. He successfully instituted new rules that improved the diverse functions of the Flanghinian. He was much loved and appreciated, to the point that in 1682, when the school of the Greek Confraternity (which had been built in 1593 by the Greek Confraternity of Venice and named after Saint George), lost its teacher, instead of searching for a replacement, the president ("Gastaldo") of the Confraternity asked Typaldos to take over the vacated post<sup>31</sup>. He accepted the offer gladly and two years later (July 9, 1684) he even undertook the task of renewing the programme<sup>32</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνιος*, 70.

<sup>31</sup> This school was fully incorporated in the Flanghinian in 1700. The one and only Greek school teacher was elected each time by vote of the community. The voting body elected Typaldos by 40 votes in favour and 4 against and two years later, when he renewed his mandate, he was elected with 42 votes in favour and only one against. Typaldos enjoyed the same acceptance, as we will see later, when he was elected Archbishop. These details are noted because they fully represent the size of appreciation that Typaldos enjoyed among the Greeks of Venice. What adds even greater value to Typaldos' election is the fact that in the past, voting in the community either to elect a teacher or for any other issue, used to divide the voters for a long period of time. It is characteristic that in 1641 the Philadelphia Archbishop Gabriel Severus had to address to Doge requesting that the teachers election should be made by the "Riformatori dello studio di Padova" because the Greeks could never agree with each other in one person, and repeated voting resulted to the fact that the school was left without a teacher. Equally characteristic is that as soon as Typaldos left the position he held as a teacher and became Archbishop, it took more than one year, following repeated elections, to finally choose the new community's teacher. What is more, because again they could not agree on one person, they decided to hire both of the candidates (see Mertzios, "Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης", 179).

<sup>32</sup> Mertzios, "Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης"

## 1.2. From election to dethronement

The following year, 1685, turned out to be the most important period in Typaldos' career and perhaps even his life. As we have mentioned, he had already tried and failed in his early efforts -at the age of 28 years- to be appointed to the Episcopal throne of the Orthodox Church in Venice. He had however the patience to wait for his next opportunity. Eight years later his efforts led him to the aspired throne. The results of his election were clear. The "Archbishop of Philadelphia" was elected by the general assembly of the Greek Confraternity of Saint Nikolas in Venice. On the day of Typaldos' election (on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 1685) the members of the Confraternity present were 139. He was chosen by a majority of 129 votes. Eight members voted against him and two ballots were left white. If one considers that there were other candidates for the position and that they didn't manage to take even a single ballot then we realize how extraordinary his win was. It is the first time in the history of the Confraternity that the names of the rest of the candidates are not even written in the proceedings because they were so clearly outvoted<sup>33</sup>. However, a scholar of the history of Cephalonia, a theologian from Crete, Arsenios Kaloudis, was one of the other nominations<sup>34</sup>. We make a special reference to Kaloudis because later he floated several rumours about Typaldos, for instance, that his consecration was performed without any of the stipulated legal actions. However, that has not been confirmed in official documents<sup>35</sup>.

Only six weeks after his election, Typaldos was recognized by the Venetian authorities, who granted him the income of the Monastery of Saint John Moraitis in Corfu. According to the decree<sup>36</sup>, the Venetian Senate, as had happened with his predecessors, had decided to concede to the "Archbishop of Philadelphia" the income from the monastery, instead of paying them 25 ducats per month. The only condition was that the monastery should continue functioning under the archbishop's responsibility<sup>37</sup>. In such conditions, Typaldos gained indirect recognition immediately after his election. However, that was not a meaningful action since the Patriarchate of Constantinople which, as mentioned above, was the head of the Orthodox Church, did

<sup>33</sup> Koukkou, *Ανέκδοτος Διαθήκη*, 138.

<sup>34</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757-758, subnote 5.

<sup>35</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 69, subnote 1.

<sup>36</sup> A.S.V., *Senato Mar*, reg. 151, fols. 140v-141r, olim 102v-103r—copy of the same text exists in the A.E.I.B. Οργάνωση 1, K 3, fol. 110v; Manousakas, *Συλλογή ανεκδότων εγγράφων*, 105-108.

<sup>37</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 7; Manousakas, *Συλλογή ανεκδότων εγγράφων*, 105-108.

not recognize him immediately after his election. Typaldos had to wait a long time before receiving the much desired letter of acknowledgement of his election by the Patriarch. Typically, official recognition of the election was required in order for the ordination to take place according to the Orthodox ritual. Almost a year had passed before the new Archbishop received a letter by the Patriarch of Constantinople, in which he recognized pro forma his election<sup>38</sup>.

There is an interesting detail about his ordination. According to the ritual of the Church, the new archbishop was to be ordained by a number of other bishops. It happened there were none in Venice and so Typaldos would have had to travel to the Ionian Islands (the Levant). In order to avoid putting Typaldos at risk with such a dangerous journey, for the time the Confraternity asked the Doge to give a special license so as two Orthodox bishops Clement (Klimis), bishop of Phanar and Neohori and Parthenios, bishop of Mani and Kalamai<sup>39</sup> from Corfu could be invited. The bishop of Cephalonia and Zakynthos, Timotheos<sup>40</sup>, was present at Typaldos' ordination. When they went to Venice they ordained him in the church of Saint George. There was no precedent because his predecessors had already been ordained bishops in other places<sup>41</sup>.

It should be noted, that while this was happening in the public sphere, at the same time -as compelling evidence drawn from the archives of the Vatican proves<sup>42</sup>- Typaldos proceeded clandestinely to demonstrate his desire to be ordained by a Catholic bishop in order to forge closer relations with the Catholic Church.

Following his ordination, rumours circulated about the validity of the ceremony. There is no evidence to substantiate that the issue of validity was discussed in Venice among the Orthodox Greeks. One can safely reach this conclusion because in Cephalonia, soon after Typaldos' election, the two bishops who ordained him, the

<sup>38</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 82.

<sup>39</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757.

<sup>40</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*.

<sup>41</sup> Just to mention some of them: Nikodemus Metaxas (Νικόδημος Μεταξάς) when he was elected in 1632, he was already bishop in Cephalonia and Zakynthos. Athanasios Vallerianos (Αθανάσιος Βαλεριάνος) who was elected in 1635. He had been previously bishop in the Island of Kythira. Gerasimos Vlachos, the one who was elected just before Typaldos, in 1679, (Typaldos was his contestant in this election). He was ordained in Corfu where he was an abbot in the monastery of Paleopolis.

<sup>42</sup> See section 4.1 and subsection 4.3.4.

archbishop Phanar and Neochoriou Klimis<sup>43</sup>, and of course the bishop of Cephalonia and Zakynthos, Timotheos, visited and were seen in Cephalonia. If there were a genuine doubt of inappropriate acts, then the two archbishops would doubtless have mentioned it. Yet nothing was heard<sup>44</sup>. In a letter sent on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1686<sup>45</sup> to his brother Janine, who resided in Lixouri, Typaldos mentions rumours spread by a failed candidate.

In the same letter, the tone of Typaldos' writing indicates that he felt particularly proud about the events that followed his election until the official appointment. He describes the ceremony of his ordination as if it were the most important event of that period in Venice: "The people here have enjoyed the ordination so much, that God was praised, the race of the Greeks was honoured and the affair turned into a story to spread in all parts of Italy, because here there has never been such an extraordinary event. May the Lord God give us His grace to serve and to lead the souls of these sane sheep of Christ towards salvation"<sup>46</sup>.

Meletios refers also to some misunderstanding that occurred with the Bishop of Cephalonia, Timotheos. This latter seems to have complained about the formality used by Meletios in a letter written to him. Meletios took the first opportunity, as soon as he officially took up the post of Archbishop of Philadelphia, to state that he was superior to the other bishops. He says: "If I understand correctly, the venerable bishop of Cephalonia should be well aware of the superiority of our throne and the privileges extended to it from the Ecumenical throne of Constantinople, to which our own churches are subject"<sup>47</sup>. It is clear that he refers to the privileges given to the Philadelphia position in comparison to the other bishops of Venetian regions. This could also be a first clue of Typaldos' scheme about the leadership of the chair he has just occupied. In closing, he says that his fellow Cephalonians should rejoice that one of their own has reached such a high position.

---

<sup>43</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757, subnote 4.

<sup>44</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757, subnote 4.

<sup>45</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757, subnote 5; Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 154. According to her, this letter must have been written after October 1687 because Typaldos is mentioning the Patriarchal decision which appoints him as the Archbishop of Philadelphia (October 1687).

<sup>46</sup> Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 154.

<sup>47</sup> Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 155.

Typaldos sent a letter to the Ecumenical Patriarch in order to expedite either the ratification or consecration. On August eighteenth 1687, Patriarch Dionysius IV Mouselimis answered Typaldos' letter. However, his official assignment was not mentioned in the response. The text that Dionysius sent contained only admonitions to Meletios, within the framework of his new position. The only optimistic hint was the Patriarch's call to Meletios as "Honourable Metropolitan of Philadelphia", in the beginning of the letter. The rest of the text would stress that Typaldos should keep his obligations and responsibilities "in full" when he took over the office of the Archbishop. There is only one phrase in which the Patriarch would justify his delay, without however any further comment. He just refers that he could not find a chance for an earlier reply "due to inconvenient conditions"<sup>48</sup>. It is obvious that "inconvenient conditions" refer to internal conflicts of the Eastern Church, which were very common at that time. The Patriarch concluded by thanking Meletios for the silk piece of fabric that Meletios had sent with his letter as a gift and sent him his wishes and blessing of the Ecumenical Seat.

Two months later, in October 1687<sup>49</sup>, Typaldos held within his hands the much desired letter by his superior. It had been thirty-one months after his election, and nineteen months after his ordination, when Patriarch Dionysius IV sent the letter ratifying Typaldos as "Arcivescovo di Filadelfia". Meanwhile, Typaldos was eager to receive the ratification letter especially after having been elected at such a young age by an absolute majority among other candidates. The letter he wrote in the meantime to his brother Janine in Cephalonia around October of 1687 reveals his displeasure about the Patriarch's delay: "About the Patriarchate issue we say nothing else than the fact that we waited for a year and that we received not only one, but two and three and indeed four Patriarchate letters, which included wishes and blessings, with extraordinary privileges and with other letters about several matters of the Great Church..."<sup>50</sup>. His disappointment runs throughout Typaldos's letter to his brother.

When attempting to understand the reasons for the Patriarchate's delay with Typaldos' confirmation, one may assume that such delay was a typical phenomenon for a metropolis, especially when being so far from the Ecumenical throne. But 31

<sup>48</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 67.

<sup>49</sup> Manousakas, *Συλλογή ανεκδότων εγγράφων*, 106.

<sup>50</sup> Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 153-156.

months of delay surely gave rise to some questions. The main grounds for the delay were probably the continual disturbances that afflicted the Patriarchate of Constantinople during that time. On March 24, 1685, for example, one day before the election of Meletios, Iakovos was assigned for the second time to the office of the Patriarch. He had become Patriarch in 1679 and was already dismissed once in 1682. From March 1685 during an eleven-month period, he used to deal constantly with problems caused by his predecessor, Parthenios. Iakovos held his office only for eleven months. He was succeeded by Dionysios IV, who on April 7<sup>th</sup> 1686 was elected as Patriarch for the fourth time. Dionysios was the one who used to admonish Meletios in his letters regarding his new duties and who finally signed the document for his confirmation as the Archbishop of Philadelphia.

In the meantime, Typaldos was of course fulfilling his duty as an Archbishop and above all as a Greek helping fellow Greeks, either students or elders. He continued helping the young who were looking for a better educational environment in Venice or at the University of Padua as well as helping others to find a job and live a decent life. There are many letters of recommendation with his handwriting in the Venetian archives from his time as an archbishop, regarding Greeks looking for a job or those who wanted to study<sup>51</sup>. We have mentioned that while he was teaching Typaldos' relations with the Greek Confraternity in Venice were excellent. His early years as Archbishop in his relations with the Greek community were characterized as smooth. He was always an accommodating man, willing to help many children who needed an education. His activities have been confirmed by a number of his testimonial letters, still kept in the archives of the Greek Confraternity in Venice as well as in the Venetian state archives<sup>52</sup>. His compatriot, Elias Tsitselis from Cephalonia, who had studied all the archives of Cephalonian families, characterized him as the "protector and reliever" for many young Greeks studying in Venice, especially from Cephalonia, as he registered them in the Flanghinian School or the "Hellenic museum in Rome"<sup>53</sup>, for free. He also sent books and clothes to churches in Cephalonia and in general he was viewed as a patriot, educator, and a person who

---

<sup>51</sup> A.E.I.B. B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3, Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ. 4.

<sup>52</sup> A.S.V., Rif, Filza 547.

<sup>53</sup> The term "Hellenic Museum" generally suggests the Greek schools which were also boarding houses. Here it refers to the Saint Athanasios College in Rome.

always encouraged all those amongst his brothers who were so often in conflict to look for peace and the fear of God<sup>54</sup>.

From 1692 on, however, just seven years after his election as an Archbishop, and five years after the official recognition of his status from the Patriarch in Constantinople, several rumours started to circulate against Typaldos. There were hints that Typaldos had shifted his beliefs: that even though he was the head of the Orthodox Confraternity in Venice, he had started turning against the views held by the Orthodox Church.

In the summer of 1692, without wasting time, Typaldos wrote a letter to Patriarch Callinicos II. He acted quite fast so as to obviate the rumours that were spreading against him. The Patriarch was not in Constantinople, he was having his summer vacation in Adrianople. There he received the envoy of Typaldos with the Archbishop's letter. Callinicos II was convinced by Typaldos and did not accept the accusations. He also wrote a response letter to Meletios in which he notified him that he was informed about things being said against him by some "malevolent and captious people"<sup>55</sup>. Amongst other things Patriarch Callinicos II writes "Such things we did not believe", and he continues: "We did not even have the wish to listen to such things, as we have already been informed by others who love the truth and have an objective view that your stance remains healthy and unchanged; we have indeed confirmed this with the best of your students, the studious 'ακέστωρ'<sup>56</sup> Mr. Andreas of Likinions"<sup>57</sup>.

The conflict between Typaldos and his opponents in the Greek Confraternity lasted for a long time. Of course there were those who supported him and others who were his sworn enemies. The full story of the conflict that lasted for so long will be described and analyzed in the next chapter. Here it is sufficient to mention that the Patriarchate of Constantinople did not seem eager to check out the veracity of the accusations which from time to time came up against Typaldos. It also did not reach a hasty decision, so, perhaps, Typaldos was scheming unobstructed for many years. The

<sup>54</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 757.

<sup>55</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα* 756; 759-760.

<sup>56</sup> "ακέστωρ" is the healer – this means someone who has studied medicine

<sup>57</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 21. In chapter 3 we have the opportunity to go into further details about what exactly took place before Typaldos was deposed, and also to try and interpret the causes for his dismissal.



Patriarch Callinicos II (1694-1702) had a high opinion of Typaldos and did not believe the accusations. The next Patriarch, Gabriel III (1702-1707), although he took actions against Ioannis Stais, a close associate of Typaldos, did not take any actions harmful to Typaldos himself. Another three Patriarchs took the Ecumenical Throne; Neofytos V (1707), Cyprianos (1707-1709) and Athanasios (1709-1711). The next in line, Patriarch Cyril IV from Kyzikos (1711-1713), was the one who decided to dethrone Typaldos.

It happened that during the time this decision about the dethronement was taken, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos Notaras, was in Constantinople. For a number of years Chrysanthos had been receiving letters as mentioned further below, mainly written by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos (1661-1740)<sup>58</sup> against Meletios Typaldos. It is therefore likely that the decision to dethrone taken by the Patriarch and the Synod of bishops around him was influenced by the presence of, and the information brought by Chrysanthos. On 10th of June 1712 Meletios Typaldos was deposed<sup>59</sup>. He had been the Archbishop of Philadelphia for a total of 27 years.

The dethronement letter was sent to Venice and to other cities so as to inform everyone about the Patriarch's decision<sup>60</sup>. This letter, full of allegations against Typaldos, calls him a "defector" from the Orthodox faith, a hypocrite who embraced the dogma of the Western Church but pretended to be persecuted. The Patriarch likens him to the Centaur, who is neither a human nor a horse. In the letter Patriarch Cyril emphasizes that Eastern Christians who live in Venice have no need or pressure whatsoever to change their faith put upon them by the "righteous" as he calls it "aristocracy of the Venetians". He also notes that the "virtuous and good" Pope Leo X had issued in 1514 a decision that allowed Greeks, that is, the Eastern Christians, to follow their own ecclesiastical order and their own political affairs, without any obstructions caused by Western clergy or political leaders. Furthermore the Patriarchal dethronement letter refers to Pope Clement the Seventh, the uncle of Leo X, who in one of his letters in 1526 to the State of Venice confirmed his predecessor's

<sup>58</sup> Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, professor of the University of Padua, was initially friend of Typaldos, but later accused him of wishing to become a cardinal of the Catholic Church or even Patriarch of Constantinople. See subsection 4.3.4

<sup>59</sup> For the full letter of Patriarch Callinicos II regarding Typaldos' dethronement, see Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 79-92.

<sup>60</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 762, subnote 1, mentions that a copy of this dethronement letter was found in the archives kept by the bishops of Cephalonia and Lefkada.

order that the Catholics should respect the customs and traditions of the Greeks, that is the Eastern Christians. He also uses as an example the coexistence of the two Bishops of the Ionian islands Cephalonia and Zakynthos, where the Latin bishop does not interfere with the duties of the Greek bishop and vice versa.

In the Patriarchate's letter Meletios is labelled: "insane", a "Christ mocker", "wretched", "full of anger against God", "fraudulent", "deceptive", "evil-thinking", "rotten", "outcast", among other things<sup>61</sup>. He is removed from all his functions and he is prohibited from attending the liturgies or other ecclesiastical activities. It is also forbidden for the faithful to kiss his hand or to have any social contact with him. Anyone who violates these prohibitions would also be subject to a similar penalty as Meletios, that is, he will be deprived of his position if he is part of the clergy and "accursed" if he is a layman. The Patriarch repeats more than twice in this letter that Meletios has been acting deceptively for many years and that although there were accusations against him for years, the Archbishop of Philadelphia offered false assurances to the Ecumenical Patriarch about supporting his faith in the Eastern dogma. The Patriarch also emphasizes that there were many people in previous years who informed the Patriarchal Throne about Typaldos's deviation from the Eastern Church and that the decision to dethrone was not taken earlier until the defection of Meletios was confirmed with further proofs<sup>62</sup>.

One of the accusations mentioned in the Patriarchal deposition letter is that of debauchery. He was accused of "sensual disgraces, obscene actions and improper conduct"<sup>63</sup>. It was customary for Orthodox members of that era to criticize immorality in one person accused for his doctrinal positions or even for his philosophical opinions, especially if they disagreed with the Eastern Church<sup>64</sup>. Investigators into Typaldos' life objected emphatically to those accusations against Meletios, and instead referred to a virtuous life and also mentioned educated people, contemporaries of Typaldos, who characterized him as a virtuous person<sup>65</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 88 passim 91.

<sup>62</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 82-83.

<sup>63</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 88.

<sup>64</sup> Dimitrios Papaioannou K., *Η Πολιτική των Επισκόπων στην Τουρκοκρατία* (Athens: privately printed, 1991), 11.

<sup>65</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 765.

Meletios lost. He was no longer the “Arcivescovo di Filadelfia”. All his dreams had sunk into the dark waters of Venice. The Venetian government provided him with a yearly income of 100 Zecchini, part of the income of a Corfu monastery which would support him to survive<sup>66</sup>. Due to his health problems Typaldos spent the last months of his life in bed. When death was approaching he was visited at home by the Nuncio of Venice who was received by Meletios with joy<sup>67</sup>. He died some months after his excommunication on the 6<sup>th</sup> of May 1713, at the age of 62, poor and condemned. His funeral was attended only by one priest, one reader and his personal friends.

---

<sup>66</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 763.

<sup>67</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 763, subnote 4.

### 1.3. Typaldos' will

In his will Typaldos bequeathed his rich library, and the vestments and sacred vessels in his possession to the Greek Confraternity and the Church of Saint George.

Despite his excommunication from the Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church, at the highest level of Pope Clement XI, sent a letter of condolences on 13 May 1713 towards the Venetian republic, encouraging it to elect a worthy successor of Meletios on the throne of the Archbishop of Philadelphia<sup>68</sup>. In one of his texts the Jesuit nephew of Meletios, Ioannis Andreou, requests a letter to be written to the Nuncio or the Patriarch of Venice to seek financial support for the orphan nephews of the deceased ex-archbishop. He writes among other things: "...either from his Holiness or from his representative (Nuncio)... Olivieri, who presents the poverty in which the Archbishop died after many years of being in service as an archbishop dedicated to the Holy Seat and the Catholic faith, in the continuous conflicts in which he played a main part for the benefit of this Church..."<sup>69</sup>. The eulogy was delivered by a Catholic priest from Crete, Count Antonius Jeronymo Landos<sup>70</sup>.

Just 17 days before his death, on the nineteenth of April, 1713, in Venice, Typaldos signed his Will<sup>71</sup>. He mentions in the first paragraph that he dictated the text to a trusted friend. Then he reveals the name of this person. It was the Latin clergyman Don Giovanni Torelli. The decision of Typaldos to dictate his will to a Latin clergyman, a friend of his, confirms once again his break with the Orthodox Church. However, upon reading the first lines it becomes rather clear that in the face of approaching death, Typaldos felt some kind of guilt for his deeds. He refers to his many sins, but such phrases could simply point to the humility of a priest when speaking about himself a short time before his death. Yet he next mentions "his beloved and respected Nation" and asks the Greeks as "an unworthy shepherd" (as he calls himself), to come together and live in peace. It is clearly not possible to assume from what is written whether this advice suggests that he recognizes that he was the cause of the division between the Orthodox Greeks in Venice. We can be certain

<sup>68</sup> Georgios Ploumidis, "Αι Βούλαι των Πατριαρχών περί των Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων της Βενετίας, 1445-1782", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 7 (1970), 234, 254-258.

<sup>69</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 763-764.

<sup>70</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 764.

<sup>71</sup> A.S.V., *Notarile, Testamenti*, notaio Nicola Arduini, b. 24, doc. 380. The will was published and commented for the first time in Koukkou, *Ανέκδοτος Διαθήκη*, 137-153.

nevertheless that he was fully aware of the effect of his actions, regardless of whether he considered them right or wrong. And he was aware of the conflicts because at some point in his will he predicts, indirectly yet clearly, what was to happen during the next decades within the Greek Church.

Five days before his death, Typaldos wrote in the codicil of his will that: “In case the Church was left without a successor, I would request Mister Bancali to sell my Bishop’s vestments to other Shepherds and to use these funds for the forgiveness of my soul, that is, to conduct many liturgies in our Church”<sup>72</sup>. The reason he refers to his successor is not only because from the time of his dethronement until the moment he made his will the Greek Confraternity had not elected his successor: he was aware (from his own experience) that such procedures were lengthy; he was fully aware of the divisions between the Greeks of the Confraternity caused by himself. Did he consider his deeds to have been a mistake? It seems most likely that he did not consider all of them to be mistakes. If he had really repented, he would surely have shown this during the period between his dethronement and the end of his life. One also assumes that he would have written such a statement in his will in a clear way. In any case he would refer to his deposition and expulsion from the Orthodox Church either by criticizing the Patriarch or by expressing his repentance about the situation. Therefore it seems plausible that, even if he repented of some of his deeds, his repentance was not referring to the core of his schemes but rather to some partial actions.

As for the rest of his will, he asked to be buried in the area of Saint George, the burial grounds available for bishops. He did not ask for any specific honours or any funeral procession. On the contrary he asked to be buried wearing the plain black monk’s robe. He forgave all those who both by word or by deed, both close to him or far away, tried to harm him, and embraced his beloved and respected people affectionately. Here it may be possible to assume that he was referring to, among others, Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos and Elias Meniates, who at the beginning were close to him while later on moved away and opposed him.

He bequeathed most of his belongings, such as books, icons and vestments to the Church of Saint George, “our church” as he wrote. The rest (jewellery, cutlery

---

<sup>72</sup> A.S.V., *Notarile, Testamenti*, notaio Nicola Arduini, b. 24, doc. 380.

golden plated and silver, clothes, etc.) he bequeathed to his relatives. To his two servants he leaves money to support a return to their homeland. He shows a special affection for his maid, Mrs. Andriani, who served him faithfully for many years; he asked for her to be taken in her old age into the Flanghinian hospital and to be well looked after. To his brother, Jeremias, Bishop of Methoni, he bequeathed many of his precious vestments and also sacred vessels, golden embroidery, a fur, precious bedcovers and golden crosses. To various other persons, both Greeks and Italians, he bequeathed several small valuable objects and icons. One of these persons was the Catholic priest to whom he dictated his will.



## CHAPTER TWO: POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONTEXT OF THE AGE OF TYPALDOS

-----

### Introductory remarks

The ideological currents not only of the *Serenissima* but of the whole epoch -through which the Greek “Archbishop of Philadelphia” formed his religious views and strategy-, can best be understood by considering the religious, cultural and political environment, as well as the respective situation of the Venetian state during these years. The religious relation of Venice with the Pope and the status of the Orthodox dogma should also not be forgotten.

During the age of Typaldos, Venice was under pressure not only from the Ottoman Empire, but also from Austria, France, Holland and Russia<sup>1</sup>. However, as the purpose of the thesis here is historically limited, the interest is focused on the following subjects, each one of them will be developed in a separate subsection:

- The battles and negotiations of the new great powers for a part of the trade with the East and the ways that the Greeks, in particular those in Venice, found to exploit these conflicts for their own benefit. Recall that the Greek territory remained bound between Ottomans and Venetians. The penultimate Ottoman-Venetian war in the late seventeenth century provided the Greeks with new possibilities. Some managed to immigrate westwards more easily while others organized their own commercial activities. Others hoped for the vision of freedom, which however would become true only one-and-a-half centuries later<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lane, *Venice*; John J. Norwich, and Peter Dimock (eds), *A History of Venice* (New York: Knopf, 1989).

<sup>2</sup> A proof of the Greek’s keen desire for liberation is the long report that the Greek nobleman Grigorios Metaxas filed to the Venetian Authorities. The report is firstly published by Lamansky and next republished in Braudel, *H Μεσόγειος*, 483-84. As Braudel states, Metaxas –from Crete or Peloponnese– in 1570, through his long reports would explain to the authorities of Venice that the time for the Greek Revolution against the Turks had arrived and that only the countries that embraced Christianity, and mostly Venice, could support such revolution.



To depict the religious conflict of the era as well as the attempts to reconcile the diverse Christian dogmas. Of particular interest is the policy of the Vatican, which after the Thirty Years War turned mainly to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Orthodox churches; also it seems to have mitigated confrontations with the state of Venice.

During the millennial history of Venice, what stood out were the common, continual battles between the Republic and the Papal state in Rome. The fundamental cause for these conflicts among Catholics was that at no time did the Popes tolerate the Republic's disrespect or resistance to its traditional authority. Venetian resistance to Rome was treated as a dangerous provocation. For almost two hundred years, there was a continuous conflict between Venice and the Pope. At the end, the Pope realized that ultimately he could not win in this dangerous game of attacks and counterattacks: by April 1607, politically and publicly defeated, the Pope retreated: he retracted the already imposed excommunication against the Republic, and in the future, would no longer dare wield the ecclesiastic weapon of exclusion against Venice<sup>3</sup>.

Venice took advantage of this situation by reinforcing its own political weapon: achieving emancipation from clerical interference. Naturally, those changes did not take effect immediately, especially at the level of the whole population. It took some time for ordinary citizens to experience such important changes in their daily life. After all, the power of the church and the awe of the faithful before Christian rituals still had roots in peoples' hearts.

The state would monitor Church activities to a significantly higher extent compared to other Italian cities or Western-European powers. The senate would select the names of the Catholic Patriarch and other high-ranking clergymen and next would send a list with such names to the Pope. The first selection was under the exclusive prerogative of the civil authority. The church would undergo taxation and any infringements would be regulated by the judges and not the Church. The Catholic Patriarch himself, up to 1451, was seated in the

---

<sup>3</sup> William Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (California: University of California Press, 1968), 568-9; David Wooton, *Paolo Sarpi: Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

small city of Grado. Even when the centre was transferred to Venice, he was given the church of Castello. It was not like that of Saint Marcus, i.e. the church temple of the metropolis, as Saint Marcus was the Doge's church temple. In addition, while in western-European countries, bishops would often take over political posts, such a thing was prohibited in Venice. Orthodox Christians, Protestants, Lutherans, Calvinists, Jews and Moslems were allowed to exercise their religious duties; however they were strictly monitored by the Venetian Authority<sup>4</sup>.

Within such a framework mingling both religious freedoms and prohibitions, the relationship of Orthodox Venetian-Greeks and their religious head with Venice will be investigated and interpreted.

Another subject is an account of the theological and philosophical ideas derived from the University of Padua and spread to the territory of the state of Venice. This subject focuses especially on the circle of the Greek intellectuals and theologians who contributed to moving forward the ideas of Renaissance Humanism and the revival of Aristotelianism and particularly on Typaldos' ideas and his effort to connect Neo-Aristotelianism with the scholastic Aristotelian philosophy.

The final point of the chapter deals with the history of the Greek community and Confraternity of Venice in order to exhibit the shifting conditions of Greeks in Venice as well as the ups-and-downs of their spiritual leader, Typaldos. Through this argument the religious and secular situation of the Greeks will become more understandable but as well the life and career of the Greek Orthodox cleric Typaldos in the Venetian Republic, a life full of unfavourable situations will be better enlightened.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lane, *Venice*, 394-395.

## 2.1. The political context

### 2.1.1. *The Sublime Porte and the West*

The end of the Thirty Years War with the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) finds the situation in Europe much different from what it had been before. Austria<sup>5</sup> was weakened, but still strong. However, other states, such as France of the Bourbons had already increased their power. Especially Louis XIV, after civil wars and wars against Spain, which finished with the Treaty of the Pyrenees, established an absolute monarchy and made the house of Bourbons the most important dynasty in Europe<sup>6</sup>.

The major consequences of the Treaty of Westphalia, and those that prepared the revolutionary changes of the eighteenth century, were associated with the specific edicts that were issued at the time, which laid the foundations of the national state; and that happened, because they clearly defined geographic boundaries for the different states and appointed a new type of relationship between citizens and rulers<sup>7</sup>. At the same time, the decline of Spain as colonial power and the rise of France as the dominant power in the European continent was taking place<sup>8</sup>. Such historical developments significantly restricted the leadership of the Vatican in the Catholic states, resulting in the reduction of its power. The Westphalia settlement did not formally dissolve the Holy Roman Empire, but by giving autonomous states sovereignty over their territory, it sharply curtailed the political power of the papacy<sup>9</sup> of the Catholic Church. The

---

<sup>5</sup> The term "Austria" refers to the Austrian Hapsburg lands.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Hugh Shennan, *Louis XIV, 1643-1715* (London: Methuen & Co, 1986); see also his Joseph Hugh Shennan, *The Bourbons: The history of a dynasty* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007).

<sup>7</sup> It could be mentioned the Edict of Nantes, issued on April 1598 by Henry IV of France. The king, as he wanted to promote the civil unity, he granted the Calvinist Protestants of France (known as Huguenots) substantial rights in a nation still considered Catholic. For the first time in the Western Europe by this Edict civil rights were separated from religion. Later, in 1685, King Louis XIV, the grandson of Henry IV, revoked the Edict of Nantes, driving in this way an exodus of Protestants, and increasing the hostility of Protestant nations toward France. See, Emile G. Leonard, *A History of Protestantism*, 2 vols (London: Nelson, 1965-7), chapter "The Edict of Nantes", V.2, 312-89.

<sup>8</sup> Characteristically Louis XIV after the treaty of Westphalia never allowed a papal Bull to be published in France until the parliament decided whether it interfered with the liberties of the French Church or the authority of the King; see Norman Ravitch, *The Catholic Church and the French Nation, 1589-1989* (London: Routledge, 1990).

<sup>9</sup> John D. Carlson, and Erik C. Owens, *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003).

rise of Protestantism, as well as the process of individualization which had already been established in the West<sup>10</sup>, slowly but steadily contributed to the emergence of the new natural science that was developing in Europe<sup>11</sup>.

In the decade of 1670, the “Sublime Porte” would enter into privileged trade agreements (“Capitulations”) with Venice (1670), France (1673), England (1675), Holland (1680) and others. Greek merchants were in an unfavourable situation. They did not receive support from their state because the regions of their residency were under foreign occupation. There were no guilds to promote their interests, no organization and almost no capital. In the same period, the Ottoman Empire was making one more attempt to increase the same European regions under its control. It took advantage of the fact that the Austrian Habsburgs had to tackle the French at their Western borders and were in continuous conflicts with the Hungarian feudal lords. They cooperated with Cossacks who wanted to liberate the country from Russian and Polish rule, achieving a great victory against Poland in 1676 (Zurawno treaty)<sup>12</sup>. Seven years later, in 1683, Turks managed to besiege and enter in Vienna as victors. This fact motivated the Holy Roman Empire which, in league with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (“Holy League”), and under the leadership of the Polish king John Sobieski, defeated the Ottoman Empire and its chiefdoms in a decisive battle which took place on the Kahlenberg hills. After two months of subjugation, Vienna was liberated and the Ottoman leader, Kara Mustafa Pasha, surrendered<sup>13</sup>.

However, conflicts between the Ottomans and Austria did not stop, forcing the Emperor of Austria, Leopold I in 1687, to ask from the Patriarch of Constantinople, Callinicos II to cooperate with him and create an anti-Turkish

<sup>10</sup> Aaron Gurevich, *The Origins of European Individualism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995); Louis Dumont, *Essays on Individualism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986).

<sup>11</sup> Peter Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4-5, claims that the new reading of Bible contributed to the emergence of science and not the opposite. So, the mathematical categories of Galileo could be viewed as an attempt to reconfigure an empirical world which has been evacuated of order and meaning.

<sup>12</sup> Orest Subtenly, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Spencer C. Tucker, *Battles that Changed History: An Encyclopaedia of World Conflict* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2010), 215.

<sup>13</sup> Alan Palmer, *The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Faber Finds, 1992); John Stoye, *The Siege of Vienna* (Edinburg: Birliin, 2000); Karen Barkey, *Empire of difference. The Ottomans in comparative perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

force. Leopold would agree to provide Orthodox Christians with full religious freedom provided they aligned with him against the “unbelievers”. Leopold was involved in the Nine-Year's War since 1688<sup>14</sup>. The war ended with the well known Karlowitz treaty, which was signed in January 1699<sup>15</sup>.

The Turkish side was represented by an authorized Ottoman diplomat and later by the Grand Vizier, Rami Mehmet Pasha and a Greek diplomat, Alexandros Mavrokordatos<sup>16</sup>. The issues regarding Austria with Turkey, Poland with Turkey and Venice with Turkey were regulated on a bilateral basis. Venice acquired dominance over the Peloponnesus and Aegina Island, while ceding Nafpaktos and Preveza to the Turks provided that they would demolish the forts in the area and thus allow free navigation in Gulf of Corinth and the Ionian coast. Venice held Lefkada and Tinos, while in the area of Dalmatian coast, where it used to dominate for several centuries, the Austrian Habsburgs started to play an important role.

The new situation formed after the Karlowitz treaty had a significant impact on the future of Greek people. Not only Austria's dominion in the North, but also the Venetians' dominion in the South provided the Greeks with the ability to travel with more freedom and high security in the west and be in touch more frequently with the new cultural and financial regions. After the Karlowitz treaty, big groups of Greeks from Thessaly, Epirus and Western Macedonia immigrated through Serbia, which was under Hapsburg occupation, to Hungary, and next they spread out to other European areas. The effect of the treaty was intense, not only on a commercial and cultural level, but also on the vision of the Greek people. It enhanced the hopes not only of Greeks but also of all the Orthodox of the Balkans, such as of Serbians, for their liberation from the Turkish yoke with the help of powerful Austria<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Ekkehard Eickhoff, *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi. Bufera nel Sud-est europeo, 1645-1700* (Milan: Rusconi, 1997).

<sup>15</sup> Lefteris S. Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453* (New York: New York Press, 2000); Martin Sicker, *The Islamic World in Decline: from the treaty of Karlowitz to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453*, 271.

<sup>17</sup> René Ristelhueber, *A History of the Balkan Peoples* (New York: Ardent Media Inc, 1971).

However, the Catholics kept pressuring Orthodox Christians to change their religious allegiance. This, as well as the fact that the Empress Maria Theresa turned away from the East to the struggle against Frederick the Great of Prussia, had as a result the decline of these hopes<sup>18</sup>. Despite this the Greeks did not lose their hopes for foreign aid. Already the policy of Peter the Great at the beginning of the seventeenth century had made Russia an important player on the European stage, which resulted in a strong influence on the vision of the Balkan peoples for liberation with the help of Russia<sup>19</sup>.

The presence of Russia in the European scene was an anchorage for the Greek expectations for liberation during the seventeenth century and particularly in the eighteenth century<sup>20</sup>. It should be noted that the Greeks were a people consisting of Orthodox Christians who continued to harbour hopes for liberation with the aid of supernatural powers (Christ, the Holy Mother). They faced the Russians as supporters of the Eastern Orthodox Church, due to their shared Orthodox religious views.

Frustrated with Venice and other Western powers, the Greeks placed their hopes in Orthodox Russia. The most popular legend of that time was that Russia, the “blonde ‘genos’” (as Greeks called the Russian people), would break down the Ottoman Empire<sup>21</sup>. Their faith in the “blonde ‘genos’” was strengthened by prophecies of monks like Kosmas of Aetolia (1714-1779)<sup>22</sup> and the priest Theodoritos of Ioannina (1740-1823)<sup>23</sup>.

At the end of the seventeenth century the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos Notaras, along with the Patriarch of Serbia & Bulgaria Arsenios the

<sup>18</sup> Ristelhueber, *History of the Balkan Peoples*.

<sup>19</sup> Ristelhueber, *History of the Balkan Peoples*; Lindsey Hughes, *Η Ρωσία την Εποχή του Μεγάλου Πέτρου* (Athens: Λιβάνης, 2007), 107.

<sup>20</sup> Athanasios Karathanasis, *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Βαλκάνια και την Ρωσία* (Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2003), 279; Constantine Sathas, *Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα*, V.2 (Athens: Νέα Σύνορα – Λιβάνης, 2010), 26f; Apostolos Vakalopoulos, “Στροφή των Ελλήνων προς τους Ρώσους” in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975), 51-58.

<sup>21</sup> Karathanasis, *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Βαλκάνια και την Ρωσία*, 279.

<sup>22</sup> Avgoustinos Kantiotis, *Διδαχαί Αγ. Κοσμά του Αιτωλού* (Athens: Ορθόδοξη Ιεραποστολική Αδελφότητα ‘Ο Σταυρός’, 2008).

<sup>23</sup> Asterios Argyriou “Η Απελευθέρωση των Ελλήνων και ο Εσχατολογικός Ρόλος της Ρωσίας και της Γαλλίας μέσα στο Ερμηνευτικό Έργο του Θεοδώρητου Ιωαννίνων (1740-1823)”, in *Καιρός, Τιμητικός τόμος στον ομότιμο καθηγητή Αθ. Δοΐκο*, V.4 (Thessaloniki: Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Θεολογικής Σχολής - Τμήμα Θεολογίας, 1994), 11-24.

Third “Carnoevic”, and the Bishop of Transylvania Brankovic, sent a letter to Peter the Great (1688) and asked for his help in the struggle for liberation from the Ottomans. The letter was attached with those of the Vlach prince Serban Cantacuzenus, the former Patriarch of Constantinople Dionyssios Mouselimis, and the current Patriarch of Constantinople, Iakovos. All letters addressed the problem of the Greek Orthodox people living under Ottoman rule. More specifically they all gave emphasis to the purges of the Greek Orthodox by the Uniates in the Peloponnese region especially after the Ottoman-Venetian War. They proposed to the Russians to assemble an army with the support of Serbian, Moldavian and other Orthodox regions in the Balkans that would approximate 300.000 men. With such an army they suggested that they could march towards Constantinople to liberate it<sup>24</sup>.

To appreciate the belief of the enslaved Greeks that their liberation will come from the blond nation of the Russians, we will include a part of the “Lettera”, written by Typaldos during the years 1698-99<sup>25</sup>. In the third part of this letter Typaldos, after speaking in derogatory terms about the Greeks, tries to convince the Venetians about the enforcement of Catholicism within the Greek community, and says:

Sometimes some of them are asking who could be the leader that Greece would hope to deliver its freedom and glory of the past. Did you ever have the chance to hear any answer other than the following: A blond nation, as suggested by a prophesy, will be our liberator. And this nation is none other than the Muscovites. Its emperor is our true leader, because among the other leaders he alone is an Orthodox. It would suffice to go into discussion with any of them to see if what I am telling you are the truth. But let us consider this point shortly. To begin with, they believe it to be a prophesy, a word or a promise of God that the empire of the Muscovites cannot abandon Greece. Secondly, they don’t have, they don’t recognize any other Orthodox leader than the Duke of Moscow. With these two views rooted in their heads, and immovable from their invincible religious motive, do you think that they would stay neutral when this leader would approach Greece with a huge army?

---

<sup>24</sup> Karathanasis, *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Βαλκάνια και την Ρωσία*, 323-328, esp. 327, subnote 8.

<sup>25</sup> The “Lettera” is further analyzed in the subsection 4.3.1.

Of course, Peter the Great did not plan the liberation of all such Greek territories that were under the Turkish rule, in the same manner as the Greek people of that era did. His intention was to bring together all Orthodox Christians and attack the Turks. This plan is clear in his declaration made on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of March 1711 to all enslaved Christians of the Balkans, twelve days after having proclaimed a war against the Turks; a war in which he soon suffered a humiliating defeat<sup>26</sup>.

### ***2.1.2. The importance of the Mediterranean***

Before closing this section, it would be proper to refer to the changes occurring at the time in shipping and trade in the Mediterranean Sea, which brought together the then great powers, such as Venice, France and Great Britain, but also exacerbated the competition among them. The Mediterranean as a special area of conflicts was of great significance both for the Greeks in the mainland and for those living in Venice, as numerous Greek traders and ship owners were active there; a number of them belonged to the Greek community of Venice. At the end of the seventeenth century, and mainly after the two wars between the Venetians and Ottoman Empire for the island of Crete, 1645-69 and 1684-99, the situation which had dominated the Mediterranean for many centuries changed<sup>27</sup>. This is due to the “northern intruders” from France, England, Holland, and later on, Russia. They upset the balance in the Mediterranean, not because they were Christians, but because they were new<sup>28</sup>.

In order to understand these changes, it is good to remember that the Ottoman Empire had introduced the system of capitulations, that is, a special system of economic concessions, aiming, on the one hand, to revitalize the Mediterranean trade and, on the other, to satisfy the demands of the European states enhancing thus their alliances against Habsburg Empire. The Ottoman Empire granted capitulations first to Venetians and Genoese in the fifteenth

<sup>26</sup> Hughes, *Η Ρωσία την Εποχή του Μεγάλου Πέτρου*, 107; Benedict Summer, *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949), 45-47.

<sup>27</sup> Molly Greene, *A Shared World: Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000), 5-7; Also Molly Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants: A maritime history of the Mediterranean* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2010), 6.

<sup>28</sup> Greene, *A Shared World*, 5.



century after the fall of Constantinople. In 1535 and 1569 they granted them to the French, in 1583 to the English, and in 1612 to the Dutch. The capitulations contributed to the economies of these states, making Mediterranean trade a significant source of income at least until the end of seventeenth century. The maritime development of the other Western states, had a particular and unpleasant impact on the former masters of Mediterranean trade, especially on Venice.

In any case, Venice, after the loss of some territories, saw the decline of its political influence and consequently its position as the first Catholic power in the sea<sup>29</sup>. The decline of Venice in the Mediterranean had been eclipsed by a new economic and political force, that of France<sup>30</sup>.

The phenomenon of piracy should also be mentioned, which took on great dimensions in the seventeenth century across the globe, but especially in the Mediterranean on the coasts and the islands of this closed sea<sup>31</sup>. The weakness of Venice, and the relaxation of the old antagonism between Venetian and Ottoman Empires, as well as the arrival of the new forces, offered the opportunity to the knights of Malta and also to the corsairs of North Africa to operate in the Eastern Mediterranean. In Barbary, and especially in Tunis, which was an international market and basis to outfit their ships, Arabs, Berbers and other African nomads assimilated with Turks, Greeks, Spaniards, Italians, Dutchmen, Englishmen and others, came in contact trading merchandise and slaves<sup>32</sup>. This situation created many problems but also opportunities to the Greek ship-owners and sailors, as will be discussed in the next section.

---

<sup>29</sup> Kenneth M. Setton, *Venice, Austria, and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: Diane, 1991).

<sup>30</sup> Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 6.

<sup>31</sup> Ferdinand Braudel, *Η Μεσόγειος*, 598-629; Maria Fusaro, Colin Heywood, and Mohamed-Salah Omri (eds), *Trade and Cultural Exchange in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (London: Macmillan, 2010); Andrian Tinniswood, *Pirates of Barbary: Corsairs, Conquests and Captivity in the Seventeenth Century Mediterranean* (London: Jonathatn Cape, 2010).

<sup>32</sup> Tinniswood, *Pirates of Barbary*.

### 2.1.3. Greeks between Ottomans and Venetians

Before the Karlowitz treaty, in the Western parts of Greece and especially in the Ionian Islands, Venice was in constant conflict with the Ottoman Empire for the sovereignty in the region. Specifically in 1669, the island of Crete was the last Greek area that fell under Ottoman occupation in the seventeenth century<sup>33</sup>. The long-lasting war for its conquest caused significant losses both to the Venetians and the Ottomans, with the latter being the final winners. The Venetians occupied the island of Kythira and the Ionian Islands, except for the island of Lefkada, some Peloponnesian areas and the island of Tinos. They were also “present” in Spinalonga and Gramvousa, two Greek islets of Crete, as well as in the port of Souda. The remaining Greek territory was under Ottoman occupation, with minor exceptions on the coast of Epirus. The Venetian retreat cleared the way for England, Holland and France. New economic relations and political balances were then created with the Ottomans, with the English and the Dutch intervening in the commercial life of the Ottoman Empire<sup>34</sup>.

The administrative structure of the Ottoman Empire was confronted with many disadvantages. Its military needs were growing bigger and bigger while the administrative system was extremely inefficient and wasteful. The corruption of public services had already started from the beginning of the seventeenth century, when graft and bribery for occupations and posts were established. The vast territory of the empire, expanding from the Black Sea to Mesopotamia and from Persia up to Hungary was a problem for an effective administration<sup>35</sup>.

The recent past (middle of seventeenth century) caused new problems for the Greeks, as many of them had cooperated with the Venetians against the

<sup>33</sup> Lane, *Venice*, 409-410.

<sup>34</sup> Mustafa Serdar Palabiyik, “Contributions of the Ottoman Empire to the Construction of Modern Europe”, PhD Thesis (Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University, 2005, and <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr>, 2005, p.124), notes: “Shoring the Atlantic Ocean and eager to find new markets, both the English and the Dutch merchants had long fixed their eyes on the lucrative trade opportunities of the East and this brought them into a fierce rivalry. However, it was the Dutch merchants – at least in the seventeenth century – that were able to prevail over the English”.

<sup>35</sup> Ferdinand Braudel, “The Mediterranean Economy in The Sixteenth Century”, in *Essays in European Economic History 1500-1800*, ed. P. Earle (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974); Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 169 passim.

Ottomans. Now that the Ottoman Empire had been stable in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea, the people of Crete, Mani, Cyclades and Peloponnese who had joined the Venetian Empire army, had to move out from their towns and villages. A lot of residents of Attica, Macedonia and Epirus immigrated westward as well. Their destinations included Venice, the Dalmatian Coast, Istria, Napoli, Sicily and Malta<sup>36</sup>.

In the sixteenth century those Greeks that were under Venetian rule, mostly habitants of the Ionian Islands, had concluded commercial agreements with ship-owners and sailors in the City of London. At that time, the English had dominated in the sea commerce of the eastern Mediterranean. And as a consequence their alliance with the Greeks was weakened. Nevertheless, the sea route from Venice to London remained open primarily due to the Greek ship-owners<sup>37</sup>.

Well known for their financial power and their activity during the sixteenth century were two brothers Agesilao and Marco Seguro of Zante (Zakynthos Island). Later, in the seventeenth century, their nephew, named Agesilao, despite the fact that he was not so rich as his uncles, was nominated Consul of Venice for “the merchants subjects to the Turk”, and after five years, for the English as well<sup>38</sup>. Other prominent ship-owners well known for their business activities were Giorgio Summacchi and his son Michele. They collaborated with the English, since the latter preferred to have for their commerce with Greeks based in Venice “as co-owners provided also a convenient cover to avoid the payment of the duties reserved to foreign ships”<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ioannis Chassiotis, “Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως”, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975), 8–51; George Finlay, *The History of Greece under Ottoman and Venetian Domination* (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1856); Apostolos Vakalopoulos, “Τουρκοκρατία 1669–1812: Η οικονομική άνοδος και ο φωτισμός του γένους”, in *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, V.4 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1973).

<sup>37</sup> Maria Fusaro, “Commercial Networks of Cooperation in the Venetian Mediterranean: The English and the Greeks, a case study”, in *Italy, Commercial Networks in the Early Modern World*, ed. Diego Ramada Curto and Antony Molho (Florence: European University Institute, 2002), 121-147.

<sup>38</sup> Maria Fusaro, “Coping with Transition: Greek Merchants and Shipowners between Venice and England in the late sixteenth century”, in *Diaspora entrepreneurial networks: four centuries of History*, ed. Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, Gelina Harlaftis and Ioanna Pepelasis – Minoglou (Oxford: Berg, 2005), 95-123.

<sup>39</sup> Fusaro, “Commercial Networks”, 134.

Other Greek ship-owners and with profiles similar to the aforementioned, such as Andrea della Vigna, the Kouvlis and Samariaris families, with origin from Zante, appear in the Venetian documentation. All of them were known Greek mercantile – entrepreneurial dynasties which owned large estates both in Zante and in the Venetian mainland<sup>40</sup>.

After the decline of Venice and the rise of piracy in the Mediterranean, as mentioned in the previous section, the Greeks tried to keep their privilege to operate as ideal mediators in the transactions between the Ottomans and the Venetians and also to adapt to the new situation. In the era of the Mediterranean piracy, Greek shipping and commerce became the victim of many assaults, especially from the knights of Malta; therefore, they tried to survive in the limits of the enmity between Christians and Muslims<sup>41</sup>.

It is true that the old enmity between Christians and Muslims was in retreat, but it is also true that new enmities emerged particularly within Christianity. The Greeks did not like to be attached to the one or the other side, but preferred to keep their autonomy and trading across the Mediterranean according to their own interest. For example, they knew that the corsairs in Malta hated the Orthodox Christians just as much as the Muslims. And the Greeks, although they have many trading ties with Muslims back in the eastern Mediterranean, they tried and downplayed these as part of their attempt to receive compensation for their merchandise in Malta<sup>42</sup>. As Molly Greene argues, “at the more general level Greeks -and Greek merchants in particular- dragged the ambiguity of the Mediterranean in their wake. The Greeks were enduringly liminal”<sup>43</sup>. This is an important note because if the term “liminality” is used as Victor Turner specified it, that is, as a transitional state between two phases, or, in relation to human beings, if it is accepted that it refers to individuals who act at the margins of a society, then, it should also be accepted that the liminal individuals have more freedom of movement or mobility in

<sup>40</sup> Fusaro, “Coping with Transition”.

<sup>41</sup> Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*.

<sup>42</sup> Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*.

<sup>43</sup> Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 11.

comparison with the individuals that act in the boundaries of a social structure<sup>44</sup>. Greek merchants and ship-owners, especially all of those who became rich through their maritime occupations, favoured this freedom and probably they did not like to lose it by changing their religious dogma or ethnic identity.

Just on April 25<sup>th</sup>, 1684, five years before the Karlowitz treaty, Venice started a war against the Sublime Porte<sup>45</sup>. The crusade was headed by Francesco Morosini, a veteran of the Candia war<sup>46</sup>. With the cooperation of the Holy See and the association of maritime forces not only from Italian cities, but also from Greek islands, Venice launched the crusade. The Ottoman-Venetian war started in 1684 and ended in 1699<sup>47</sup>. The Western Powers encouraged plenty of Greeks who also started rising against Turkish rule in several areas. The Turks retreated but in order to discourage the Greeks from massive insurrection, slaughtered and ravaged many Greek villages. The Greeks' need to get rid of Turkish rule was more than obvious in the way they were recruited and the battles in which they participated. In the battle of Lefkada, which started on July 21<sup>st</sup>, 1684, more than 2,000 Greeks participated, recruited from the islands of Ithaca, Cephalonia, Zakynthos and Corfu. In addition, a lot of ancillary ships from the Ionian Islands fought next to 38 galleys and 8 galleasses of the Western powers<sup>48</sup>. Timotheos Typaldos<sup>49</sup>, Archbishop of Cephalonia and Zakynthos, was among those who significantly contributed to the Greek participation. In 1685, the Venetian forces invaded Peloponnese, which they occupied until 1715<sup>50</sup>.

Many leaders of the Orthodox clergy supported the Venetians in their conflict against the Turks; they considered it as a chance to expel the Ottomans

---

<sup>44</sup> Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1995), 128.

<sup>45</sup> "The Morean War" is the name for the Sixth Ottoman–Venetian War (1684–1699). This was part of the wider conflict between Venice and the Ottoman Empire. See Chassiotis, "Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως"; Vakalopoulos, "Τουρκοκρατία 1669–1812".

<sup>46</sup> For the war events of that period, see Eickhoff, *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi*; Lane, *Venice*, 409-410; Norwich and Dimock, *History of Venice*, 536-549.

<sup>47</sup> Chassiotis, "Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως"; Setton, *Venice, Austria, and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*.

<sup>48</sup> Chassiotis, "Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως".

<sup>49</sup> Timotheos came from the generation of Typaldos-Haritatos. Meletios, whose life and work is investigated herein, came from the generation of Typaldos-Tzanatos. Apparently the family roots were common but later separated into two branches.

<sup>50</sup> Despoina Michalaga, *Συμβολή στην Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία της Πελοποννήσου κατά τη Β' Βενετοκρατία, 1685-1715* (Athens: Θεολογική Σχολή Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών, 2008), 43-46.

from Greek territories. The Bishop of Salona, Filotheos<sup>51</sup>, was one of them, as well as Makarios the Metropolitan of Larisa, Ierotheos the Metropolitan of Thebes, Amvrosios the Metropolitan of Evripos, and Iakovos the Metropolitan of Athens<sup>52</sup>.

In the autumn of 1687, the Venetians reached the Port of Piraeus and conquered the city of Athens. They bombed and destroyed for the first time in history the Parthenon. After 8 months the Venetian forces withdrew from Athens, leaving again the city under Ottoman control<sup>53</sup>.

In the meantime, in 1687 Suleiman the Second was moving northwards, trying to occupy, once more, new territories. The only thing he managed to achieve was, ironically, to be defeated once more. Therefore, with the Karlowitz treaty, he re-established Habsburg domination in the area<sup>54</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> Constantine Ntokos, *Η Στερεά Ελλάς κατά τον Ενετοτουρκικόν Πόλεμον 1684-1699 και ο Σαλώνων Φιλόθεος* (Αθήνα: 1975).

<sup>52</sup> We set forth in detail the names of the officials in order to highlight the vital role that Church officials played during this period and their influence to the Orthodox population of occupied Greece and other territories.

<sup>53</sup> For an analytical description of these events, see: James M. Paton (ed), *The Venetians in Athens 1687-1688: from the Istorìa of Cristoforo Ivanovich*, Gennadeion Monographs I (Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940). The book includes some original texts, presented only in the original Italian, and an English introduction to the short-lived occupation and the reasons for the Venetian withdrawal. See also Theodor E Mommsen, "The Venetians in Athens and the Destruction of the Parthenon in 1687", *American Journal of Archaeology*, 45/4 (Oct-Dec. 1941), 544-556; Chassiotis, "Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως", 27-28; Kornilia Chatziaslani, "Morosini in Athens", digital edition [http://www.eie.gr/archaeologia/En/chapter\\_more\\_8.aspx](http://www.eie.gr/archaeologia/En/chapter_more_8.aspx), last accessed 20/11/2013; Alessandro Marzo Magno, *Atene 1687: Venezia, I Turchi e la Distruzione del Partenone* (Milan: Il Saggiatore, 2011).

<sup>54</sup> Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar (eds), *Süleymân the Second and His Time* (Istanbul: Gorgias Press & The Isis Press, 2010), 163-223.

## 2.2. The era of conflicts between Christian dogmas

The seventeenth century is marked by the last major religious war in Europe, the Thirty Years War, which ended with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The big ‘loser’ of this war was Roman Catholicism. The Thirty Years War changed the religious situation in Western Europe. Protestants were no longer seen as a widespread minority in Europe and Calvinism had won legal recognition for the first time in the Holy Roman Empire. Thus, while Catholicism was still the dominant religion in some of the major nations such as France and Spain, it was definitely weakening<sup>55</sup>. The weakened Catholic Church, tried by other means -primarily political- to impose its faith on the Orthodox believers living within its territories of influence. And that happened with the spread of “Unia”.

The term “Unia” has its origin in the Latin word “Unio” (union). Although the term originated in the sixteenth century, the corresponding policy began to emerge in the eleventh century with the conquest of Orthodox populations by the crusaders. The model of “Unia” was widely implemented by the end of the eleventh century in Southern Italy and Sicily in order to cut off politically, but mainly spiritually, the population in the area which had for centuries been part of the Byzantine Empire. In 1215, during the days of Pope Innocent III, the Fourth Lateran Council allows Orthodox Eastern church to maintain their traditions and keep their rituals and their own language, providing that they would recognize the primacy of the Pope. In 1439, after the Council of Florence, the phenomenon took great proportions<sup>56</sup>. It was connected during the late sixteenth century with the expansionist efforts of the Catholic Church in those countries -mainly in the East- where the majority of Orthodox Christians lived. “Unia” were established officially in 1596 in Poland, (“Unia” in Polish, “Unija” in Russian). The Uniates described themselves as followers of the

---

<sup>55</sup>Ravitch, *The Catholic Church and the French Nation*; Carlson and Owens, *The Sacred and the Sovereign*. For details see subsection 2.1.1.

<sup>56</sup> Father Georgios D. Metallinos, Dimitrios Gonis, Elias Fratseas, Evgenios Morarou and bishop Yevtits, *H Oυνία Χθες και Σήμερα* (Athens: Αρμός, 1992).

Byzantine rite (Βυζαντινόρυθμοι), or of the Greek rite (“Ελληνόρυθμοι”) or Greek-Catholics (“ελληνοκαθολικοί”)<sup>57</sup>.

At that time, some Orthodox communities began to accept the Pope as their religious leader. They adopted the Catholic faith, keeping simultaneously the traditional rituals and symbols<sup>58</sup> of the Greek Orthodox Church. It is worth mentioning that the priests of the “Unia” as far as the external appearance is concerned did not differ from the Orthodox ones. For this reason also the Orthodox bishops and circulars of the Patriarchate of Constantinople called the Uniates “wolves in sheepskins” or, “the Orthodox about to fall”<sup>59</sup>. The preservation of the Orthodox rituals and appearance enabled “Unia” priests to avoid the ‘traitor’ approach, and to cover in this way the relinquishing their tradition. What is more, unlike Latin priests, they were allowed to get married.

The “Unia” movement expanded -with the contribution of Jesuits- expanded during the seventeenth century in Ruthenia (Karpatho-Russia) (1646), Slovakia (1649), Transylvania (1698-1699), Serbia Croatia, Slavonia and in the early eighteenth century in the Middle East<sup>60</sup>. At that time the largest wave of pressure on the Orthodoxy and the most conversions to Catholicism took place. The regions of the Dalmatian coast and those bordering with the lands of the Ottoman Empire received the strongest pressure<sup>61</sup>.

The case of Poland indicates how the Vatican used the imposition of the above, such as the collusion between the rulers of certain areas and the Pope, so that the decrees of the “Unia” Church would comply. Meanwhile, they often

<sup>57</sup> Father Georgios D. Metallinos, “Ουνία, Πρόσωπο και Προσωπείο”, in Metallinos et al, *Ουνία χθες και σήμερα*, 15-16.

<sup>58</sup> Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, 19.

<sup>59</sup>For “Patriarchal Circular of Gregorius VI, 1838” see Manouil Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες* (Athens: Αλφειός, 1996), 612. Also for the full text of the circular see: Father Georgios D. Metallinos “Appendix”, in Metallinos et al, *Ουνία χθες και σήμερα*.

<sup>60</sup>See Dimitrios Gonis, “Ιστορική Ανασκόπηση του προβλήματος της Ουνίας”, in Metallinos et al, *Η Ουνία χθες και σήμερα*, 99f; Graeme Murdock, *Calvinism on the Frontier, 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 139; Ronald Roberson, *The Eastern Christian Churches: A Brief Survey* (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1988), 34-35; Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Bruce R. Berglund and Brian Porter-Szűcs, *Christianity and Modernity in Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European Press, 2010), 215.

<sup>61</sup>The first person to impose a Unia Church as the official Church of his country was the king of Poland Sigismund III (1587-1632), who had studied in Jesuit schools.



approached the Orthodox clergy promising them, attractive benefits, such as a prominent position in the society of clergies in the Western Church in order to proselytize them<sup>62</sup>. Special efforts were made to entice the bishops of the Orthodox Church also by granting them socio-economic privileges. Patriarchs and the Bishops joined the “Unia” Church and were rendered an equal position to a Catholic Cardinal, thus enjoying the religious and political powers, as well as the accompanying financial benefits. One evidence of the Vatican’s converting policy is the document signed by thirty-eight Romanian high priests (7 October 1698) who declared that they are now members of the Church of Rome<sup>63</sup>.

In Italy, some Greek confraternities operated under a mixed religious scheme with a view to safeguard unhindered exercising of their religious views. For example, the Greeks in Sicily and the Spanish-dominated Southern Italy accepted their affiliation to the Pope and the sect of “Unia”, as long they could apply the Greek ritual (il rito Greco) into their churches. This fact brought about too many objections among the Greek confraternities, as it was combined with oppositions resulting from the financial status of the churches. As a result, a lot of confraternities, such as the ones of Naples, Ancona and Livorno were on the edge of being extinguished<sup>64</sup>. However, a lot of transitions were noted from the purely Orthodox doctrine to the Uniate one and vice versa<sup>65</sup> or even the participation of some Greeks in churches or charity institutions of both churches – Catholic and Orthodox – for reasons that will be detailed below<sup>66</sup>.

These developments took place at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, at a time when conflicts and religious disputes between Catholics and Protestants in Western Europe had caused vivid discussions and disagreements among Orthodox theologians. Most of them had not been prepared and did not have the background to study and comprehend the new religious trends. Others swayed between Catholicism and

---

<sup>62</sup> Gonis, “Ιστορική Ανασκόπηση του προβλήματος της Ουνίας”, 55.

<sup>63</sup> Gonis, “Ιστορική Ανασκόπηση του προβλήματος της Ουνίας”, 99-100.

<sup>64</sup> Ioannis Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης: Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2001), 107-108.

<sup>65</sup> Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 107.

<sup>66</sup> See subsection 2.4.3.

Protestantism<sup>67</sup>. At this time the centre of the Orthodox Church – the church of Constantinople – was in crisis. One should note that in the last half of the seventeenth century, 27 different Patriarchs sat on the Ecumenical Throne. The lack of stability in the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church is most evident in the fact that during the same period the Catholic Church had only six Popes, i.e., the average service of a Patriarch was less than two years, while that of a Pope was more than eight years<sup>68</sup>. In 1671, the Venetian Bailo in Constantinople considered as a possible option the subordination of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to the Pope<sup>69</sup>. The situation of the lower clergy was devastating, with deep poverty and extended illiteracy among clergymen. On the contrary, Catholic priests, in particular the Jesuits, were founding schools in the urban centres of the Ottoman Empire and the Aegean islands. The situation started changing at the end of the seventeenth and in the beginning of the eighteenth century due to the generations of Orthodox Christians that graduated from Italian educational institutes, mainly in Venice and Padua, as well as the scholars of Constantinople who formed the generation of Fanariotes<sup>70</sup>.

This policy of attracting and conferring privileges on behalf of the Catholic Church towards the defenders of “Unia” appears to fit the movements of Meletios Typaldos and his turn towards Catholicism. In his “Lettera”<sup>71</sup>, Typaldos expresses his disappointment at the lower social position in which he feels that he and his Orthodox flock were placed. He writes: “When we are recognized as Catholics we have the honour to see them (meaning the Roman Catholics) attending our ceremonies with reverence and respect and we enjoy so much the admiration they feel as they observe how rich, full of reverence and depth our ceremonies are”.

<sup>67</sup> Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία 1204-1985*, V.3 (Thessaloniki: Ηρόδοτος 1968).

<sup>68</sup> Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας 1453-1821*, revised edition, translated to Greek by Georgios D. Metallinos (Athens: M.I.E.T, 2005).

<sup>69</sup> Chassiotis, “Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως”, 10-13.

<sup>70</sup> They were Greek aristocrats who lived in Constantinople and held important administrative posts within the Patriarchate. As a result, they could have influence on the Patriarch’s decisions and intervene with the election of Patriarchs. Their education and wealth led Ottomans to utilize them within the Ottoman Administration and the leadership of great areas in the Balkans, like Wallachia and Moldavia. See, Constantine T. Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός* (Athens: Ερμής, 2002); Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*; Stavrianos, *The Balkans since 1453*.

<sup>71</sup> “Lettera” is a letter sent by Typaldos to a Venetian Official. See subsection 4.3.1.

It is also clear that he wanted and decided as head of the Orthodox Church in Venice to convert to Catholicism without taking into consideration the body of the Greek Orthodox Church. There is no evidence that there was a collective decision. On the contrary, by using Venetian authorities, Typaldos imposed on his subordinate priests of the St. George Church a confession of faith to Catholicism, in order to spread through them his views.

It is also noteworthy however, that while there were isolated cases of Greek Orthodox people who accepted to join “Unia” there was no massive influx into the new church. A major reason for the failure of “Unia” in the Greek population, it seems, was that the Bible and the liturgy of the Orthodox Church was written in Greek. The Great Fathers of the Orthodox Church, from Saint Basil the Great to Ioannis Chrysostomos, and later by Maximus the Confessor and Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, up until the Hesychasts<sup>72</sup>, all wrote in Greek. Therefore for Greek clergy and their flock it was easy to internalize them. Even on the level of theological issues, Greek Archbishops and theologians were not easily persuaded by the Catholic doctrine. Carrying on their long theological and philosophical tradition, (which was initiated by the Neo-Platonists and continued to Saint Gregorius Palamas), they strongly opposed the arguments of Catholicism. Certainly coherent confrontation of the “Unia” by the Orthodox Church took place only in the eighteenth century from Greek monks of the school of “Κολλυβάδων” in the Holy Mountain<sup>73</sup>.

---

<sup>72</sup> The ultimate goal of the Hesychasts is the experiential knowledge of God. As supported by the main founder of the Hesychasts, Saint Gregorius Palamas (1256-1359), God exists in two ways, as per His essence and as per His holy and uncreated energies. Man cannot meet God in His essence. However, he can reach and bond with Him through His holy and uncreated energies. The best way to do it is though praying. What this means is that by the exercise of sobriety (the mental ascesis against tempting thoughts), the Hesychast arrives at a continual practice of the Jesus Prayer with his mind in his heart and where his consciousness is no longer encumbered by the spontaneous inception of images (see, Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffing, and John F. Healey (eds), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity* (Malden, MA.: Blackwell Publishing, 1999).

<sup>73</sup> The name “Κολλυβάδες” is firstly used in 1754, after a conflict started when the monks of Saint Anna Skete (Monastery) on Holy Mountain disputed on the regularity or non-regularity of performing memorial services on Sundays and not on Saturdays. Soon, the conflict expanded to theological issues. Supporters of “Κολλυβάδες” were proven to be prominent priests and writers, such as Athanasios Parios, Makarios Notaras, Nikodimos from Holy Mountain and others. Through their texts, mostly *Φιλοκαλία των Ιερών Νηπτικίων*, they connected the movement of “Κολλυβάδες” with such of Hesychasts of the fourteenth century (see Patrinelis, *Εκκλησία και Ορθοδοξία*, 131-132; Constantine Papoulidis, *Το Κίνημα των Κολλυβάδων*

But these efforts did not influence the main body of the Orthodox following in the main Greek territories because the majority of the Orthodox Christians “lost neither their Orthodox faith, nor their Hellenistic tradition; because the mandatory reference to the decisions of the Council of Florence within the church which had been imposed as a practice to the Frank dominated countries by the Vatican ended up idle without impact and substance”<sup>74</sup>. However, studying the protagonists of the movements for reunion and the religious debates of the time, we are able to understand their pragmatism and arrive at a better understanding of the plans and operations of the Archbishop of Philadelphia.

The Christian unionists’ initiatives had their origin in religious and political reasons<sup>75</sup>. This becomes obvious from the first significant attempt to unite Eastern and Western Church, made by the Byzantines in the years 1438-1439, at the Council of Florence whose members (the most eminent was Bishop Bessarion) were fully aware of the Ottoman threat<sup>76</sup>. The Patriarch and the rest of the delegations were persuaded that after the united seal *Laetentur Coeli*<sup>77</sup>, on July 6<sup>th</sup>, 1439 the unity of the two Churches had been obtained. It is known that as soon as the delegation returned to Constantinople, there had been a change of mind and the decisions of the Council of Florence<sup>78</sup> were not recognized. The five points that constituted the important differences -with Filioque being the

---

(Athens: Αποστολική Διακονία της Ελλάδος, 1991); Stelios Ramfos, *Το Αδιανόητο Τίποτα: Φιλοκαλικά Ριζώματα του Νεοελληνικού Μηδενισμού* (Athens: Αρμός, 2010).

<sup>74</sup> Dimitrios Tsakonas, *Κοινωνιολογία του ελληνικού πνεύματος* (Athens: 1969), 70; Dimitrios Tsakonas, *Εισαγωγή εις τον Νέον Ελληνισμόν* (Athens: 1971).

<sup>75</sup> The fact that the motives of those supporting the Union of Orthodox Church with other Churches were political is also proven by the attempts of some Orthodox circles to unite their Church even with Islam. Specifically, the theologian Georgios Trapezountios (1395-1484) and the philosopher Georgios Amiroutzis (beginning of fifteenth century about 1470) suggested to Mehmet the Second the Union between Christianity and Islam. (see Georgios Zoras, *Γεώργιος ο Τραπεζούντιος και αί προς ελληνοτουρκικήν συνεννόησιν προσπάθειαι αυτού* (Athens: Σπουδαστήριον Βυζαντινής και Νεοελληνικής φιλολογίας Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών, 1954).

<sup>76</sup> A typical example is such of the Orthodox Archbishop Bessarion who after the Council of Florence, resorted to the West and became a Cardinal. See John Monfasani, *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and other émigrés. Selected Essays* (Brookfield: Variorum, 1995).

<sup>77</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 60; Hubert Jedin, *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: A Historical Survey* (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), 104.

<sup>78</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 60; Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959); Christos Patrinelis, “Βιβλιοκρισία του Βιβλίου του Joseph Gill *The Council of Florence*”, *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, V.29, (1959), 494-499.

main one- remained unsolved up until our days separating the two Christian worlds.

After the Council of Florence, the Catholic Church followed a more systematic approach to union with the Orthodox Greeks. After the fall and the migration of many Byzantine intellectuals to Italy, the Greek unionists gained high prestige and power. At the same time, the Catholic Church, was not content only to give honours to the Greek unionists, but implemented an educational policy for the children of the Orthodox Greeks in an attempt to finally attract them into the Catholic Church.

In 1513 Pope Leo X founded the Greek Gymnasium of Rome<sup>79</sup> (it operated from 1514 to 1521, after Pope's Leo X death) in which the studies were oriented exclusively to the classics. Almost at the same period, Ianos Laskaris asked Leo X to found a Greek school in Florence, where Arsenius Apostolis taught<sup>80</sup>. Apostolis had lived in France and maintained good relations with King Francis I. He also asked him to establish a Greek school in Milan, which was then under French domination. The school operated just for a short period of time and shut down for financial reasons<sup>81</sup>. Two other schools, such of Podocatarus and Uran, are reported by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos<sup>82</sup>, but we do not have any further information about their operation.

In November 1576, Pope Gregory XIII founded the Greek Saint Athanasius College in Rome (it operated for two centuries and about 1000

---

<sup>79</sup>Tutoring board included: Ianos Laskaris, Marcos *Moussouros* and Arsenius Apostolis: see Zacharias N. Tsirpanlis, *To Ellhniko Kollégio ths Rómhs kai oi mathétes tou, 1576-1700: Συμβολή στη μελέτη της μορφωτικής πολιτικής του Βατικανού* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1980).

<sup>80</sup>Manoussos Manousakas, "Arseniou Moneμβασίας του Αποστόλη επιστολαί ανέκδοτα, 1521-1534: Προς Κάρολον τον Ε', Κλήμεντα τον Ζ', τον Έρασμον, τους Καρδινάλιους Niccolo Ridolfi και Egidio Canisio, τον Ιανόν Λάσκαριν και τον Ιουστίνον Δεκάδουν", *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου*, 8/9 [1961 (1958/9)], 31-33, 53.

<sup>81</sup>Émile Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique, XVIe siècle*, V.1 (Paris: Garnier, 1918), 335-336.

<sup>82</sup>Nicolaus Comnenus-Papadopolus, *Historia Gymnasii Patavini post ea, quae hactenus de illo scripta sunt, ad haec nostra tempora plenius, et emendatius deducta. Cum actuario de claris professoribus tum alumnis eiusdem*, V. 1 (Venice: Sebastianus Coletis, 1726), 38; Constantine Garitsis, *Νικόλαος Κομνηνός Παπαδόπουλος, Μυσταγωγική προθεωρία εκ του κανονικού δικαίου* (Athens: Γαρίτσης, 2012).

students studied in it)<sup>83</sup>. Orthodox students, in order to be admitted, were required at some point between the period of six months or a year after entering the College to make a confession of faith in favour of the one undivided Church. It was a practice that disturbed the Orthodox Church from the beginning and for a long time.

It is characteristic that even in the eighteenth century, Parios (who later was to become Saint Athanasios Parios) denounced this policy of the College<sup>84</sup>. Many of those students, when they graduated, each one for different reasons, retracted their confession and returned to the Orthodox doctrine. But there were also important scholars and graduates of the College who worked for the reunion of the Churches<sup>85</sup>.

Educational institutions and particularly those of the Jesuits also played an important role by providing high quality education. Jesuit professors even were principals at the Greek College in Rome between 1591-1604 and 1622-1773. The Pope believed that through such an educational process it would be possible to reunite the two Churches under his rule<sup>86</sup>. In brief, the educational policy of the Vatican had not only religious but also political dimensions. The graduates of these schools whether they followed a priestly career or followed a career in trading or other professions, were often travelling to the territories of their homeland, and therefore they were becoming the best ambassadors of the policy of the Holy See. At the same time, they instilled into the enslaved Greeks the hope that their release would come from Catholic kings, such as the King of Spain<sup>87</sup>. Most important however, of all this Catholic influence was also the cultivation by Greek unionists of Catholic culture and Western literature. Along with the ousting of the Orthodox faith, Greek children of the Diaspora were losing contact with the Orthodox Byzantine literature and accepted Latin Fathers as successors of the ancient Greek spirit.

<sup>83</sup> Tsirpanlis, *Το Ελληνικό Κολλέγιο της Ρώμης και οι μαθητές του*; Zacharias N. Tsirpanlis, *Οι Μακεδόνες σπουδαστές του Ελληνικού Κολλεγίου Ρώμης και η δράση τους στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία* (Thessaloniki: Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών, 1971).

<sup>84</sup> Athanasios Parios, “Λόγος εις την εορτήν του θείου Γρηγορίου του Παλαμά εν Θεσσαλονίκη”, in *Λόγοι πανηγυρικοί ιδ’ του πανιερωτάτου αρχιεπισκόπου Φιλαδελφείας Μακαρίου του Χρυσοκεφάλου* (Vienna: 1797), 459.

<sup>85</sup> Among them: Nikolaos Komninios Papadopoulos, Leon Allatios, Petros Arkoudios, etc.

<sup>86</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 63.

<sup>87</sup> Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 144.

On the other hand, the Greek unionists of the European Diaspora should be regarded as those who first cultivated in the West the philhellenism creating among Western scholars a movement of solidarity with the enslaved race of Greeks<sup>88</sup>. A philhellenic movement that would certainly mature slowly, but will be fruitful in the early nineteenth century, when the Greeks based on their own powers, will take the decision to revolt against the Turks. Under the strong influence of the Catholic Church, many Greek communities, particularly those of Southern Italy and Sicily, were constantly challenged by Uniates. It is certain, that the acceptance of the “Unia” by the Greek Diaspora communities proved temporary, as one could often meet followers swapping from one confession to the other<sup>89</sup>.

However, regardless of the policy of “Unia”, many Greeks of the Greek colonies in Italy - contrary to those of the main Greek territories- converted to Catholicism in the seventeenth century. The reasons were mainly social, that is, hoping to improve their social status, as well as economic, in order to facilitate their financial transactions with the political authorities. Without being considered strange at that period, some of them kept at the same time their Orthodox faith when entering the Greek temples<sup>90</sup>. In any case this “trade off” from one dogma to another had created suspicions in the Catholic clergy, and may have resulted in various conflicts in the microcosm of the Greek Diaspora, especially when religious differences intertwined with financial matters<sup>91</sup>.

---

<sup>88</sup> Bessarion was the first to persuade the popes Callistus III and Pius II to start a war against the Turks and free Constantinople while he himself travelled to Germany and France to find allies. Due to the death of Pius II he could not fulfill his plan: see Constantine Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία: Βιογραφία των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων, από της καταλύσεως της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι της Ελληνικής εθνεγερσίας, 1453-1821* (Athens: Κορομηλάς, 1868), 29 passim. Leon Allatios was another characteristic figure in implementing Greek letters into the Western scholar circles. He wrote more than a hundredth books, published and unpublished, about ancient philosophy, history, theology, grammar etc in Greek, ancient Greek, Latin, Italian and French. He was librarian in the Vatican library; also Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία* 268-274; Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 167.

<sup>89</sup> Domenica Minniti-Gonia, *Ο Ελληνισμός της Διασποράς*, V.2 (Patra: Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο, 2001).

<sup>90</sup> Sotirios Koutmanis, “Χρονικά για την ιστορία της Ελληνικής Κοινότητας Βενετίας, 18<sup>ος</sup> αι.” *Εώς και Εσπερία*, 7 (2007), 311-334. More information for the Greek Catholics of Venice is also provided in subsection 2.4.3.

<sup>91</sup> As an example we can mention the Greek Confraternity in Neapolis, which was involved in long legal disputes over its property titles. Similar conflicts occurred in Ancona and Livorno (see Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 107-108).

Usually systematic and persistent in their aims in the late seventeenth century, the Jesuits brought some ecumenical Patriarchs closer to the Catholic Church<sup>92</sup>. This did not last for long. Relations worsened again when the Catholic Church tried to take a piece of the Patriarchate of Antioch and Alexandria, creating the Melkite church<sup>93</sup>. As we shall see in chapter three, the systematic and pervasive policy of the Jesuits was invoked, by the Greek lawyer in the service of the Serenissima and trader Thomas Flanghinis, so as to convince the Council of Ten of the need for the foundation of purely Greek schools in Venice<sup>94</sup>.

Another tactic adopted by Catholics was to pursue policies through the Sublime Porte against the Patriarchate in Istanbul. Patriarch Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638) opposed this practice; he adopted unification initiatives, but this time between Orthodoxy and Protestantism. This had been attempted before, by Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) and the Patriarch of Alexandria Gerasimos A. Spartaliotis (1569/1570-1636). Melanchthon, one year before he died, worried about the strength of the Turks and the fragmentation of the Christian Religion; having secured the support of Luther (1483-1546), he attempted unsuccessfully to communicate with the Ecumenical Patriarch. His writings about his concerns never reached Istanbul<sup>95</sup>. On the contrary, in the hands of the Patriarch Jeremiah II Tranos, letters of Martin Crusius from Tübingen would later arrive. Crusius opened a dialogue about the possibilities of finding common ground between

<sup>92</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 64.

<sup>93</sup> The Melkite Greek-Catholic Church is an Eastern Catholic Church. The moment of its institution was the election of Cyril VI Tanas, in 1724, by the Melkite bishops of Syria as the new Patriarch of Antioch. Then, the Patriarch Jeremias III of Constantinople declared Cyril's election to be invalid and excommunicated him. Five years later, in 1729, Pope Benedict XIII recognized Cyril as the legitimate Patriarch of Antioch and recognized his followers as being in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church. From this time onwards, the Melkite Greek-Catholic Church has existed separately from and in parallel to the Greek Orthodox Church of Antioch: see Ignatios Dick, *Melkites: Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholics of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem* (Boston: Sophia Press, 2004).

<sup>94</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*.

<sup>95</sup> Ernst Benz, "Melanchton et l'Église Orthodoxe", *Irenikon* 29 (1956): 165-176. Some years earlier (1551) Melanchthon had sent to Patriarch Iosaphat II –via his deacon Demetrius Mysos– the confession of faith of Luther: see Constantine Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, Vol. 6 (Athens: Νίκας, 1925), 470.



Eastern Orthodox Church and the Protestant Church<sup>96</sup>. The debate lasted from 1573 to 1581 but did not blossom<sup>97</sup>.

But the dialogue with the Protestants started gaining ground when the Ecumenical Patriarch Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638), by joining the forces with the Protestant nations (England-Netherlands) and partially reforming the Eastern Church, was trying to halt the expansion of Catholicism. Lucaris' approach to the Protestant nations ultimately proved to be a conscious attempt to reform the Eastern Church<sup>98</sup>, the first after the fall. Catholicism, however, as already mentioned, and in the form of “Unia”, and the politics of slander against the Patriarchate, had begun to gain ground and jeopardized the powers of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Following his studies in Venice and Padua, Lucaris, at the age of 21, became a deacon and at the young age of 29 he became Patriarch of Alexandria (1601-1620) and then Patriarch of Constantinople (1620-1638). During this time, with the pressures of embassies of Catholic countries, he was dethroned five times and five times respectively, with the supporting vote of the clergy, as well as with the support of other forces beyond those of the Orthodox faithful<sup>99</sup> he was installed again. Eventually he was accused of allegedly preparing a revolution of the Greeks against the Turks. He was sentenced to death and hanged on June 27, 1638. According to the great Greek historian of the nineteenth century Constantine Paparrigopoulos, “perhaps never before the value of the Ecumenical Patriarch, was brighter than the time that it was served by Cyril Lucaris”<sup>100</sup>.

---

<sup>96</sup> Apostolos Vakalopoulos, “Ανταγωνισμός των Δυτικών θρησκευτικών ιδεών κατά τα τέλη του 16 και κατά το πρώτο μισό του 17 αι. και οι απέναντι αυτών στάση των ορθοδόξων Ιεραρχών”, in *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, V.3 (Thessaloniki: Ηρόδοτος 1968).

<sup>97</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 55-56.

<sup>98</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 56.

<sup>99</sup> The Anglicans and Protestants, especially the British and the Dutch were applying pressures to the Sublime Porte in support of Cyril Lucaris. They had very good relations with him and believed that Lucaris was the Patriarch who could unite the Eastern Church with theirs.

<sup>100</sup> Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, 468; George P. Henderson, *Η αναβίωση του ελληνικού στοχασμού 1620-1830: η ελληνική φιλοσοφία στα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας*, translated in Greek by Fanouris Voros (Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 1994); Petsios, *Περί Φύσεως*.

The great turmoil began in 1629. It was then when a text entitled, “Cyril Lucaris: Short Confession on the Orthodox Faith” was published in Switzerland. The text contained Calvinist positions<sup>101</sup> which caused immediate reactions from both Catholics and Orthodox. For many years it was questioned whether it was indeed the work of Lucaris. Even today, the official website of the Ecumenical Patriarchate<sup>102</sup> in Constantinople, avoids taking position as to the authorship of the “Confession”. But it has been documented thanks to the comparison of the handwriting with other writings of Cyril that he is the author<sup>103</sup>.

The text caused widespread controversy. Cyril and his followers, including John Karyofillis (1600-1693), Mitrophanes Kritopoulos, Patriarch of Alexandria (1636-1639)<sup>104</sup>, and Theophilos Korydalleus (1570-1645)<sup>105</sup>, director of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople, all of them were condemned for their reformist views by the Synods of 1638 and 1642 in Istanbul and by the Synods of 1672 in Istanbul, Jerusalem and Bethlehem<sup>106</sup>. Those Synods rejected the positions held considering them to be based on Calvinism<sup>107</sup>.

<sup>101</sup> The Confession consists of 18 short chapters and four questions-and-answers. The acceptance of the Calvinist position about God, who has determined everything for the human, the recognition of the Holy Bible as the only book, rejection of icon worship, etc. are some of the features of this Confession: see George P. Michaelides, “The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris”, in *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 12/02 (June 1943), 118-129.

<sup>102</sup> www.ec-patr.org.

<sup>103</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 55.

<sup>104</sup> Mitrophanes Kritopoulos, a “protégé” of Lucaris, studied in Oxford for seven years (1617-1624) with a scholarship awarded by the King of England James I, and made contacts with many circles of the Anglican Church: see Colin Davey, “Metrophanes Kritopoulos, Pioneer for Unity”, *Θεολογία*, 38 (1967), 459-486; Andronikos Dimitrakopoulos, *Δοκίμιον περί του βίου και των συγγραμμάτων Μητροφάνους του Κριτοπούλου πατριάρχου Αλεξανδρείας* (Leipzig: Metzger and Vitting, 1870).

<sup>105</sup> The Aristotelian philosopher Theophilos Korydalleus, originally an associate of Lucaris, rejected his position because of the pressures exerted on him. He was ordained bishop in 1640, but was soon dethroned and moved to Athens where he taught philosophy until his death: see Evangelos Papanoutsos “Θεόφιλος Κορυδαλεύς” in *Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία* V.1 (Athens: Αετός. 1950), 52; Vakalopoulos, *Ανταγωνισμός των Δυτικών θρησκευτικών ιδεών*; Andronikos Dimitrakopoulos, *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς, ήτοι, Περί των Ελλήνων των Γραμμάτων κατά Λατίνων και περί των Συγγραμμάτων Αυτών* (Leipzig: Metzger and Vitting, 1872).

<sup>106</sup> Jesse Russell and Ronald Cohn (eds), *Synod of Jerusalem* (Georgia; TSU-Tbilise State University, 2012).

<sup>107</sup> Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*, 473.

Reference was made at length to the case of Lucaris for two reasons: first, because this “Confession” was the source of a great debate that lasted until the death of Peter the Great in 1725. During that time the last expectations for a possible reunion between the churches vanished. Such thoughts of a union in the meantime had acquired followers in Russia. Second, these thoughts clearly influenced Meletios Typaldos like so many other unionist priests, theologians and philosophers who participated, during the seventeenth century, in the “mobility of ideas” within Christian confessions. More concretely the Greek Bishop Typaldos tried to undermine the power of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Venetian ruled areas in search of a ‘middle way’ between Constantinople and Rome<sup>108</sup>.

Among other things, Lucaris was the first after the fall of Constantinople, who attempted to create an Orthodox printing facility in Istanbul. The Catholic French Ambassador Sezy and the Jesuits convinced the Ottoman authorities that the works published would undermine the state, leading to the cancellation of the plans of Lucaris. Although the allegations proved false and the Jesuits, as the leading figures of the project, were expelled from the city, the printing press did not operate after a new intervention was made, this time by the Venetians.

While not adopting the extreme positions of the papal court, the Venetians did not want anti-Catholic propaganda in their territory. They wanted to close the printing facility because it could result in publishing Greek texts uncontrolled by their own censorship that would be available on the island of Crete. The Venetians were worried that the Orthodox hierarchy of the island would turn into a source of resistance of the Greeks under Ottoman rule.

It is worth mentioning that they had also forced the leaders of the Orthodox clergy, to formally pay three times a year their respects to the Pope and the Catholic Archbishop during the official celebrations of the Serenissima. The situation in Crete changed after 1669 when the Turks recaptured the island and the Orthodox hierarchy, clergy and believers were placed again under the rule of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

---

<sup>108</sup> *Dimitrios Tsakonas, Εισαγωγή εις τον Νέον Ελληνισμόν* (Athens: unknown publisher 1971), 40-49.

In the Ionian Islands, where the Venetian domination remained much longer (especially in Corfu that was under Venetian rule from 1204 until the fall of the Serenissima 1797), Rome was seeing the Greek residents as Uniates<sup>109</sup>. The Orthodox Head Priest of each island was accountable to the Catholic Archbishop. More intense was the influence of the Venetian policy on two of the Ionian Islands, Zakynthos and Cephalonia; it was where the Archbishop of Philadelphia Meletios Typaldos had come from.

The Catholic Church, however, during the period in which it sought to close the printing facility of Lucaris, by decision of the Congregatio de propaganda fide, established its own printing press, an enterprise which within a period of fifty years (1628-1677) printed 45 books, almost one per year: in Greek, ancient Greek and Latin in order to distribute them to the Greek Orthodox for free. That endeavour worked as propaganda for the Catholic doctrine<sup>110</sup>. A publishing war had begun. The Orthodox of Moldavia (Moldovlachia) from 1642 to 1682 began printing books and theological studies in favour of their own doctrine. They also printed books in Arabic for the Orthodox faithful of the Middle East so as to be inspired against the unionists' plans of Rome<sup>111</sup>.

In any case, there were many attempts at a reunion, from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century, and with particular intensity in the seventeenth century. Notable Orthodox theologian philosophers and clerics already by the mid sixteenth century and the early of seventeenth excelled in debates favouring the reunion of Christian doctrines. Some of these figures are mentioned here in order to show more clearly that Meletios Typaldos was not the only Orthodox religious leader who embraced the prospect of reunion. In fact, his particular case is historically and culturally important precisely because he was one of many. As it will be better clarified later, they belonged to the circle of the Greek Humanism, which became the basis for the creation of the Neo-Aristotelian stream within Greek thought.

<sup>109</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 34-37.

<sup>110</sup> Zacharias N. Tsirpanlis, "I libri Greci pubblicati dalla 'Sacra Congregatio de propaganda fide', XVIII sec.", *Balkan studies*, 15 (1974), 204-224.

<sup>111</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 103.

One was Gabriel Severus (1539/1540-1575)<sup>112</sup>, initially voted vicar of the church of St. George in Venice who later became the Bishop of Philadelphia. Severus is considered as the first spiritual leader of the Greeks of Venice. He was also a capable and ambitious diplomat. He defended the idea of celebrating the Orthodox and the Catholic Easter together, at a time when the reform of the calendar from the Julian to the Gregorian had become a red flag for the Orthodox community. He was conciliatory in some of the five points ( Primacy of the Pope, Purifying Fire, Bliss of Saints)<sup>113</sup> of disputes arising in the Council of Florence, such as the purifying fire and blessedness of the saints. There were also Meletios Pegas and Maximus Margounios, who were fellow students of Severus at the University of Padua. They died in the early seventeenth century. Pegas believed that Jesus Christ as head of the Church could become the unifying symbol of the two faiths. Margounios found attractive the Catholic view of the emanation of the Holy Spirit. He believed that the division between the two dogmas was due to the fact that his contemporary Greeks actually ignored the Latin tradition and that the doctrinal differences they stressed were not as strong as they appeared<sup>114</sup>.

Further examples are Leo Allatios (1588-1669), Ioannis Matteo Karyofyllis (1566-1633), and Peter Arkoudios, who were named by Orthodox critics the “Latin friendly trinity” and “ελληνομάστιγες” (cursers of Hellenism). They studied at the Greek College of Rome. Allatios’ family had both Orthodox and Catholic members. He believed that the two churches did not differ in crucial issues except in some particular points regarding the mysteries that could be resolved. His projects (over 60 books) and his personal relations

---

<sup>112</sup> Dimitrios Apostolopoulos, “Gavriil Seviros, arcivescovo di Filadelfia a Venezia, e la sua epoca”, in *Atti della giornata di studio dedicata alla memoria di Manussos Manussacas, Venezia, 26 settembre 2003* (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 2004).

<sup>113</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 173-174. About the five points of dispute see Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 103.

<sup>114</sup> Probably for this reason, Georgios Karamanolis, “Was there a Stream of Greek Humanists in the Late Renaissance?”, *Ελληνικά* 53 (2003), 44-45, suggests, he “bequeathed his library, which consisted mainly of Latin classics and works of the Latin Church Fathers primarily to the Monastery of Iviron on Holy Mountain but also to other Greek Orthodox monasteries....because he clearly wanted the Greek Orthodox monks to come in contact with the Latin theological tradition which all European theologians knew but the Greeks basically ignored”.

distinguished him as an agent of reconciliation between the two churches<sup>115</sup>. Then there was Athanasius the Orator (1571-1663): He studied at the Jesuit College in Istanbul. He was in favour of the reunion and the ‘Infallibility of the Pope’<sup>116</sup>. Neophytos Rodinos<sup>117</sup> (1576/1577-1659) was a Cypriot who travelled to Venice, Rome (he studied at the College of St. Athanasios), Spain, and Poland (ordained priest by Uniate Bishop of the Ruthenians) and under the mandate of the Congregatio de propaganda fide, he was active in Albania. He continued his action in Italy while passing from Venice for a while, replacing the Orthodox priest of St. George.

Summarizing the above, the conclusion of Karamanolis seems reasonable, that most of the Greek Humanists “had the idea that only after a careful study of the entire early Christian tradition can one come to a conclusion about how things really stood, an idea which fits well with the humanistic way of thinking. Greek theologians often look on such cases with some contempt. But this is a mistake. The reasons underlying the sympathies of Greek Humanists with Catholic or Protestant doctrine are presumably to be found in the new approach of Humanists to the study of the Bible and the early church. We must also remember that Greek Humanists were invited to take sides in the contemporary theological debates between Catholics and Protestants”<sup>118</sup>.

During those years of intense religious disputes, theological discussion certainly was not confined to debates between Rome and New Rome (Constantinople). Similar discussions took place in France, England and Russia. Anybody could use the positions of the participants to their interests. The French and the Catholics seized upon the ideas of the Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Mogila (1596-1646)<sup>119</sup>. Influenced by his education in Polish Jesuit

<sup>115</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 278-285.

<sup>116</sup> One year before his death, he wrote a text on the Papal Infallibility: see Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique*, 144-145.

<sup>117</sup> Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*; Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Συμβολαί εις την ιστορίαν της νεοελληνικής φιλολογίας: περιλαμβάνον επιστολάς λογίων ανδρών της ιστ’ και ιζ’ εκατονταετηρίδος”, in *Ο εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος* 17 (1882-1883).

<sup>118</sup> Karamanolis, *Stream of Greek Humanists*, 44.

<sup>119</sup> Later we will see that Peter Mogila founded a Greek school in Kiev. See subsection 3.3.1.

schools, he wrote his “Confession” (“Confessio Orthodoxa”) <sup>120</sup> with positions closer to the Catholics. The English, as we have already seen, tried to approach the Byzantines in an attempt to gain from the tradition of Orthodoxy<sup>121</sup> the glamour that their own relatively new church needed. A few decades later a rift of theological issues took place. The Anglican Church asked the Patriarch to declare his position on the issue of transubstantiation in the Eucharist. The response sent by Dionyssios IV in 1672 was positive. The theologians in England were divided. The majority of them had a different view of it.

Final attempts for reunion were made by the “*ἀνώμοτους επισκόπους*”<sup>122</sup> (bishops without an oath). In 1716 they gathered the contested points within Orthodox theology and attempted to unite the whole of Orthodoxy, including the Russians, under the wings of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, defined as the Patriarch of the Holy City of Christ. The project ended in 1723, though the discussion continued until 1727, with a lively correspondence between the Anglican Archbishop and the Patriarch of Jerusalem Chrysanthos, but without leading to any result<sup>123</sup>.

---

<sup>120</sup> Julius Joseph Overbeck (ed.), *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church from the Version of Peter Mogila* (London: Thomas Baker, 1898).

<sup>121</sup> Gunnar Hering, *Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και Ευρωπαϊκή Πολιτική 1620-1638* (Athens: M.I.E.T., 1992).

<sup>122</sup> These are the bishops who remained in their seats after the conflict for the legality of the schism after 1688. See Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 59.

<sup>123</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 59.

### 2.3. Neo-Aristotelianism and Hellenist Humanism

In order to understand better the influences Typaldos experienced during his stay and activity in Venice one should go beyond the political changes and religious disputes of the time (both dealt with in the previous section). The seventeenth century among other things was an era of deep intellectual pursuits and scientific revolutions which nowadays we call “modernity”. Therefore it is of great interest to investigate whether and how Greek scholars participated in these changes and which worldviews they embraced, so as to understand the intellectual context that affected Typaldos’ way of thinking and acting. Otherwise, our knowledge would be incomplete and evidently incapable of establishing a fair judgment on the behaviour of such a controversial personality.

The wealthy Greeks of the mainland and the regions under Venetian rule, such as Cyprus and Crete, used to send their children to study at the University of Padua which was one of the most intellectually dynamic institutions in the seventeenth century. There Pomponazzi, Zabarella, and Cremonini inaugurated the current of Neo-Aristotelian philosophy that had a major influence on seventeenth-century scholars<sup>124</sup>.

Neo-Aristotelianism followed the European Renaissance Humanism. Being a Humanist meant being substantially interested in the ancient Greek and Roman culture as well as fostering ancient Greek and Latin language<sup>125</sup>. In fact, humanism, by turning to ancient texts, either challenged the absolutism of the Bible or directed itself to the original manuscripts in an attempt to discover some brand new meanings<sup>126</sup>.

Many of the Greeks residing in the cities of Diaspora participated in the Humanist Movement. Several of them became teachers and editors of Greek and Latin classics, wrote in Greek or Latin, and enjoyed the admiration of their contemporaries. As Karamanolis argues, “taking some figures at the turn of the fifteenth century, we know that Ermolao Barbaro admired Gazes' erudition [...]

<sup>124</sup> Petsios, *Περί Φύσεως*, part 3.

<sup>125</sup> Jill Kraye, “Philologists and Philosophers”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 142-160.

<sup>126</sup> Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and the Holy Writ* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983); Debora K. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible, Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010).



Erasmus also acknowledged the proficiency in Latin of Gazes, Mousouros, and I. Laskaris<sup>127</sup>.

A lot of the Greek Humanists who were active in Europe in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries studied in Padua, since they came from Crete and to a lesser extent from Cyprus, both of which were under Venetian rule. One of the first who studied in Padua was Maximus the blessed, the later Athonite monk<sup>128</sup>. Others were Maximus Margounios (1530-1602), Gabriel Severus (1541-1616) who became the first Bishop of Philadelphia, and Ioannis Kottounios (or Joannes Cottunius) (1572-1657)<sup>129</sup>. The Greek scholars established a humanistic tradition, which was the foundation for the seventeenth century “Hellenists’ circle of Padua”<sup>130</sup>.

The Hellenist Humanists of Padua held the view that one of the outstanding features of humanistic tradition should be the strengthening of research and knowledge, thus the expanding of the study and the teaching of ancient writings; therefore they promoted the study of ancient philosophy and even succeeded in including the teaching of the Greek language in the University’s curriculum<sup>131</sup> whilst

---

<sup>127</sup> Karamanolis, *Stream of Greek Humanists*, 26.

<sup>128</sup> Maximus was born in 1480 in Arta. He traveled to Paris, Florence, Venice and Padua. When he returned he became a monk on Holy Mountain and gave an impetus to the education of monks there. In 1518 the Great Prince of Moscow (Grand Prince of Muscovy) Vassily III appointed him librarian and interpreter of his court: see Dimitrios Athanasiou, *Άπαντα Αγίου Μάξιμου Γραικού*. V.1: “Λόγοι” (Holy Mountain: Ιερά Μεγίστη Μονή Βατοπαιδίου, 2011).

<sup>129</sup> Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*. Particularly for Maximus Margounios and Gabriel Severus see Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία του νέου Ελληνισμού*, (Thessaloniki: Ηρόδοτος, 1968). For Ioannis Kottounios see Tsirpanlis, *Το Ελληνικό Κολλέγιο της Ρώμης και οι μαθητές του*; Aristeidis Stergelis, “Νέα βιογραφικά στοιχεία για τον Ιωάννη Κωττούνιο”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 5 (1968), 249-254; Constantine T. Dimaras, “Έλληνομακεδόνες λόγιοι 15ου και 16ου αιώνα: Ιωάννης Κωττούνιος”, in *Μακεδονία. 4000 χρόνια Ελληνικής Ιστορίας και πολιτισμού*, ed. Michael Sakelariou (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1982), 398- 399; Athanasios Karathanasis, *Πραγματεία περί Μακεδονίας. Μελέτες και άρθρα για την πνευματική κίνηση και ζωή της Νεότερης Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 1990), 127.

<sup>130</sup> See Giorgio Fedalto, “Stranieri a Venezia e Padova, 1550-1700”, in *Storia della Cultura veneta: Dalla controriforma alla fine della Repubblica* V.4/ii: Il Seicento, ed. Girolamo Arnaldi and Manlio Pastore Stocchi (Vicenza: Pozza, 1980), 499-501; Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati, *Τα Καταστατικά του σωματείου (Nazione) των Ελλήνων φοιτητών του Πανεπιστημίου της Πάδοβας, 17ος-18ος αι.*, (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Ε.Ι.Ε, 1995).

<sup>131</sup> In order to prove the interest of the Greek Humanists for the language, Karamanolis, *Stream of Greek Humanists*, 43, quoting many bibliographical references, argues that: Portos “gave lectures in Ferrara in 1554 as a member of the Academy of Filareti stressing the importance of the Greek language, and we know that he opposed Erasmus’ views on the pronunciation of Greek and presumably also of Latin. Yet Portos’ views were challenged. Nikolaos Sofianos, for example, upheld that demotic Greek is to be used freely by the Greek people, although it should be polished and enriched. He thus undertook a project of translating ancient words and some ancient Greek treatises into demotic Greek, and he also wrote a Grammar of modern Greek. Antonios Eparchos and Alexandros Noukios seem to agree largely with Sofianos in this respect. Margounios, Pegas, and Kritopoulos took a similar position. They valued the ancient language

offering courses on law, medicine and philosophy. Also, since they founded several Greek schools, such as the one established by Kottounios, they provided a model for Greek speaking schools in the centuries to follow.

On the path prepared by the European and Greek Humanism the Neo-Aristotelian current was built. The latter moved away from the Aristotelian Logic and Rhetoric and gave emphasis to the Physics of Aristotle as well as to his treatise *On the Soul (Per Anima)*. “Neo-Aristotelianism” is a term used to differentiate the Aristotelianism developed in the University of Padua by Zabarella and Cremonini, from other Aristotelian streams of the same period. It was a modern interpretation of Aristotle, which based its approach to the philosophy of nature on the Aristotelian’s *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, as well as on the new science, while it based its ideas about the human soul on the texts and commentaries of the philosopher Alexander of Aphrodisias. The later lived from the end of the second until the middle of the third century AD, and he was considered the leading expert on Aristotle. Being against scholastic Aristotelianism, and following a material causality, Neo-Aristotelianism of Padua taught that the philosophy of physics is the knowledge for all things of the world; therefore it cannot be based on theology, but it can be used by it.

One of Cremonini’s students and perhaps the most loyal follower of Alexander of Aphrodisias, was the Athenian philosopher Theophilos Korydalleus (about 1550-1631) who is considered the founder of the circle of the Greek Neo-Aristotelians<sup>132</sup>. Korydalleus’ prestige and fame among the intellectuals of the time was so strong that the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucaris, had to invite him so as to reorganize the Academy of the Patriarchate<sup>133</sup>.

---

and wrote in it, but also wanted to enrich the vernacular one, and for this reason they translated several ecclesiastical works into the vernacular or wrote sermons in it”

<sup>132</sup> For Korydalleus and his contribution to the Greek Neo-Aristotelianism, see Henderson, *Η αναβίωση του ελληνικού στοχασμού*, 23-35; Thanasis Papadopoulos, *Η νεοελληνική φιλοσοφία από τον 16<sup>ο</sup> έως τον 18<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα* (Athens: Ζαχαρόπουλος, 1988), 119 passim; Nikolaos Psimenos “Introduction”, in *Η ελληνική φιλοσοφία από το 1453 ως το 1821: Η κυριαρχία του Αριστοτελισμού*, V.1, ed. Nikolaos Psimenos, (Athens: Γνώση, 1988), 15-50, 173-181; Cléobule Tsourkas, *Les débuts de renseignement philosophique et de la libre pensée dans les Balkans. La vie et l’œuvre philosophique de Théodore Corydalée, 1570-1646* (Bucuresti: Institut d’Études et de Recherches Balkaniques, 1948).

<sup>133</sup> Of course, after Lucaris’ death, he was deposed by the Orthodox Church and had no choice but to return to his hometown, Athens, where he continued teaching up to his death in 1645.

It should be noted that, despite the antithesis of Korydalleus with Medieval scholasticism, it was not the non-conventional elements of his thought that survived in the eighteenth century and influenced Greek thought. In the educational institutions of Constantinople, Chios, Patmos, the areas around the Danube and elsewhere were taught his ideas that had been accepted by the Orthodox Patriarchate; that is, ideas that came into conflict with the ideas of the European Enlightenment that were being disseminated in the meantime. Without its original un-dogmatic spirit, the philosophical system of Neo-Aristotelianism became an obstacle for the renewal of Greek culture<sup>134</sup>.

Korydalleus' Neo-Aristotelianism became a powerful movement in the realm of the Greek thought<sup>135</sup>. Many intellectuals of the time developed their arguments around his teachings – either in agreement or disagreement with him. It is of great interest the arguments of the dissenters, among them was Typaldos. Even though they also had been taught in Padua and had been followers of Neo-Aristotelianism and new sciences because of their persistence in religious dogma- they still adhered to the Medieval Scholastic doctrine regarding the subject of the Soul. Although they were also influenced by the development of the new sciences, especially mathematics, they, and particularly Kottounios<sup>136</sup> opposed quantitative physics as well as the new cosmology. Kottounios, in particular, insisted on the geocentric model of the world –that earth is at the orbital center of all celestial bodies- defended by Aristotle (Aristotelian Physics), since this was aligned –in his opinion- with the description given by the Bible. It would be interesting to consider the view of Kottounios in regard to the question of the soul (the Aristotelian “psyche” in Greek or “anima” in Latin), because this very subject was later one of the points of disagreement between the Greeks (including Typaldos) and the Italian Neo-Aristotelians.

---

<sup>134</sup> Henderson, *Η αναβίωση του ελληνικού στοχασμού*, 30.

<sup>135</sup> Emmanouil Patiniotis, “Οι Pestiferae Questiones του Κυρίλλου Λουκάρεως και η ανάδυση του κορυδαλικού προγράμματος”, in *Πρακτικά του Συνεδρίου Βυζάντιο-Βενετία-Νεότερος Ελληνισμός. Μια περιπλάνηση στον Κόσμο της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Σκέψης*, ed. Georgios N. Vlachakis and Thymios Nikolaidis (Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2004), 211-244; Henderson, *Η αναβίωση του ελληνικού στοχασμού*; Petsios, *Περί Φύσεως*. See also section 2.2, subnote 105.

<sup>136</sup> Kottounios (1572-1657) was born in Verria in Macedonia. He studied first in the Greek college in Rome, and then went on to study in Padua. Later on he held the post of a professor in the universities of Bologna and Padua. For references see in this section, subnote 129.

Aristotle, in his work *De Anima*, III.5, describes that the soul is of a double nature: the one is a power common to all living organisms, (contains nutritive and sensitive properties), and the other is the intellect. In its turn, intellect is also composed of two properties or conditions, one passive and one active. The passive property receives the intelligible forms of things, but only the active intellect is the cause of creativity, capable of turning potential knowledge into an actual one. This part of the intellect is the divine essence of the human individual; therefore it does not belong to man, does not perish with the human body, but it is immortal and everlasting<sup>137</sup>.

The above interpretation of the soul is also promoted by Alexander of Aphrodisias. According to Alexander the intellect could be divided in three parts: the natural, the acquired and the active. Only the active intellect, which enters the soul from outside, is immortal, while the individual parts of the soul die along with the body.

In their interpretations of Aristotle Zabarella and Cremonini suggested that the immortality of the intellect could only be ensured when it was active, which allowed it to get to know eternal truths. In that sense the immortality of the intellect depends on its potentiality and cannot be assumed as granted from the beginning. If human nature is equipped only with the passive part of the intellect then the intellect will die when the person does.

Kottounios shared the views of Zabarella and Cremonini regarding the separation of philosophy and religious faith. Concerning the issue of the Aristotelian intellect, however, he had a slightly different approach, more in agreement with the

<sup>137</sup> Aristotle, *Περὶ Ψυχῆς*, translated by Ioannis S. Christodoulou (Thessaloniki: Ζήτρος, 2003). According to Aristotle, the body is central for the study of soul, however, the soul, it is the "first actuality of a natural body which has organs" (De Anima, ii 1, 412b5-6); otherwise, "the soul must, then, be substance qua form of a natural body which has life potentially" (De Anima, ii1, 412a19-21). Nevertheless, body and soul are not identical, or, as Aristotle argues, "It is not unclear that the soul –or certain parts of it, if it has parts- naturally is not separable from the body" (De Anima ii1, 413a3-5). (The passages of Aristotle are from the following English sources: Aristotle, *De Anima*, edited by David Walter Hamlyn and Christofer John Shields (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) and Eugene T. Gendlin, *Line by Line Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*, V.1 (N.Y.: Focusing Institute, 2012). In any case, the Aristotelian conceptualization of the mind (or intellect), and particularly his distinction between passive and active intellect, led to dispute as to what it means. This issue was the reason to cause heated debates in medieval philosophy, as each theological dogma and philosophical stream sought to reconcile its beliefs and ideas to Aristotle's account of an incorporeal soul with the ultimate intention to explain the nature of the God and the eternal life.

views of Aquinas, therefore more aligned with those of the Catholic Church. Specifically, while Kottounios did not doubt the significance of actuality (“Ενέργεια”) of the intellect in relation to learning, he insists on the immortality of the whole intellect. In his approach the intellect is unified, cannot be divided, because in any condition the human is able to think, have memory and learn<sup>138</sup>. These views bring him nearer to Catholicism, as also happened with Margounios at an earlier time. Margounios (1549-1602) of a Cretan origin studied in Padua, philosophy and tried to highlight the inherent similarities between the Orthodox and the Catholic creed, while he expressed his strong opposition to Calvinism and Lutheranism. These remarks are significant because they show that the approach of Typaldos towards Catholicism was not out of the blue, but it was within the trends of a long tradition of thought researching the similarities of these two creeds.

After that, in the mid seventeenth century, the Greek scholars were divided in two distinctive trends. The followers of Korydalleus were dissociated from the medieval views of scholastic Aristotelianism, according to which the truths of experience were lower than revealed truths. These were replaced by the view that the human being is able by his intellect, without any mediation or contemplation on the initial sense of the human being with the objects of the world, to approach the immaterial, integral and universal truths. These ideas have common ground with the ideas of Descartes, who influenced greatly the next generation of Greek intellectuals, as will be seen in the following subsection.

The second trend of religious Neo-Aristotelianism, consisting of intellectuals such as Georgios Koressios, Nikolaos (Nikiforos) Klarontzanos, Meletios Syrigos, Nikolaos Koursoulas, Nikolaos Kerameus, Gerasimos Vlachos, Georgios Sougdouris, and Meletios (Meletios) Typaldos did not follow the ideas of the Italian and Korydaleus to the letter, as they tried to connect the new ideas with those of the scholastic Aristotelianism of the medieval Fathers<sup>139</sup>. Therefore, even though they did not deny scientific achievements, they separated physics and phenomena of the social world -where things can be explained based on physical operations, and with the tools provided by natural science- from the spiritual world, where the

---

<sup>138</sup> Papadopoulos, *Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, 201-206; Karamanolis, *Stream of Greek Humanists*, 37.

<sup>139</sup> Petsios, *Μεσαιωνικός-σχολαστικός αριστοτελισμός*, 248.

interpretation of phenomena is based on Catholic concepts that only theology and not philosophy can supply.

### 2.3.1. Greek Forms of pre-Enlightenment

In the previous subsection it was mentioned that Typaldos belonged to the current of religious Neo-Aristotelianism. He was not simply a member of this circle but probably a person who encouraged their quests. This can be concluded from the fact that he was the teacher of the majority of scholars considered today as the early representatives of the ideas of the Enlightenment in the Greek republic of letters<sup>140</sup>. He was also the one that “imposed” on the Greek community and on the Greek Orthodox establishment<sup>141</sup>, Greek pre-Enlightenment figures such as Methodios Anthracites, Antonios Katiforos, Vincentios Damodos and Meletios Mitrou, who are all connected in one way or another with Typaldos and the Flanghinian School.

All the above indicate that Typaldos was open to new ideas participating in the respective discussions. Such an argument can be further reinforced by the fact that the Paduan Professor Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos regarded Typaldos as a man influenced by Western thought. In a letter to the Patriarch of Alexandria, Chrysanthos, on the 17th of April 1704, he wrote that Methodios Anthracites belongs to the circle of the Western oriented Meletios Typaldos. He writes that Anthracites is directly influenced by Typaldos, sometimes following Photius’ teaching and sometimes that of Latins<sup>142</sup>. In any case one cannot deny that Typaldos, despite his differences with the pre-Enlightenment intellectuals on the interpretation of Aristotle (as most of them were followers of Korydalleus and not Kottounios), he still preferred to have them as his interlocutors.

<sup>140</sup> Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*; Paschalis Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός* (Athens: MIET, 1996); Panagiotis Noutsos, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός: Τα Όρια της Διακινδύνευσης* (Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 2005).

<sup>141</sup> It should be stressed that in 1686, Meletios signed a reference letter on behalf of Meletios Mitros, one of the most prominent pre-Enlightenment figures: see Constantine T. Kyriakopoulos, *Μελέτιος (Μήτρος) Αθηνών, ο Γεωγράφος, 1661-1714*, PhD Thesis, (Athens, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 1990), 69-77.

<sup>142</sup> Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati, “Ο Μεθόδιος Ανθρακίτης και τα Τετράδια”, *Ελληνικά* (1995), 111-127, esp. 116.

Arguing about “Greek Enlightenment” it is probably necessary to clarify that the meaning of this term does not correspond absolutely with the perspective of the Western Enlightenment. It is a term introduced in the Greek literature by Dimaras<sup>143</sup>. The aim of the latter was to predicate that at the end of the eighteenth century Modern Greek thinking was developed which opposed the established political, social and religious status quo of the time embracing freedom of thought and its disengagement from religious superstitions. In any case it should not be confused with its European counterpart since it was addressed to an uneducated people under foreign rule who lived in pre-industrial conditions with “old fashioned” traditions and beliefs. Due to this, the main concern of Greek Enlightenment was to educate people so as to prepare them for the struggle of independence.

It should also be noted that the main centres of the Greek Enlightenment were areas of the Greek Diaspora in Western Europe, such as Venice and Vienna; also, regions of mainland Greece or Danubian areas that were in contact with them. These relations created the channels through which the impacts of the European thinking and the ideas of the Enlightenment reached the Greek world.

At the regions mentioned above, especially in Venice, Greek tutors – mostly priests - were active during the first decades of the eighteenth century. Their tutoring set the pace for the emergence of the Greek pre-Enlightenment<sup>144</sup> and for that reason they are considered as pre-Enlightenment figures.

Most of the latter were followers of the Korydalleus school of Neo-Aristotelianism<sup>145</sup>. Their work is substantially based on key elements of Descartes’ philosophy, motivating therefore the Greek way of thinking towards directions attached to the European Enlightenment<sup>146</sup>.

---

<sup>143</sup> Aikaterini Koumariou, “Ο νεοελληνικός διαφωτισμός: μια ιστορική πραγματικότητα”, in *Πενήντα χρόνια Νεοελληνικής παιδείας. Η παρουσία του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά στην επιστήμη των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων* (Athens: Εκδοτική Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας -Σχολή Μωραΐτη, 1985), 17-26.

<sup>144</sup> The transitional years from the primary Greek Enlightenment to the main Enlightenment years are those of Evgenios Voulgaris (1716-1806). Voulgaris, priest, educator and translator of Voltaire’s work, through his teachings inaugurates a new era in the history of Greek Education: see Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*; Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*; Noutsos, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*.

<sup>145</sup> As per Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 27, the pre-Enlightenment years start from 1709 to 1774 (the year when the Treaty of *Kioutsouk Kainartzi* was entered into between Russia and defeated Turkey, with important financial and religious benefits for the Greeks).

<sup>146</sup> Constantine Petsios, “Ανθρωπολογία και Γνωσιοθεωρία στις Απαρχές του 18<sup>ου</sup> αιώνας: Descartes και Νεοελληνική Σκέψη”, *Ερανιστής* (1999), 22.

The affinity to Descartes is mostly depicted in Damodos' work, who insists on a person's ability to think of and understand his actions not through a knowledge which repetitively returns and reflects on them but solely and exclusively because he is inherently capable of achieving self-awareness. In short Damodos adopted Descartes' "first meditation", according to which the absolute certainty of existence does not come as a result of thinking. It is expressed through its undeniably apparent character: "everything that thinks is, or exists"<sup>147</sup>.

In order to fully understand the kind of ideas flowing within the circles of pre-Enlightenment figures, as well as their relations with Typaldos and therefore the kind of concerns which Typaldos seemed to share, some additional information is set forth below with regard to the views and works of some of them.

Starting from the oldest one, the monk Methodios Anthracites (circa 1660 – 1749), who had been a close partner and friend of Typaldos for quite a long time, it should be noted that during an era of strong criticism of the church and its despotic powers, as well as the luxurious lifestyle of the highest clergy, beyond moral standards, he became the main voice of criticism of the Eastern Orthodoxy. He served as a chaplain at the Orthodox Church of St. George in Venice and worked as the text editor at the publishing house of Glykis. Later in life he studied philosophy in the cities of Ioannina and Kastoria.

He based his criticism primarily on the corruption that was evident within the ranks of the clergy. He also criticised the way they took advantage of people's faith in order to extract money and the recurrent excommunications that took place beyond religious reasons<sup>148</sup>. His arguments indicate a transition from religious humanism to a different type of approach, which takes into account inherent natural criteria instead of supernatural principles<sup>149</sup>.

Anthracites left Venice in 1710 and headed to Ottoman-occupied Greece in order to teach and introduce the ideas of the Enlightenment. The Bulgarian Parthenios Pavlovic, who left his country and went to study with Anthracites

<sup>147</sup> René Descartes, *Στοχασμοί περί της πρώτης φιλοσοφίας* (Athens: Εκρεμμές 2003); Petsios, "Ανθρωπολογία και Γνωσιοθεωρία".

<sup>148</sup> Methodios Anthracites, *Θεωρία Χριστιανικά και Ψυχοφελείς Νουθεσία* (Venice, 1699), 231-232.

<sup>149</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 45.



from 1719 to 1721, refers to him remembering: “In Siatista and Kastoria, the philosopher and monk Methodios, used to teach logic and mathematics. However, his keen interest in the philosophy of Descartes brought him before the Patriarch of Constantinople where he underwent interrogation. He was prohibited from teaching this philosophy”<sup>150</sup>. The main accusation against Anthracites was that he used to teach his students about the Spanish theologian and herald of the Quietist movement, Miguel de Molinos. Moreover, his deviation from the Aristotelian line of thought, by which the church abided, provoked the high clergy who in turn accused him of dogmatism and excommunicated him from the Assembly of the Ecumenical Patriarchate<sup>151</sup>. They actually forced him to burn the “notebooks” of his philosophical and religious views himself, in the yard of the Patriarchate. Next, he was reinstated in the priesthood and was allowed to teach only the peripatetic philosophy according to Korydalleus<sup>152</sup>. Anthracites, additionally to Descartes and Molinos, had translated and taught the works of Malebranche and Spinoza, believing that his students should be made aware of the currents of thought that were prevailing in the West<sup>153</sup>.

Meletios Mitrou (1661-1714), commonly known as Meletios the Archbishop of Athens, was another remarkable figure of the Greek pre-Enlightenment<sup>154</sup>. He studied in his homeland, Ioannina, at Gionmas School, and next in Venice and Padua, where he studied philosophy, medicine, Latin and rhetoric<sup>155</sup>. From 1685 to 1687 cooperated with the publishing houses of N. Glykis, N. Saros and Italian Michelangelo Barbonio. In 1686, the newly elected Archbishop of Philadelphia, Meletios Typaldos, signed, on behalf of Meletios Mitrou, a certificate of proficiency in order for the latter to be appointed as a teacher at the Greek school of Venice. It was one of the most important actions taken by Typaldos as an Archbishop, which clearly reflects the trust between the

<sup>150</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ο Μεθόδιος Ανθρακίτης και τα Τετράδια”, 113.

<sup>151</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ο Μεθόδιος Ανθρακίτης και τα Τετράδια”, 113.

<sup>152</sup> Philaretos Vafeidis, “Κώδιξ της Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Καστοριάς και τινά εκκλησιαστικά βιβλία αποκείμενα εν τισι των εκκλησιών αυτής”, *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια* 20, (1900), 125.

<sup>153</sup> Georgios Zaviras, *Νέα Ελλάς η Ελληνικόν Θέατρον* (Thessaloniki: Εταιρία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών, 1972).

<sup>154</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 124-125.

<sup>155</sup> Andreas Papadopoulos-Vrettos, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία, ήτοι κατάλογος των από πτώσεως της βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι εγκαθιδρύσεως της εν Ελλάδι βασιλείας τυπωθέντων βιβλίων. Βιογραφία των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων* (Athens: Βιδαράς και Λιούμης, 1851), 221.

two men<sup>156</sup>. As mentioned above<sup>157</sup>, Typaldos himself used to be the one and only teacher at the school of the Greek community, a post he held in parallel to the office of the principal of the Flanghinian School. The reason for this double appointment was that no one was thought to be suitable to become a teacher of that school. Therefore, it was obvious that Typaldos would choose as his successor only someone who would embrace the same thinking as his. Meletios Mitrou taught for one year; next, he decided to return to his country and keep on his teaching work at his homeland.

At the end of the 1690's, Meletios Mitrou prepared his dissertation titled "Old and New Geography", which would be later published in Venice (1708). Influenced by modern European thinking, Meletios Mitrou adopts a critical method to present geography, which is based on direct observation and differs from that followed by traditional education. He enriched his work with references to the achievements of the nations and prominent historic personalities. The geography by Meletios Mitrou is, according to Paschalis Kitromilides, a "remarkable text which gradually formed the perception of the space that entrenched the consciousness of the Greek Enlightenment"<sup>158</sup>. So, Meletios Mitrou was one of the four persons closely connected to Typaldos, who at the same time are considered to be dominant figures of Greek pre-Enlightenment culture.

Antonios Katiforos (1685-1713)<sup>159</sup> is certainly one of the representatives of the Greek pre-Enlightenment, who seems to teach Aristotelian physics in the Flanghinian School<sup>160</sup>. Katiforos studied English philosophy. He is regarded to be responsible for the introduction of John Locke to Greek literature<sup>161</sup> since Ioannis Litinas and Eugenios Voulgaris were his students who translated the *Essay* of John Locke into Greek.

<sup>156</sup> Kyriakopoulos, *Μελέτιος (Μήτρος) Αθηνών*, 69-77.

<sup>157</sup> See section 1.1.

<sup>158</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 128-130.

<sup>159</sup> Margherita Losacco, *Antonio Catiforo e Giovanni Veludo interpreti di Fozio* (Bari: Dedalo, 2003).

<sup>160</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 197.

<sup>161</sup> Alkis Aggelou "Πώς η νεοελληνική σκέψη εγνώρισε το 'Δοκίμιο' του John Locke" *Αγγλοελληνική Επιθεώρηση*, 7 (1954), 128; Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 119-122, 243; Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati, *Ο Βικέντιος Δαμοδός Βιογραφία – Εργογραφία 1700-1754* (Athens: M.I.E.T, 1998), 473, subnote 29.

After travelling extensively in central and northern Europe, where he met a lot of important figures (among them Frederick II of Prussia) and expanded his intellectual horizons<sup>162</sup>. Katiforos moved to Zakynthos where he became the Archbishop. He wrote a new grammar of the Greek language under the title “Accurate Greek Grammar”, aspiring to make it the main textbook in the Greek schools that operated in Greek communities abroad. He believed in the distinction between science and religion. He claimed that in religion tradition prevails and therefore there is no point in adding new elements, while in science it is imperative to seek for new methods, innovation, and knowledge. Katiforos opened a window for new influences.

Vincentios Damodos has also been a prominent student of the Flanghinian School (1700-1754)<sup>163</sup>, with Katiforos playing a leading role in his philosophical proficiency. The Archbishop of Philadelphia, Meletios Typaldos, who died a few months after Damodos’s admission in the School, had already established a tolerant intellectual environment, wherein personalities such as Damodos<sup>164</sup> managed to shape their personality. In a document drafted by him as the Archbishop on April 25, 1700, Meletios Typaldos had certified that Vincentios Damodos was a Christian baptized according to the rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church, that he was “di sanguine civile”, had a decent character and that he had some knowledge of Latin grammar<sup>165</sup>.

Damodos is classified as one of the pioneers of philosophical renovation along the course to Enlightenment<sup>166</sup>. Contrary to the Neo-Aristotelians who accepted the authority of Aristotle, Damodos argues for a rational thought that, as he writes, it is “the light of the Knowledge received from nature”<sup>167</sup>. For that reason he is considered as one of the representatives of Descartes’ rationalism.

All the important works of Damodos that distinguish him as one of the pioneers of the Enlightenment were published two centuries after his death. In his “Moral Philosophy” he analyzes the despotic power exemplified in community and family life. In the same way that Patriarchs and bishops cannot

---

<sup>162</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 48.

<sup>163</sup> Bobou-Stamati, *Ο Βικέντιος Δαμοδός*.

<sup>164</sup> Bobou-Stamati, *Ο Βικέντιος Δαμοδός*, 26.

<sup>165</sup> A.S.V., Rif., B.547; Bobou-Stamati, *Ο Βικέντιος Δαμοδός*, 472.

<sup>166</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 51.

<sup>167</sup> Vincentios Damodos, *Επίτομος Λογική κατ’ Αριστοτέλην* (Βενετία 1759), 11.

impose injustices on the people a husband cannot arbitrarily exercise authority over his wife, but should abide by the rules of justice<sup>168</sup> instead.

In order to understand the influence of the two streams of Neo-Aristotelianism and mainly of the ideas of the early Enlightenment in Greek scholarship, it is worth to know that their impact was strong particularly in the eighteenth century, when many Greek scholars and theologians attempted to find the connections between Orthodox theology and the new scientific discoveries and the ideas of the European Enlightenment. Indicatively, the great representative of the Greek Enlightenment, Eugenios Voulgaris, who based his teaching on the Neo-Aristotelian approach, supported the view that Physics will remain a captive of Philosophy, but the latter should be used to support Theology, therefore God as the initial source of the universal truths pertaining to the human being (whereas the soul is the second source and the senses are the third)<sup>169</sup>. However, most -if not all- supporters of the Greek Enlightenment, who did not deny the Orthodox dogma but rather tried to combine it with the newly born ideas, were eventually defeated by the conservative circles of the Patriarchate<sup>170</sup>.

It is also worthwhile to note that during the era of Typaldos the Orthodox dogma had not yet acquired able theologians and philosophers to support it, so that the ideas of Enlightenment, , were not dealt with sufficiently by the Orthodox Church. That is to say, during the seventeenth century and the first half of the eighteenth century, no Greek theological thinking had been developed capable of opposing the new philosophical concerns of Catholic and Protestant thought. Therefore, people, such as Typaldos, could not find in Orthodoxy the required answers to be given to the questions that arose due to the emerging sciences. This was attempted much later, in the middle of the eighteenth century, when St. Nikodemos, the Athonite, brought up again in the domain of the Orthodox dogma the neptic<sup>171</sup> teaching of the Fathers of the

<sup>168</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 50-53.

<sup>169</sup> Constantine Petsios (ed.) *Η Λογική εκ παλαιών τε και νεωτέρων συνερανισθείσα, υπό Ευγενίου διακόνου του Βουλγάρως. Ης προτέτακται Αφήγησις προεισοδιώδης Περί Αρχής και Προόδου της κατά την Φιλοσοφίαν Ενστάσεως, και Προδιατριβαί τέταρες εισαγωγικά Εις άπασαν εν γένει την Φιλοσοφίαν Προτελεστικάι* (Ioannina: Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων, 2010), ch.3.4.

<sup>170</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*; Noutsos, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*.

<sup>171</sup> The term “neptic” (derived from the Greek word “νήψη”) means the awareness of the human being to keep his mind clean of thoughts and images that bound his internal freedom and

Eastern Church<sup>172</sup> and specifically in its Palamist version<sup>173</sup>. Nikodemos and his contemporaries, who were part of the movement of “Κολλυβάδες”<sup>174</sup>, proposed, in contrast to Western intellectualism, the Orthodox existential experience, which created within Greek thought two powerful streams that are still opposing each other even today. The one stream accepts the Orthodox Christian experience as a way of looking at reality without denying that rational thought accompanies the feeling<sup>175</sup>. In contrast, the other stream argues<sup>176</sup> that an Orthodox tradition such as the Neptics, which substitutes the ego by the giving to the other, does not help the individual to participate in the modern competitive world<sup>176</sup>. It is rather unfortunate that still today no fertile dialogue is born between these two streams, in the framework of Greek thought.

In short, seventeenth-century Western European intellectual currents did not meet any significant opposition, which allowed them to penetrate the circles of Orthodox scholars. It should be pointed out that even the Kollivades, in the eighteenth century, when they attempted to respond in writing to the new ideas with their own writing, entitled *Philokalia* (“Love of the Beautiful”), mentioned writings of the distant past, that is, the Patristic and Hesychast traditions<sup>177</sup>. These were the writings that would defy the scientific Enlightenment and the technological advancement of the West.

The work of all of the above comes to confirm that the Greek Enlightenment of the eighteenth century was not only a child of the European Enlightenment, but came about through lengthy processes led by prominent Greek thinkers during all the preceding centuries. All these thinkers contributed

---

purity and distract him from his communication with God. Such “νήψη” is described by the Fathers of the Church as holy “hesychia” (that is quietness or peace of mind). In addition, there is a whole Hesychast movement and that is why the word “hesychia” is used more often here: see St. Nicodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth. *Φιλοκαλία, λόγος περί νήψεως και προσευχής* (Athens: Πουρνάρας, 2002). Originally published in Venice in 1782.

<sup>172</sup> See Introduction, subnote 13.

<sup>173</sup> Here it should be mentioned that “Palamistic” means the teaching set up by the Saint Gregorios Palamas (1296-1359), the founder of the religious movement of Hesychasts. According to him, theology is superior to philosophy, and the wisdom of God is given to man according to God’s wishes. From this point of view, theology can only be fulfilled through theoptia (seeing the light of the divine grace). See section 2.2.

<sup>174</sup> About “Κολλυβάδες” see section 2.2, subnote 73.

<sup>175</sup> Fr Nicolaos Loudovikos, *Ορθοδοξία και Εκσυγχρονισμός: Βυζαντινή Εξατομίκηση, Κράτος και Ιστορία, στην Προοπτική του Ευρωπαϊκού Μέλλοντος* (Athens: Αρμός, 2006), 335.

<sup>176</sup> Ramfos, *Το Αδιανόητο Τίποτα*.

<sup>177</sup> According to Podskalsky (*Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 43-44) the stagnation in Greek Orthodox thought is caused by its captivity by the influence of the eternal truth and by its turn in on itself after the Florence synod.

to the maintenance of the Greek language and to the enrichment of the Greeks cultural heritage with the ideas of their time.

### 2.3.2. *Intellectual stance of Typaldos*

Typaldos, participating in the circle of the Greek religious Neo-Aristotelians, adopted in particular the ideas of Kottounios, and mainly those of Koursoulas<sup>178</sup>. According to the views presented in his works, while he accepted the interpretation of the natural phenomena from modern sciences, he insisted nevertheless, as many of his contemporaries did<sup>179</sup>, on the subjugation of philosophy to religious faith<sup>180</sup>.

Unfortunately, the only available sources for the views of Typaldos are two texts compiled by him and used for educational purposes during his office as a teacher in the Flanghinian School. The first one is the single-sheet document entitled *Theses Philosophicae* (Venetiis 1681)<sup>181</sup>. The second one is a longer text which interprets Aristotle's *Physics* and is included in a code kept in Docheiarion Monastery in Holy Mountain<sup>182</sup>. This second text, titled *Synthesis*, describes at length the matters that briefly are referred to in the *Theses Philosophicae*. Petsios, however, with regard to *Synthesis*, draws a really important conclusion which explicitly confirms not only Typaldos' world view but also the main directions of the era with regard to the education of Greek students of the Diaspora. According to Petsios' evidence, *Synthesis* is actually nothing more than a re-composition of

<sup>178</sup> Nikolaos Koursoulas studied first in the College of Rome. He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Padua and was proclaimed as a doctor of theology and philology in 1625. For information on the work and views of Koursoulas, see Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*; Despoina Mihalaga, "Η ζωή και το έργο του Νικολάου Κούρσουλα του Ζακυνθίου, διδασκάλου, φιλοσόφου και θεολόγου", in *Πρακτικά διεθνούς επιστημονικού συνεδρίου Άγιοι και εκκλησιαστικές προσωπικότητες στη Ζάκυνθο* (Athens: 1999), 346-347.

<sup>179</sup> Here it could be mentioned Sevastos Kyminites (1630-1703), who initially taught at the Academy of Constantinople and later of Bucharest.

<sup>180</sup> Virvidakis S. "Η Φιλοσοφική σκέψη στην Ελλάδα από τον 16<sup>ο</sup> ως τον 20<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα", in *Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία και Επιστήμη: από την Αρχαιότητα έως τον 20<sup>ο</sup> Αιώνα*, V. A, collective volume (Patras: Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο 2000), 385-436.

<sup>181</sup> See Introduction, subnote 8.

<sup>182</sup> See Introduction, subnote 9.

Koursoulas' text *Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους Φυσικὴν Πραγματείαν Ὑπομνήματα καὶ Ζητήματα*<sup>183</sup>, Typaldos' participation is exhausted in having prepared the *Preamble*.

In any case, Typaldos opposed those who attempted to interpret Aristotle's teachings, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias and wrote: "...οὐ μὴν καὶ κατ' ἴχνος τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους περιπατήσω ἐν ταύτῃ περιπατητικῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐφ' ὅσον αὐτοῦ ἔδοξε καὶ αἱ διδασκαλίαι ταις τῶν θεολόγων καλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς οὐκ ἀντιτάττονται δόγμασι. Φίλος γὰρ Πλάτων, φίλος Σωκράτης, ἀλλὰ τούτων πάντων φιλτάτη ἡ ἀλήθεια"<sup>184</sup>. In Koursoulas' text, as copied by Typaldos in *Synthesis*, the views of the supporters of Aristotelian scholastic philosophy are praised; more specifically, he considers Thomas and Scotus as the most prominent of the Aristotelian philosophers<sup>185</sup>, something that proves Typaldos' attachment to medieval scholasticism. In this manner, Typaldos failed to break the bonds of the theological tradition of the middle Ages, in particular on the problems of universals, divine illumination, and the nature of human freedom; he seemed to pay little attention to the existing historical differences among the two Christian dogmas. These differences are regarded by him as mere aspects of earthly powers, and this view renders him ready to attach himself to the Christian creed that is the most powerful in the region of his activity -Catholicism- during this specific historical period.

The really important aspect of Typaldos' didactic documents is not the corpus of his views, but mostly -as properly stressed by Petsios- the confirmation that : "it is more than obvious that for at least fifty years, the philosophical teaching provided to Venice was mostly based on Koursoulas' analysis and expressed the traditional interpretation of Aristotle"<sup>186</sup>.

In addition, the relation of Typaldos with prominent Greek pre-Enlightenment figures proves, rather indirectly, the ampleness and the impact of his personality. Typaldos' works on Aristotle, as they have been preserved, characterize him as a

---

<sup>183</sup> Petsios, "Ὁ μεσαιωνικὸς – σχολαστικὸς ἀριστοτελισμὸς ὡς πλαίσιο τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς διδασκαλίας στὴ Βενετία κατὰ τὸν 17<sup>ο</sup> αἰῶνα: τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ Ματθαίου (Μελετίου) Τυπάλδου".

<sup>184</sup> This excerpt is from Petsios, *Περὶ Φύσεως*, 183. In English it can be rendered: "he will walk on the path of the Aristotelian peripatetic philosophy, to the extent that its views and teachings are not contradicting the good and pure theological creeds. Because it is good to be friends with Plato and Socrates, but it is better to be friends with the (theological) truth".

<sup>185</sup> Petsios, "Μεσαιωνικὸς-σχολαστικὸς ἀριστοτελισμὸς", 259.

<sup>186</sup> Petsios, "Μεσαιωνικὸς-σχολαστικὸς ἀριστοτελισμὸς", 261.

conservative, religious Neo-Aristotelian who either was convinced by a part of new ideas or he did not wish to enter into conflicts with the Church. However, no doubts should shadow his intellectual gravity, which derived from his wide knowledge and his office in the ecclesiastic hierarchy. Moreover, Typaldos was a personality who had fairly gained the respect of Greek scholars and undisputedly was keen in expressing his concerns and participating in pivotal issues of his time.



## 2.4. The relations between Venice and the Greek Confraternity

### 2.4.1. *The Greeks in Venice up to the time of Typaldos*

The relation between Venice and Byzantium is intensively reflected by two incidents described by Chryssa Maltezos<sup>187</sup>. The first incident refers to the period after the fall of Constantinople during the crusade of 1204, when the Doge Pietro Ziani, Enrico Dandolo's successor, suggested Constantinople to become the capital of the Venetian State due to its key geographic location. Chryssa Maltezos has proposed that the idea did not thrive as the financial interests of Venice defined its historic mission and inhibited it from conceiving the global aspect of the role it could have taken over due to historic concurrences. The second incident is related to Venetians' religiousness. In May 1797, just before Venice was defeated by Napoleon's forces, the Venetians would flood Saint Marcus Church in order to worship the icon of Holy Virgin the Victory Maker ("Νικοποιός"). It was the same icon -painted in Constantinople- used for centuries by the Byzantines in reaffirming their faith when the empire was in danger by outside forces. Byzantium did not exist anymore but the attractive power of the icon, with which the Byzantines had associated their victories, led the Venetians to believe in such, at the most difficult time of their city. Another strong example of the position of Venice in the collective memory of the Greek people is a song that the Greek mothers for centuries -even today- when they put their babies to sleep at night they usually sing to them the following lullaby: "Κοιμήσου και παρήγγειλα στην πόλη τα προικιά σου/ στη Βενετία τα ρούχα σου και τα διαμαντικά σου"<sup>188</sup>.

After the fall of Constantinople, Venice, an outgrowth of the Byzantine Empire, had become for Greeks almost another kind of Byzantium,

---

<sup>187</sup> Chryssa Maltezos, "Βενετία, η άλλη πατρίδα των Ελλήνων", in *Δημοσία Ιλαρία*, ed. Chryssa Maltezos (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών της Βενετίας, 1999), 13-14.

<sup>188</sup> English translation: "Sleep and I've ordered your trousseau from Constantinople/from Venice your vesture and jewelry..." see Maltezos, *Βενετία, η άλλη πατρίδα των Ελλήνων*, 11. As Maltezos argues "that song reflects the ideological orientation of the Greek people after the fall of the Byzantine empire".

symbolically, a “quasi alterum Byzantium” as Bessarion called it. The sea-encircled city-state provided one possible escape for Greeks under Ottoman rule. And it was known that the polis-state also served as a kind of new homeland to emigrants, a haven for a number of nobles, artists and spiritual figures who had abandoned Constantinople and other enslaved Greek areas under Ottoman regime<sup>189</sup>.

Venice’s Greek Orthodox subjects numbered 480,000, almost 20 percent of the Empire’s total population<sup>190</sup>. Cyprus, Crete, Peloponnese, Lepanto, Constantinople etc. were the origins of those Greeks who came to settle in Venice. They left their homes because some of them did not want to live under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. Others wanted to study in Italy. Most of them chose Venice because at the time, that city-state offered a rare opportunity for trading, especially after the sixteenth century when the Venetian state opened its trade to foreigners. By the end of the fifteenth century until the seventeenth century, with small differences, the Greek population in Venice, according to the archives of the Greek Confraternity, numbered more than 5000 citizens<sup>191</sup>.

Venice indicated a preference toward the confraternities’ policy concerning the way foreign minorities should be governed. It was a model of governance which the Ottoman Empire had been applying in order to govern the various nationalities subjected to its authority. All foreigners, such as the Greeks, had the right to organize themselves into confraternities. A

<sup>189</sup> Among the famous Greek emigrants was Marcos Moussouros (1470-1517) who was for many years literary editor in the printing house of Aldus Manutius -one of the earliest printers of Greek classic texts - as well as professor of Greek at Padua and Venice. Other known emigrants were the previously referred to “Hellenist circle of Padua” (see subsection 2.3.1.) and the pre-Enlightenment friends of Typaldos (see subsection 2.3.2).

<sup>190</sup> Benjamin Arbel, “Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox in the Early Modern Venetian State”, in *The Three Religions*, ed. Nili Cohen and Andreas Heldrich (Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2002), 73-86.

<sup>191</sup> Giorgio Fedalto, “Le minoranze straniere” in *Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente* V.1, ed. Hans-Georg Beck, Manoussos Manoussakas, and Agostino Petrusi, (Florence: Leo S. Olschiki, 1977): 143-163; Giorgio Fedalto, “Stranieri a Venezia e Padova, 1550-1700”, in *Storia della Cultura Veneta: Dalla controriforma alla fine della Repubblica V.4/ii: Il Seicento*, ed. Girolamo Arnaldi and Manlio Pastore Stocchi (Vicenza: Pozza, 1980), 499-505; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 12. Ο συνολικός πληθυσμός of the Venetian state τον 17<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα κυμαίνονταν ανάμεσα στους 102.000 κατοίκους στα 1633 και 138.000 κατοίκους στα 1696. Ακριβείς αριθμούς see in Daniele Beltrami, *Storia della popolazione di Venezia dalla fine del secolo XVI alla caduta della Repubblica* (Padova: A. Milani, 1954), 59; Daniele Beltrami, *La composizione economica e professionale della popolazione di Venezia nei secoli XVII e XVIII* (Padova: CEDAM, 1951), 69-85, 155-179 (from *Giornale di Economisti e Annali di Economia*, 10, n. 3-4, 1951).

Confraternity therefore did not include the entire population of the community. It constituted an organized community, which enjoyed special privileges offered by the political authority of each city. Each Greek Confraternity had the right to build a Greek Orthodox Church, while, in terms of operation, it was regulated by statutes already approved. Each Confraternity elected those who governed it, managed its finances and provided for the care of the needy, the maintenance and operation of the church, as well as the foundation and operation of the Greek schools. In addition they represented the Confraternity to the political authorities. Their funds came from subscriptions, donations and heritages, as well as taxation.

The confraternities in Venice were established only by a state license. They were “communities” but each one was named after a patron saint. The organization and administration of the confraternities, not only in Venice, but everywhere, were based on statutes (statuti). After the request of the Greek community, the Council of Ten gave its permission on the 28th of November 1498, to establish a Greek Confraternity under the name of “Saint Nicolas”. It had been agreed that a number of the male members of the Confraternity would not exceed 250<sup>192</sup>. The number of female members was not limited. However, it was not common for women to participate in such organizations.

The Greek Confraternity of that time was the main organizational form of a community. The purpose of the existence of a Greek Confraternity was double: First to maintain strong links between the Greeks of the Diaspora and their place of origin. This connection was not profit oriented, since the members of the Confraternity did not earn jobs or money from their membership. On the contrary, they were paying money for the needs of the Confraternity. However, their connection had considerable emotional effects and enhanced a sense of belonging. Let us remember that the legal form of the Confraternity was the main institution that Greeks had established in order to be self-governed under the Ottoman occupation. The adoption of the same organizational form in exile contributed to attaching the community’s memories -regarding the way of their

---

<sup>192</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 15.

government- with the traditions of their homeland<sup>193</sup>. Secondly, the Confraternity's aim was to serve mainly religious guilds and charitable issues emerging within the communities. Solidarity among community members was ensured either by the administration of the Confraternity, or by its wealthy members; establishing and funding charitable institutions such as nursing homes, orphanages, and others. And that was because the community members were not only wealthy people with roots in the old families of the Byzantine Empire, but also the anonymous sailors or traders. Although both were members of the same community, they belonged to two different social worlds.

As the interest of preserving the religious belief of the Greeks is of great importance, it is worth mentioning the events and policies that allowed the Greeks to maintain their cultural and religious identity. Recall that since the fall of Constantinople, Venice enjoyed the reputation of being a tolerant state. Nevertheless, such tolerance about religious matters did not mean that every foreign group (among them Greeks) could do, without permission from the polis-state, whatever they liked. On the contrary, one of the criticisms levelled against the Republic was that the Venetian authorities controlled all aspects of social, political as well as religious activities.

Venetians did not like or accept interferences by the Pope or the Jesuits. Actually they did not like any kind of interference in the affairs of their state. They allowed foreign merchants to become active in their economy, or emigrant workers to find jobs in Venice; they gave permission for constructing confraternities but, of course, everything allowed was under strict Venetian rules and according to the state's laws. Greek settlers were foreigners who, like all settlers, had to follow strictly the rules of the Venetian state. And it was a very powerful pre-modern state that imposed hard rules on everybody. Everything was under the control of the authorities. For example, at the beginning of the sixteenth Century, the Venetian authorities detected a dangerous trend coming from the Confraternity's election. Various Greeks not registered in the Confraternity's record were voting for its council. The authorities feared that massive participation could raise ethnic issues. So they

<sup>193</sup> Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 106.

decided (on 7<sup>th</sup> May 1533) that those who wanted to take part in the elections for the so-called “capitolo” (assembly) had to register one month before the elections, and they must have paid their dues<sup>194</sup>. And all these rules were applied despite the limited number of the Confraternity’s membership.

On the 4<sup>th</sup> of October 1511 the Greeks and in particular the Greek “stradioti” asked one more time for permission to build their own Greek Orthodox Church, dedicated to Saint George, patron saint of the warriors. Their request was directed to the “Consiglio dei dieci”<sup>195</sup> which was competent for such matters<sup>196</sup>. Their basic argument was based on the valuable services they had provided in defence of the city-state:

“essendo noi reduti in questa terra condotti dale Excellentie Vostre per vostri militi e defenssori del vostro glorioso stato et havendo etiam conduto la maggior parte de noi le brigate nostre, cioe muglier e fioli cum intention di viver e morir soto l’ombra dele Excellentie Vostre”<sup>197</sup>.

They also asked permission to build a cemetery because, until that time, the “stradioti” had no other choice but to bury the corpses of their companions at sea. The “Consiglio dei dieci” accepted the request. Three years later, on April 30 1514, the Doge Leonardo Loredan signed a “bull” permitting the construction of both a Greek Orthodox Church and a cemetery. In 1526, the first ecclesiastical commissaries were elected, among them the heroic soldier Theodoros

---

<sup>194</sup> A.S.V., Provveditori di Comun, Atti, b. 9, fols. 116v-117r.

<sup>195</sup> A.S.V., Consiglio dei Dieci, Parti Miste, filza 28, doc.51.

<sup>196</sup> Consiglio dei dieci: It aimed at the preservation of the security of the state and therefore it could intervene at all levels of political and social life of the country. It was proven as the most important patrolling authority of the public and private life. It controlled the operation of confraternities and trades and the activity of the ecclesiastic institutions. (See da Mosto, *Archivio*, 52-55).

<sup>197</sup> A.S.V., Consiglio dei Dieci, Parti miste, filza 28, doc. 51; A.S.V., *Rif*, Filza 548. Free translation: “Being humiliated on earth, we were called by Your Excellency to strengthen the army and your glorious state, so here we brought women and our children to live and die under the umbrella of your lordship”. The paper, of three pages, is undated and there is no number on it. It contains the important dates of the Greek religious history in Venice. It starts with the papal bull of 1511. It was the license to the Greek Confraternity to build its own church in Venice; the church of Saint George. Following some other important dates such as: 1514, is mentioned as the year that the building site for the church was bought; 1536 and 1540, are mentioned as the years that the Greek Confraternity took the right to elect its own priests; 1578 and then the paper is setting down all the archbishops of Filadelfia, starting from Gavriil Severus, the first elected and ending to Meletios Typaldos.

Paleologos<sup>198</sup>. In 1527, by the first day of Lent, a part of the temple had already been built. The Orthodox Christians of Venice attended their first Mass there. In 1536, a wooden design was prepared according to the eastern architectural model of churches and in 1539 the foundation stone was set for the final building of the church.

The Confraternity dedicated many years to finishing the project but on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 1573 the church of Saint George became a reality: it was built on “Ponte dei Greci” under the famous sloping belfry. Today, it still exists. The temple was graced with important holy heirlooms. Some of them came from Constantinople and were secretly sent to Venice after the fall. Several modern religious painters of that era, such as Tintoretto, created masterpieces exclusively for that temple.

The Church of St. George, in the course of the years did not remain merely a building but a symbolic field of Orthodox worship and faith<sup>199</sup>. The significance of the Church in the life of the Greek minority of Diaspora is shown in the letters sent during the middle of the seventeenth century (1641 and 1642) by some other Greeks, to the rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia requesting financial assistance:

the Church does not belong to a city or a region, but to the whole “genos” of the Romans [...] this alone, without exaggeration, may be called a sacred anchor, in which the salvation of our “genos” stirs, because all other Churches of the Romans (Greeks) are under tyrannical rule, with the exception of this one, that [...] enjoys complete freedom and Orthodox frankness...<sup>200</sup>

It is worth noting that the Church of St. George was built with much effort and toil, and after Greek merchants and ship owners had imposed a tax for the construction of the Church, on every Greek ship that weighed anchor in Venice<sup>201</sup>. In addition, the, merchants and ship owners were mostly those of the members of the Greek Confraternity, who resisted Typaldos and his Catholic-friendly group.

<sup>198</sup> Marianna Kolyva, “Θεόδωρος Παλαιολόγος, αρχηγός μισθοφόρων ‘στρατιωτών’ και διερμηνέας στην υπηρεσία της Βενετίας, 1452c-1532”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 10 (1973), 138-162.

<sup>199</sup> Α.Ε.Ι.Β. Β’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 27, ff 2r-3r.

<sup>200</sup> Chryssa Maltezou, “Οδηγός του Αρχείου”, in series *Βιβλιοθήκη του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας*, 26, (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 2008), 52.

<sup>201</sup> Molly Greene, “Trading Identities: The sixteenth-century Greek moment” in *A Faithful Sea: The Religious Cultures of the Mediterranean, 1200-1700*, ed. Adnan A. Jusain and Katherine Elizabeth Fleming (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 131.

When in 1514 permission was granted to build a Greek church, the Pope was Leo X (1475-1521). It should be noted that Venice, despite its tolerance, was a Catholic power which partially exercised its policy to regions under its domination (such as the Ionian Islands, Peloponnese and Crete) through Catholic clergymen. By suppressing Orthodox worship, Catholic clergymen engaged Greek people to follow the Catholic rituals, a fact that provoked the indignation of the dominated regions and gave rise to “immortale odium contra Latinos” (undying hatred against Latin people). Therefore, there were ongoing conflicts between Orthodox and Catholic clergymen, something that led Pope Leo X to provide the Greeks of the State of Venice the privilege of coming directly under the pope’s authority and not, as before, under the local ecclesiastical authorities<sup>202</sup>. Put Greeks under his jurisdiction allowed them to freely exercise their religious duties based on the Orthodox rituality. Leo X (second brother of Lorenzo Medici “the Magnificent”) was known for his favourable attitude toward Greeks; he was susceptible to and influenced by Greek literature<sup>203</sup>. This pope gave the Greek Confraternity the right to choose its own Orthodox priest. The first elected priest was Mihalis Savinas from Koroni, a Venetian colony in southern Peloponnese. After almost a century, the Greeks in Venice (who at the time numbered more than 5000 citizens<sup>204</sup>) had finally obtained legitimate religious rights<sup>205</sup>.

---

<sup>202</sup> Apostolos Vakalopoulos, “Η προσηλυτιστική κίνηση της καθολικής εκκλησίας” in *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, Vol. III (Tsessaloniki: Ηρόδοτος, 1968).

<sup>203</sup> He had founded the Greek high school in Rome (it functioned from 1516 to 1519). The high school was exclusively oriented to studying Greek classic antiquity. There was no theological side to the pope’s initiative, like the one Pope Grigorio the 13<sup>th</sup> took later in 1577 founding the Greek college of Saint Athanasios in Rome on purpose to influence as many Orthodox Greeks as he could and increase the power of Catholicism. Pope’s Leo X initiative was clearly a proof of its interest about Greek letters (see “Pope Leo X” in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, New York: Robert Appleton Company). Hence, he helped the Greek headmaster of the school, Zaccare Kallergis, to establish a printing house and print many Greek works. That specific job was financed by an Italian Maecenas Cornelio Benigni, friend of Leo X. Marcos Moussouros, who as it was mentioned earlier (in the subnote 79 of the section 2.2) was member of the tutoring board of the *Greek College of Rome, established by the Pope Leo X*, and literary editor in the printing house of Aldus Manutius (see in this subsection, subnote 189), dedicated the first printed book of Aristotle to Pope Leo X asking for his help to liberate the enslaved Greeks. After the pope’s death, both the school and the printing house stopped functioning and Venice took the first place for printing and studying in Greek. See Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*.

<sup>204</sup> See Fedalto, “Stranieri a Venezia e Padova, 1550-1700”, and Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*.

<sup>205</sup> The Pope’s decision made a big difference: earlier, from 1412 to 1418, a priest from Evvoia Island, Michael Kosmas as well as the priest Assanis (1418) were serving in the Greek community of Venice and became the first Church members to be threatened by the authorities with deportation if they didn’t stop holding Orthodox services in Venice. Now, however, the

Ironically, these on-going conflicts reflected in parallel ways the very history of Venice. Several times in the millennium of its history the Republic had to confront a series of religious problems (especially vis-à-vis the Popes); such problems were some kind of powder keg within the very foundation of the state. In the Greek case, a parallel explosive situation was the dangerous issue of Catholicism versus Orthodoxy. On both sides, what often mattered in the harsh polemics over the role of religion in society, and in particular in the polis-state of Venice, was determined by strong personalities. What seemed a religious struggle, therefore, did not entail only religious differences; there were also, and above all, vested interests, political situations and a variety of philosophical perceptions regarding the various practices of faith.

#### **2.4.2. *The establishment of the Metropolis of Philadelphia***

The problems did not end with the privileges earned by Greeks. As will soon be shown, legalization of the practice of the Orthodox faith by the Greeks of Venice would not be the last difficulty that Greeks had to face. While faith was supposed to unite people, in many cases faith was causing divisions. The situation of the Greek-Orthodox Confraternity in Venice was one such case: from now on Greek people would have to confront many difficulties, obstacles and dangerous contradictions or confrontations. The church would of course play a crucial role in all the vicissitudes of the Greek community.

For several years, the problems encountered by the Orthodox Christians of Venice in relation to their church could be divided into two categories. The first category included the problems created by the local Catholic Patriarch who, significantly, from the beginning was opposed to the building of an Orthodox church in order for the Orthodox Christians to perform their rituals. The second category included the problems among Orthodox Greeks themselves. Several of the disputes among them were triggered by the policy of division practiced by Meletios Typaldos. Internal conflicts started in the late seventeenth century and did not come to an end until almost a hundred years later.

---

Republic accepted the legitimacy of their religious differences. Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 11.



The Metropolis of Philadelphia, which was the foundation stone of the Orthodox religious representation in the West, would turn, for many decades, into a serious problem. It was the first big metropolis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the West founded in 1575<sup>206</sup>. The Archbishopric of Philadelphia was initially established in the wide region of Lydia in Asia Minor in the seventh century. Honoris causa, the metropolis of the Church of Saint George in Venice was named after the metropolis of Philadelphia. Its establishment required a reciprocal arrangement between the Ecumenical Patriarch and the ambassador of Venice in Constantinople and next a decision by the Venetian Senate. The primary reason for the Venetians to allow the establishment of the Metropolis was the spirit of religious freedom but also the great number of Orthodox Greeks residing in Venice<sup>207</sup>.

The metropolitan chair was granted to people who stood out for their culture and knowledge. Each metropolitan, was, as a compliment, named president of the Greeks and represented their ultimate religious symbol. Among his other duties, the metropolitan was responsible for certifying the identity of newly-arrived Orthodox Greeks in the towns of Venice and Padua who had come in order to study. The Church was for centuries -from the fall of Constantinople to the Greek revolution in 1821- the main, if not the only, access to education for Orthodox Greeks. It also disseminated literature and ideas. Among the clergymen, a lot of personalities were distinguished by their learning: they were the forerunners of the Greek Enlightenment<sup>208</sup>.

The first Orthodox archpriest with actual competency over the 4,000 Orthodox Christians who lived in sixteenth century in Venice was Gabriel Severus<sup>209</sup>. Severus was highly esteemed both by the Orthodox Christians of Venice and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II, who nominated him as a metropolitan. He had exceptional relations with the Venetian aristocracy as well. The prominent theologian and lawyer Paolo Sarpi highly esteemed him<sup>210</sup>.

---

<sup>206</sup> Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*, 399; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 69.

<sup>207</sup> William McNeill, *Venice: The Hinge of Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 198-199.

<sup>208</sup> Such as: Anthracites, Mitrou and Damodos who have already been referred to (see subsection 2.3.1).

<sup>209</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 68-72.

<sup>210</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 71.

Soon enough, the Greek Confraternity of Venice silently recognized his right, (so far exercised exclusively by the Greek Confraternity) to elect the parish priest of the Saint George church. The Patriarch, upon consultation with the Venetian Ambassador in Constantinople, and upon the Senate's consent, assigned Severus with more duties. He was granted the title of "Honourable Exarch of Lydia"; a title which was awarded to all future metropolitans of Philadelphia<sup>211</sup>. In the mid seventeenth century, two more Patriarchs took care of the archiepiscopal throne of Philadelphia. In 1644, Patriarch Parthenios proclaimed Athanasios as Archbishop of Philadelphia in order to expand his domination over the Orthodox congregation and clergy living within the Venetian State. The Archbishop's rights, apart from the performance of his clerical duties, included passing judgment on any ecclesiastic issues that arose<sup>212</sup>.

In 1653, Patriarch Ioannicius' decision addressed once more Athanasios (Valerianos), the Archbishop of Philadelphia but it went one step forward. He assigned to him the task of appointing the Metropolitans of Cephalonia and Zakynthos, Lefkada, Kythira, Monemvasia and the senior priest of Corfu. The election, of course, was performed by the local society. Their consecration, however, was an exclusive decision by the Archbishop of Philadelphia. Ioannicius states in his letter that there is no need any more for the Archbishop of Philadelphia to ask for the Patriarchate's consent<sup>213</sup>. Yet, he allows the Archbishop of Philadelphia to assign the right of consecrating the Bishop of Kythira to the Bishop of Cephalonia due to the great distance between Venice and the island of Kythira<sup>214</sup>. Being fully aware of the extended range of rights provided to the Archbishop of Philadelphia, Ioannicius ended his letter with one condition. He obliged any elected Archbishop of Philadelphia to travel to Constantinople in order to be officially assigned by the Patriarch. It should be also emphasized that both the letter of Patriarch Parthenios and Patriarch

<sup>211</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 70-71.

<sup>212</sup> Manouil Gedeon, *Κανονικαί Διατάξεις*, V.1 (Constantinople: Πατριαρχικό Τυπογραφείο, 1888), 44-47.

<sup>213</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 45-52.

<sup>214</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 77-78.

Ioannicius were signed by archpriests of the Holy Synod<sup>215</sup>. Therefore, decisions were taken by the Synod and not only the Patriarchs.

There seem to be several reasons why the Synod and the Patriarch proceeded to such a remarkable upgrading of the Archbishop's of Philadelphia role. The most important is that the relation between the Patriarchate and the Venetian Aristocracy was very good. This is something frequently mentioned in the two aforementioned letters of the Patriarchs Parthenios and Ioannicius<sup>216</sup>. The Patriarchate's honorary references to the Venetian Aristocracy, i.e. the Senate and the Doge, revealed its true intention to safeguard the good relation between them. It is known that from time to time the Venetians would approach to a greater or lesser degree the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Sublime Porte, in order to serve their own interests<sup>217</sup>. Therefore, such upgrading of the Archbishop of Philadelphia would contribute to the maintenance of good relations between the Venetians and the Patriarchate.

In order to understand the policy of the Patriarchate against the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, it's good to know that the threat of Jesuits was still there -not only theoretically but physically as well<sup>218</sup>- and therefore also the fear that the Orthodox Christians might adopt the doctrine of Catholicism. By enhancing the autonomy of the Archbishop of Philadelphia, the Patriarchate made it clear to the Orthodox Christians that their Church was more liberal and distanced itself from past inflexible procedures. Furthermore, the Orthodox Christians' privilege to elect their priests and hierarchs themselves was already very important<sup>219</sup>. In addition, the fact that during that time there were constant conflicts that inhibited the free transfer of archpriests might have played a role too. Finally, it is possible that the Patriarchate was encouraged to take such

---

<sup>215</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 43-44, 51-52.

<sup>216</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 40, 45.

<sup>217</sup> Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006); Lucette Valensi, *Βενετία και Υψηλή Πύλη: Η Γέννηση του Δεσπότη*, trans. Anthi Karra (Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 2000).

<sup>218</sup> Specifically, Archbishop Severus was threatened by the Jesuits according to his own allegations to the Venetian authorities: see Giuseppe Cappelletti, *Jesuiti e la Repubblica di Venezia: documenti diplomatici relativi alla Società Gesuitica* (Venice: Grimaldo, 1873), 239.

<sup>219</sup> Manoussos Manousakas, "Η εν Βενετία Ελληνική Κοινότης και οι Μητροπολίται Φιλαδελφείας", *Επετηρίς Εταιρίας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 37 (1969-1970), 170-210, esp. 189-190.

decisions because of the personality of Athanasios who was then the Archbishop of Philadelphia: he had been known for his sagacity, good administration and obedience to the Ecumenical Throne<sup>220</sup>.

### 2.4.3. Greek followers of the two doctrines

Significant attention needs to be paid to the tolerance demonstrated by the Patriarchate towards the Venetian Aristocracy but also to the members of the Greek community that embraced both doctrines – Orthodox and Catholic – as already mentioned<sup>221</sup>. Some of these members belonged to the wealthy segments of the Greek Confraternity in Venice, a fact that forced the Patriarchate not to isolate them, either because they possessed power within the Venetian society or because it hoped that they would sometime return to the Orthodox religious views.

Research on the cases of Greeks who participated in both doctrines, leads to the view that they could be divided into four categories as will be discussed in detail below. However as a general observation, it could be said that, although phenomena of a mixed culture have begun to be discussed rather recently in postcolonial studies, as well as globalization under the name of hybridity<sup>222</sup>, in places of the Greek Diaspora similar phenomena had already been observed before the eighteenth century. Maltezou, for example, argues about such phenomena on the island of Crete where the cultural elements directly influenced the Venetians who moved to the island.

As early as the late thirteenth century intermarriages between Greeks and Venetians were referred to. The closeness of the relationship became stronger in the mid-sixteenth century when religious differences are smoothed out mainly in cities. Then Venice turns to the local population taking it in account due to the rising Turkish threat. The long peaceful co-existence resulted in a fruitful cultural dialogue [...] On the other hand, after the fall of Constantinople; Venice had gathered many Greek emigrants, who

<sup>220</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 47-48.

<sup>221</sup> See section 2.2.

<sup>222</sup> For “hybridity” is a cross between two separate races or cultures, see Robert J.C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (New York: Putnam, 1995); Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).

transferred to the Serenissima their knowledge, businesses and desires. Greek emigrants felt safe under the protective power of Venice, a Christian state able to take on the fight against the Turks<sup>223</sup>.

However, the “mixed culture” -created by a prolonged co-habitation between Orthodox and Catholic people- does not explain all the cases of Greeks who attended the liturgy in Catholic churches or embraced Catholicism. Other reasons, either of practical purposes or of personal profit induced Orthodox emigrants to accept the Catholic doctrine. This is the reason that led this research to distinguish the aforementioned Greeks in the following four groups:

(a) A number of them could not find significant differences between Catholicism and Greek Orthodoxy. They could not understand the theological differences between the two dogmas. Such differences had not yet been theologically established to such an extent that would qualify them as a major problem. By contrast, the proximity to Catholics and participation in Catholic churches eased religious differences. A typical example can be drawn from the mystery of Holy Communion<sup>224</sup>. In the Catholic Eucharist, the bread and wine, take on the essence of the body and blood of Jesus when the words of Jesus are spoken over them by the priest. However, in the Orthodox Greek Liturgy, the invocation of the Holy Spirit is necessary. Only with its mediation, a transformation takes place, and the bread and the wine mysteriously are transformed into the real body and blood of the Christ. This difference, between the two dogmas, was not of interest for those Christians who did not understand their deeper meaning. For that reason, they participated in both churches, without having the sense that they were committing a sin. This category would also include some Greek scholars who had become Catholics, as they could not find significant differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy. A typical case is that of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, who despite being a Catholic, was close to the Archbishop of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos Notaras.

---

<sup>223</sup> Chryssa Maltezoou, “Η Κρήτη στη διάρκεια της περιόδου της Βενετοκρατίας”, in *Κρήτη, Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός* V.2, ed. Nicolaos Panayotakis (Irakleion: Πανεπιστημιακές εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 1998), 142-153.

<sup>224</sup> The writer of “Apologia” refers to the tolerant attitude of the Orthodox theologian and archbishop of Thessaloniki, Neilos and Nikolaos Kavasilas, with regard to the acceptance of the Catholic Holy Communion. See Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 188; also, subsection 4.3.6., about “Apologia”.

(b) A second group refers to those who participated in Catholic rituals exclusively for practical purposes. A typical example is that of the Greek students in Padua and other Italian cities, as they would receive their sacrament in the Catholic churches of their cities, as frequent travelling to Venice was really difficult at the time<sup>225</sup>. This is the case of the Patriarchate allowing the participation of Catholics in Orthodox rituals as it believed that they could become a source of the educated clerics that it wanted. Indicatively, we refer to Elias Meniates<sup>226</sup>, who from a Catholic turned into a strong supporter of the Byzantine Orthodoxy and next he became the Bishop of Kernike and Kalavryton.

(c) A third group consisted of Greeks who came from the wealthiest and most powerful segments of the Greek community in Venice and participated not only in Greek-Orthodox confraternities, but also in charitable Catholic confraternities or at least they used to maintain good relations with the Catholic Church in order to become better incorporated into the circles of the Venetian community.

This third category also included cases such as the one of Nikolas Kouvlis<sup>227</sup>, who lived in the mid sixteenth century. He was a prominent member

<sup>225</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 187.

<sup>226</sup> Elias Meniates was a student and close associate of Meletios Typaldos, son of the priest Frangiskos Meniates – friend of Typaldos too. He was born in Cephalonia in 1669. From 1681 up to 1689 he had been studying in Flanghinian School of Venice, being a protégé of Meletios Typaldos, preacher and teacher of the Greek Confraternity of Venice. When Meletios Typaldos became Archbishop of Philadelphia Meniates became his secretary and within the same year became deacon and preacher of the Orthodox church of Saint George in Venice. In parallel, he taught at the Flanghinian School from 1688 up to 1690, as well as during 1698 – 1699. During 1691-1698 he lived and taught in Cephalonia, Zante and Corfu and after his short stay in Venice he lived in Constantinople for seven years. In 1710 he was ordained Bishop of Kerniki and Kalavryta. He passed away on 1<sup>st</sup> August 1714 in Patras. After his death his remains were entombed by his father in the Church of Saint Nikolaos of Meniates in Lixouri. His full teachings were published for the first time in 1716 in Venice and 23 editions followed until 1900, something that attests to the reputation and popularity of his work. Although Meniates was one of those who had signed a Confession of Faith to Catholicism, his prompt withdrawal from the entourage of Meletios Typaldos and his amends when he had been in the court of the Patriarch along with his writing work have established him as one of the most significant spiritual Orthodox Priests of that era: Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, 394-397; Despoina Vlasi, “Ο Ηλίας Μηνιάτης στη Βενετία. Σπουδαστής και διευθυντής του Φλαγγινιανού, δάσκαλος της ελληνικής σχολής και ιεροκήρυκας στο ναό του Αγίου Γεωργίου των Ελλήνων, 1681-1699” *Κυμοτόη* V. 22-23 (2012-3).

<sup>227</sup> Despoina Vlasi, “Δύο διαθήκες των αρχών του 17<sup>ου</sup> αιώνα από το παλαιό αρχείο του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας”, *Θησαυρίσματα* 31 (2001), 181-209.

of the great Confraternity of “San Marco” (“Grande Scuola di San Marco”)<sup>228</sup>; of Zacharias<sup>229</sup> from Corfu who served as “Σύνδικος” (a high ranking member) in “Scuola Del Sacramento”, of the Catholic “San Zeremia” church, and also of Ioannis Vergis<sup>230</sup> who was elected president of “Scuola della Passion” of the Catholic “San Zulian” church.

Others had developed a close friendship with Catholics and many used to bequeath a part of their belongings to Catholic churches or monasteries. Fani Mavroides<sup>231</sup>, for instance, who had published the register of the Greek Confraternity in the sixteenth century, has identified such cases. Iakovos Samariaris, a very wealthy merchant and ship-owner, who had been a member and president of the Greek Confraternity, asked in his will as an Orthodox to be buried in the building of the Orthodox church of Saint George in Venice. He bequeathed 100 ducats to the Greek Confraternity so they would take care of his Orthodox funeral. At the same time, he asked for two “Scuolas” (“Scuola di San Todoro” and “Scuola dei Marineri”) to participate in his funeral procession and bequeathed 100 ducats to each one. Yet he also asked his trustees to ensure that 24 Jesuits would follow his funeral procession. The constituents should give them as an act of charity an amount of money. Three explanations could be ventured for expressing such a wish. The first is that, among some people, the differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism were not so vast. The second, that most of the Greeks in Venice had come from Greek territories where both doctrines of Christianity were active, especially those who had a lot of social relations because of their occupation and status. The third was that, metaphysically speaking, they wanted, just in case, to have all opportunities opened to them for life after death, if any existed.

In order to have a complete picture, we can see the exact opposite example. The painter Thomas Batas from Corfu, one of the painters of the church of Saint George, in his will (April 11, 1599) states that in his funeral, he wants the “Greek doctrine” to be followed, i.e. to be buried according to the

---

<sup>228</sup> Fani Mavroidi, *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής Αδελφότητας Βενετίας στο ΙΣΤ' αιώνα* (Athens: Καραβίας, 1976), 141.

<sup>229</sup> A.S.V., Proveditori di Comun, b. 10, doc. 9

<sup>230</sup> A.S.V., Proveditori di Comun, b. 14, reg. 21, fol. 171v

<sup>231</sup> Mavroidi, *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής Αδελφότητας Βενετίας*, 137.

Christian Orthodox ritual. He even asks to be buried in the building of the Church of St. George -just like the wealthy merchant Samariaris- and even in a good plot, as he feels he deserves it for all his support offered to the church. One can also assume, from his will, that he was wealthy. He left 1000 ducats to his wife – after her death, the money would be available for the dowries of virgin girls or for an Orthodox nunnery, as long as it was in Venice. He left 100 ducats to the monasteries of Holy Mountain, 25 ducats to the Church of St. George in Venice and precious vessels to the Archbishop of Philadelphia. The will -with regard to the question of identity- is very interesting, as he also leaves money for his unmarried maid. He even ordered that she be given the necessary furniture for the home when she was married. But this will, could be executed only if she was getting married to a Greek man. Otherwise, “if she will not marry a Greek do not give her anything”<sup>232</sup>. We can see that both the merchant Iakovos Samariaris, and the painter Thomas Batas, who lived in the same century, were giving special attention to their burial in an Orthodox and ritualistic manner, and within the Orthodox church of St. George. Samariaris also left money to the community of which he was a member for decades, calling for the fulfilment of his wishes by giving them as well a fixed annual income from the rent of a house bequeathed to the community. He even wanted a part of the inheritance to go towards the construction of a Greek Church steeple or for the painting of the church, both activities that enhanced the Orthodox identity. Although, at the end of his life, he asks for the participation of Roman Catholics in his funeral procession, he does not abandon his doctrine or his ethnic identity. In addition, he financially assists the Confraternity to pursue its goals.

Another characteristic case is the one of Antonios Masgas, President of the Confraternity from 1701 to 1703 and in 1707, that is to say, during the most crucial times of objections against Typaldos. Masgas, a fierce opponent of the Archbishop<sup>233</sup> held the office of “Guardian Grande” in the “Del Santissimo Sacramento” in the parish of “San Severo” and in the “Scuola di Santa Maria della Pace” in the church of “San Giovanni e Paolo”. He therefore participated

<sup>232</sup> Mertzios, “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης”, 235.

<sup>233</sup> See subsection 4.3.5



in two Catholic churches. In his last Will, Masganas asked to be buried in the Orthodox temple of Saint George, dressed as a Capuchin monk<sup>234</sup>. Furthermore, Nikolaos Karagiannis, member of the family of traders that founded schools in Greece, member of the presidium of the Greek Confraternity (1707, 1724, and 1733) was at the same time (1700) president of the Catholic Confraternity of “Santa Maria Della Pace” in the church of “San Giovanni e Paolo” “governatore” and “guardian”<sup>235</sup>. Michael Angelus Farolfo degradingly refers to Masganas and Karagiannis as opponents of Typaldos, when the opposition between such two parties had been on the edge<sup>236</sup>.

d) Of course there were a number of Greeks who embraced Catholicism either out of pure faith or out of clearly beneficial purposes, since they faced the perspective of their career in close dependence with such dogma<sup>237</sup>. Examples of such a few cases include Frangiskos Kolobis, who became a missionary of the Catholic Church<sup>238</sup> and Antonios Stratigos, destitute at first, who was next appointed by Typaldos as a secretary and next became one of the authors of the Flower of Piety collection (“Ανθη Ευλαβείας”). Such cases, due to their small number, left the Patriarchate and the Orthodox Church indifferent.

#### 2.4.4. *The professions of the Greeks in Venice*

Greek emigrants brought with them skills and knowledge. According to records kept in the Greek Confraternity, in Typaldos’ era there were over twenty types of professions -mostly for men and as few for women- listed in the archives of the Greek community. Of course, not all Greeks were registered in

<sup>234</sup> A.S.V., Notarile, Testamenti, b.1051, fols. 263v-264v (27 November 1709).

<sup>235</sup> See Sotirios Koutmanis, “Το τρίτο είδος. Θρησκευτική υβριδικότητα και κοινωνική αλλαγή στην ορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Βενετίας, τέλη 17<sup>ου</sup> – αρχές 18<sup>ου</sup> αιώνα”, *Θησαυρίσματα* 37 (2007), 389-420.

<sup>236</sup> Biblioteca del Museo Civico Correr di Venezia (B.M.C.C.), Cod. Cicogna. 2764, fol. 93r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XI della controversia tra l’ arcivescovo Greco di Filadelfia et il popolo Greco in Venetia dal 1707 sino all’ anno 1709*.

<sup>237</sup> A lot of Typaldos’ students are typical example of such category, as they sought for the Archbishop’s favour. Some of them were: Ilias *Meniates* (see references in the sections 3.2 and 4.1), Frangiskos Kolompis, who became a missionary of the Catholic Church (see Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 274-275), Antonios Stratigos, destitute at first, who was next appointed by Typaldos as a secretary and next became one of the authors of the “Flowers of Piety” collection (“Ανθη Ευλαβείας”) (ιδε A.S.V Riformatori di Padua, busta 498), and section 5.2.

<sup>238</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 274-275.

the archives. There are two categories: those who were listed in the Confraternity's register and those who never registered. The latter was the majority. We have already mentioned that, according to the Venetian authorities' relevant licenses, the male members could not go beyond the number of 250. If we accept the given numbers for the Greek minority in Venice during the sixteenth and seventeenth century then the restriction of 250 involved about 5% of the total population of Greeks there. Of course the information of the Confraternity's archives when used as a statistical sample maybe not so precise for the entire population, however it is considered quite representative for the middle and upper class who mainly participated in the Confraternity.

Among the members of the Confraternity one can find Greeks who had been living in Venice for a long time and were active. Naturally, the majority had been composed by those who were not listed. That does not necessarily mean that all of them were isolated or that they did not participate in activities of the Confraternity. For example, they attended church services and celebrated saint's days. Some were not interested in participating, either because of the restriction of numbers which discouraged them, or because the environment made them hesitant. There were some Greeks, of course, especially merchants and soldiers that were listed in the Confraternity's register but who often did not pay their contribution. It means that they were absent for long periods of time.

Three major categories come out of the Register: a) general professions (such as artisans, craftsmen, artists etc); b) soldiers (called "stradioti"); c) merchants and mariners. In order to understand the importance of these professions one can refer to the estimation made by Ersie Burke for the entire Greek community<sup>239</sup>. Ersie Burk estimates merchants and shopkeepers as constituting 30 per cent of the community, maritime jobs, in which she includes captains and crews as 24 per cent, and artisans as 14 per cent. From the register

<sup>239</sup> See Maartje van Gelder, *Trading Places, The Netherlandish Merchants in Early Modern Venice* (Leiden, The Netherlands, Brill 2009), 104, subnote 20; Fusaro, "Coping with Transition", 104, subnote 20.

one can also extract information about some female occupations, but these are very limited and do not contribute to a better knowledge of the community<sup>240</sup>.

According to Venetian law, each occupation had a kind of guild, or closed association. Consequently, every professional, foreigners included, had to be a member of a so-called “Scuola Artigiana”. The Greeks who were coming either from Venetian colonies or Ottoman occupations were used to such procedures. So in many cases it was easy to distinguish themselves.

Since the purpose of this chapter is not to provide an extensive catalogue of the professions practiced by Greeks in Venice but rather to outline their social status so that their place in Venetian society can be concluded, a summary of their occupations<sup>241</sup> follows:

**Tailors:** One of the most important professions because Venetians were famous for their social events. Many Greek tailors became active members of the Confraternity. Most of them donated to the Confraternity money or clothes (which at that time were pieces of art) or even their sewing tools which were snapped up immediately.

**Sword makers (spaderi):** It was very common for many Greeks to be “spaderi” so that after a while, according to the archives, the term had become a surname for some families. They also had money and were active members of the Confraternity.

**Craftsmen of gold (“tiraoro-Battioro”):** Were called those who strained gold in order to make a worsted yarn for crewel out of it. Battioro were those who hammered gold into thin sheets to be used especially for paintings.

---

<sup>240</sup> A.E.I.B. Οικονομική Διαχείριση 2, K 1, fols. 26r, 32v. At that period of history, the most of women were housekeepers. Many were nuns; others were working as needlewomen, nannies, wet nurses, servants. The majority of the registered women were helped by the Confraternity because they were poor. There are however a few cases of women who donated to the Confraternity. Maria Chalipa was a lady-in-waiting for Ekaterina Cornaro, the queen of Cyprus. She lived in the sixteenth century and provided 61 ducats and 11 pounds and 18 soldi toward the cost of building the Greek Orthodox Church.

<sup>241</sup> The data about profession are retrieved from Mavroidi, *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής Αδελφότητας Βενετίας*, 75-142.

Painters (“pittori”): This category includes those who were making gilt-edged frames for paintings (“doratori”); miniaturists (“miniatori”), costume designers (“disegnatori”), those who were making embellishments (“ricamatori”), those who designed playing cards (“cartolari”), manufacturers of masks (“mascherai”), epigraphists (“pittori di targhe”), and of course artists (“dipintori”). By the end of the seventeenth century (1682) painters did not have a different association. They belonged to the aforementioned “painting craftsmen”, a category that also included house painters.

Typographers<sup>242</sup>: In this category belong all those who work in the Italian or the Greek printing and publishing houses. Some of the most known specializations of this category were of: the publisher, editor, corrector, scribe and calligrapher.

Other common professions were: barbers, spice sellers (“specieri”), caulkers, builders and carpenters.

However, the most prominent professions practised by the Greeks in Venice were mariners and merchants. In the previous subsection the importance of the ship-owners has been emphasized, but, while they were considered Venetian subjects, the most of them were not members of the Greek community of Venice, since, usually, they lived in the Ionian Islands. However, many of their crews belonged to the Greek community of Venice<sup>243</sup>.

Venice was for centuries a great maritime power. Greeks were a seafaring people, very daring and therefore much in demand as sailors and especially pilots. The profession of pilot (“piloto”) was crucial in those times because naval technology had not advanced. Ship-owners needed persons who knew the routes and could pilot their ships safely. Additionally, many of the Greek pilots could speak Turkish, an important asset since Venice had developed a vast network of trading relations with the East. Many Greeks worked as sailors, helmsmen and captains as well. Since these professions were important to

---

<sup>242</sup> Due to the contribution of this professional category to the cultural development and to the ethnic feeling of the Greeks, a more analytical description of it will be presented in the subsection 2.4.4.

<sup>243</sup> Fusaro, “Coping with Transition”.

Venice, the authorities did not discriminate: many foreigners worked on equal terms with Venetians. The mariner's codex that regulated these relations with foreign professionals was a very detailed one<sup>244</sup>.

In this short reference of the professions of the members of the Greek community, should not be omitted that several members had been working as "stradioti" (or "stratiotti", or "strathioti")<sup>245</sup>.

All the Greeks had managed with skill and reputation for honesty to make the Greek minority a notable religious and cultural ethnicity worthy of respect, which contributed significantly to the flourishing of the economic and cultural power of Venice. Numerous Greeks became members of the Senate and of other councils responsible for the administration of the Venetian Authority.

Entrano in senato<sup>246</sup> molti patrizi o come senatori di grado o per ragione d' egli uffizi che attualmente sostengono come del consiglio di quaranta o simili o come ultimi usciti da altri uffizij che hanno luogo in senato per le azioni de loro magistrati. Tra questi ve ne sono sempre molti de Greci, non di rito e religione ma di patria, come nati nel regno di Candia o nel Levante<sup>247</sup>.

Special reference should be made to the members of the community that were active in the field of trade and mostly to those who managed through their intelligence and skills to become wealthy and powerful, gaining the respect of the Venetian authorities and other leaders in Western Europe. Some of them were emigrants from the mainland of Greece who had been settled in Venice. Others were merchants from areas along the Danube River who came later and settled in Venice. Their business activities would expand from Venice to

<sup>244</sup> Achille Bosisio, "La legislazione marittima veneziana e la Scuola di S. Nicolò dei Marinieri," *Ateneo Veneto*, 131 (1944-1945), 45-47.

<sup>245</sup> The name comes from the Greek word "στρατιώτης" meaning soldier: see Georgios *Pelidis* "Morire per honor di la Signoria", *Δημοσία Παρία 500 χρόνια από την ίδρυση της ελληνορθόδοξης κοινότητας Βενετίας (1498-1998)*, ed. Chrysa Maltezou, (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1999), 26-46.

<sup>246</sup> Senato: an administrative and executive authority established in the early thirteenth century. Initially, it consisted of 60 members and its sessions were held before the Doge and the Signoria. Gradually, 60 more members were added (Zonda). The Council of 40 participated also in the Senate meetings. Its competences included legislative, political, diplomatic, military and financial tasks. da Mosto, *Archivio*, 34 passim.

<sup>247</sup> B.M.C.C, cod. Cic. 2764, fol. 37r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore*, op.cit. English translation: "Numerous patricians would make up the Senate, either as senators or as members of participating respective unions, such as the Council of 40 or other councils, activated in the field of the Senate. Among them there would be a lot of Greeks, regardless their dogma or religious views, but with regard to their country, born in the Kingdom of Crete or the East".

Constantinople. From there, their activities would bisect along the Black Sea coasts, via the areas of Wallachia and Moldavia, up to Poland. Other Greek traders followed the opposite direction: from the areas along Danube they reached Venice and next London<sup>248</sup>. They mostly transported silk, textiles, leathers, wool, oil, salt, raisin, wheat, cereals and colonial products. In parallel to their business activities, they made donations for the establishment and maintenance of Greek schools, monasteries and churches in the cities of the Greek Diaspora, as well as in their homeland<sup>249</sup>.

Great emphasis should also be given to Greek publishers who published and promoted a considerable number of Greek books. The books printed in Venice became valuable “weapons” in raising the consciousness of Greeks still living under Ottoman occupation.

However, the reason for a particular reference to the members of the high Greek ‘bourgeoisie’<sup>250</sup> of Venice is not only their economic and political power or their charitable initiatives and the enhancement on their part to the Confraternity’s finances. The main reason is that they were active members of the Confraternity’s Council and protagonists of its struggle against Typaldos. Consequently, in the frame of this Thesis, it is of particular interest to know their social activities and interests as well as their personal objectives and behaviours, in order to understand their firm and constant position against Typaldos’ apostasy.

The first years after the institutionalization of the Confraternity, they contributed to its foundation with donations and financial allowances for the construction of the Church of Saint George. In the following years, they became the most consistent supporters of the Confraternity’s activities and politics. Such activity authorized them to stand up against Typaldos, defending their Orthodox faith and their Greek background.

<sup>248</sup> Andronikos Falangas, “Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants of the fifteenth – seventeenth centuries”, *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* (2007), 7-21.

<sup>249</sup> Georgios Ploumidis, “Σχολεία στην Ελλάδα συντηρούμενα από κληροδοτήματα Ελλήνων της Βενετίας, 1603-1797”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 9 (1972), 239-243.

<sup>250</sup> The term “bourgeoisie” does not entail the characteristics that it acquired in the eighteenth century when social sciences combined it with the industrial revolution in order to describe a social class which is distinguished by the ownership of capital. Here, it denotes the wealthy people of the middle class, who differ from the aristocrats.

Perusing the history of the illustrious Greek families of Venice, one may understand that some of these families originated from the Byzantine Empire (like that of the Cantacuzenus family), but most of them came from the most vital urban centres of Greece, such as Epirus, or from Danube provinces within the Turkish Empire. According to Ersie Burke, in the sixteenth century, only five families from the Byzantine nobility lived in Venice. They “kept themselves aloof from their Greek-speaking neighbours, were not members of the Greek Confraternity”<sup>251</sup>. In the mid-seventeenth century, a great flow of Epirus residents settled in Venice and showed a remarkable tendency for trade<sup>252</sup>. Examples are the families of Voulgaris, Gionmas<sup>253</sup>, Theodosiou<sup>254</sup>, Ieromnimonos<sup>255</sup>, Glykis<sup>256</sup>, Karagiannis<sup>257</sup>, Maroutsis and others.

The settlement in Venice allowed Greek traders to enter into the hierarchy of the Venetian trading world. “In 1670 they managed to be represented in Capi di Piazza, i.e. in the special representation union of the traders in Venice, which often enough acted as an unofficial consulting organ within Venice with regard to trade”<sup>258</sup>. Their trading attitude abided by the rules of the Venetian trading world. To this end, analysts confirm that such Greeks did not act and live as members of a minority but, on the other hand, made no effort to overcome the existing institutional structures<sup>259</sup>. They had understood that their establishment

---

<sup>251</sup> Ersie Burke, *The Greek Neighborhoods of sixteenth century Venice, 1498-1600: Daily life in an Immigrant community*, PhD Dissertation, (Australia: Monash University, 2004), p. XX; Nicolaos G. Moschonas, “La Comunita greca di Venezia: aspetti sociali ed economici”, in *I Greci a Venezia*, ed. Maria Francesca Tiepolo and Eurigio Tonetti (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2002), 221-242.

<sup>252</sup> Constantine D. Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 11, (1936).

<sup>253</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 11, 92-110.

<sup>254</sup> Georgios Ploumidis, *Το Βενετικόν τυπογραφείο του Δημητρίου και του Πάνου Θεοδοσίου, 1775-1824* (Athens: 1969).

<sup>255</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 11, 111-135

<sup>256</sup> Constantine D. Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 10, (1935), 1-185, and 11 (1936), 295-341.

<sup>257</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 11 (1936), 141-150.

<sup>258</sup> Artemis Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou, *Η Ελληνική Κοινότητα της Βενετίας (1797-1866)*, PhD Thesis, (Thessaloniki: Aristoteleion University of Thessaloniki, 1978), 42.

<sup>259</sup> Fotis Baroutsos, “Οι Έλληνες έμποροι της Βενετίας”, in *Δημοσία Ιλαρία*, ed. Chryssa Maltezos, (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1999), 144.

and success could only come through the support of the elite of Venetian traders and authorities<sup>260</sup>.

Some members of the Greek bourgeoisie were exclusively devoted in the development of their business activities. However, a great number of them provided their wealth for the sake of Greeks and their homeland, as witnessed by their actions. This fact is confirmed by cases of families that stood out for their benefactions to Greece. For example, Apostolos Tsigaras, brother of the wealthy benefactor from Epirus, Zotos Tsigaras, inherited from the latter the manuscript of a Greek chronicle, which he issued in 1631 in Venice under the title “Chronograph”. This chronicle seems to have significantly contributed to the enhancement of the “collective memory of Hellenism”<sup>261</sup>.

Such interest for Greeks is also reflected in the publication and widespread popularity of a poem written in the early seventeenth century by a Greek trader called Stavrinos in order to exalt the valour of Michael the Brave<sup>262</sup>, who led an anti-Ottoman uprising in 1594 in the area of Transylvania and Moravia, and who was considered by many Greeks as a hero able to prepare the Balkan people for their liberation from the Ottoman oppression. Stavrinos’ poem referred to the glorious past of the Greek nation, and as Falangas notes, “it is really interesting if we consider that Stavrinos lived long before the emergence of the Greek nationalism”<sup>263</sup>. The poem was first published in 1638 in Venice and was funded by another well-known trader, Panos Pepanos. Falangas comments, that: “In the preface of this first edition, we are able to realize that Pepanos’ motivation reflects the patriotic spirit of Stavrinos”<sup>264</sup>.

The wealthy Greeks of Epirus, members of the Greek Confraternity in Venice, bequeathed a great deal of their legacies for the construction of schools

<sup>260</sup> Eftychia Liata, “Ένας Έλληνας έμπορος στη Δύση. Πορεία μιας ζωής από τον 17<sup>ο</sup> στον 18<sup>ο</sup> αι.”, in *Ροδωνιά: Τιμή στον Μ.Ι.Μανούσακα*, collective volume, V.1 (Rethymno: Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, 1994), 283.

<sup>261</sup> Eftychia Liata, “Ένας Έλληνας έμπορος”, 10; Dionysios A. Zakythinos, *Μεταβυζαντινά και Νέα Έλληνικά* (Athens: Dodoni, 1978), 27-28.

<sup>262</sup> Émile Legrand, *Recueil de poèmes historiques en grec vulgaire relatifs à la Turquie et aux principautés danubiennes* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1877), 38.

<sup>263</sup> Falangas, “Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants”, 11.

<sup>264</sup> Falangas, “Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants”, 11.



or churches in Ioannina and other areas of Epirus<sup>265</sup>. More specifically, Emmanouil or Manos Gionmas in his last will appointed the presidium of the Saint George Confraternity of Venice as the executors of the School of Theology (“Ιεροδιδασκαλείο”) of Ioannina. He would perpetually pay the interest of a principal of 20,356.10 ducati (back then, the annual interest - bearing a rate of 3%- would amount to 610.16 ducati) in order to cover the operating expenses of the School. “He hereby requests all of you to accept such liability and strictly abide by his will for the benefit of the Greek Nation”<sup>266</sup>.

The contribution of many families to the prosperity of the Confraternity was so crucial – such as Kouvlis family – that the Confraternity provided them with a private burial monument, as a gesture to recognize their great support<sup>267</sup>. However, the contribution by Glykis family should be highlighted for two reasons: the first is related to the activities of their printing house which decisively contributed to the establishment and expansion of modern Greek, with a great impact on the uniformity of the Greek nation<sup>268</sup>. The second refers to their hierarchy within the Confraternity during the crucial period of Typaldos’ apostasy and the relations with him.

In 1670, Venice welcomes the first Greek printing house<sup>269</sup> founded by Nikolaos Glykis (1616-1693), a trader from Ioannina who moved to Venice in 1644. His son, Michail (1647-1713), his grand-son Dimitrios (1683-1716) and other descendants continued their publishing activities up to 1854 when the family business shut down. Approximately 1424 books were published during the two centuries that the publishing house remained active<sup>270</sup>. The range of Glykis family business, which was rather middling for great Venice, managed to

---

<sup>265</sup> Christina Papakosta, “Ηπειρώτες έμποροι στη Βενετία, 16<sup>ος</sup>-19<sup>ος</sup> αι.”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 37 (2007), 445; Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεϊόν”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 181-187; Constantine Mertzios “Ανέκδοτα ηπειρωτικά μνημεία”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 13 (1938), 91-116; Ploumidis, *Σχολεία στην Ελλάδα*, 236-249; Maltezos, *Οδηγός του Αρχεϊού*, 210-263.

<sup>266</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεϊόν”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 92-110, esp. 95.

<sup>267</sup> Vlasi, *Δύο διαθήκες των αρχών του 17<sup>ου</sup> αιώνα*, 181-209.

<sup>268</sup> The printing house issue is discussed in more detail in subsection 3.4.3.

<sup>269</sup> Ioannis Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων στη Βενετία (1670-1854) Συμβολή στη μελέτη του ελληνικού βιβλίου κατά την εποχή της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Athens: Χρήστος Μπούρας, 1987), 17.

<sup>270</sup> Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων*, 187-283.

cover the Balkans and the Ottoman-occupied regions, something that was quite remarkable.

Nikolaos, Michail and Dimitrios Glykis (father, son and grand-son respectively) had been active members of the Greek Confraternity from 1647 and onwards<sup>271</sup>. In 1668, Nikolaos Glykis becomes the president of the Confraternity, upon having been previously elected as a secretary, Vicario and Governatore where he was also elected in 1661. Due to his frequent visits to Ioannina, Michail was elected as a secretary of the Confraternity in 1670 and later remained as a simple administration member. Dimitrios was elected as a vicar in 1705 and a *governatore* in 1715. During the period of great controversies between Typaldos and the Confraternity, both Michail and Dimitrios Glykis participated in the Confraternity administration.

Michail, but mostly Dimitrios, had spent most of their lives in Ioannina and used to travel in Venice in order to check on their business. Thus, their religious spirit was left intact by Catholicism. Their books -widely embraced in Ottoman-occupied Greece- mostly dealt with religious affairs and were used for the rituals of the Mass. The extreme opposition between the Archbishop and the publisher probably arose in 1706, a crucial year regarding the outcome of the controversy between Typaldos and the Greek Fraternity. This is when Typaldos was responsible for the censorship of Greek books. In a report drafted by the Censorship Service in December 1706, several deviations were noted from the Catholic teaching in “τριώδιον” and “πεντηκοστάριον”, (books with religious hymns chanted in Greek Orthodox church the first before and the second after Easter) according to which the souls of Christians do not go to heaven just after their death, but after the Second Coming of Jesus<sup>272</sup>. It is clear that the censorship service had to identify any deviations of the religious books from “the Catholic religion, the Christian principles or the principles of morality”<sup>273</sup>.

<sup>271</sup> Constantine D. Mertzios, “Η οικογένεια των Γλυκέων ή Γλυκήδων”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 10 (1935), 18-19.

<sup>272</sup> A.S.V., Rif., 579, fasc. “Scrittura relative a devieti di stampa... 1622-1798; and in Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκήδων*, 83.

<sup>273</sup> A.S.V., rif., 287: “Adi 27 Aprile 1687./Faccio fede io Georgio Musalo me (dic) o Fis (ico), come Revisor pro Lingua/Greca del Santo Officio di Venetia d’ haver deligentem (en) te letto/ il libro Greco, che contiene favole, dove non ho trovato cosa veuna/ che sia contra la Fede, prencipi Christiani, ne contra i buoni costu/ mi, come con mio giuramento ho affermato, et

Therefore, someone who would exercise censorship should be a Catholic or affiliated to the Catholic Church.

As mentioned above, the Glykis family had developed a strong network of commercial transactions within the Ottoman-occupied Greek regions. Therefore, any book that deviated from the Orthodox dogma could not be published and released in the Greek regions. Quite rightly, they should keep good relations with the Archbishop of the Orthodox Church in Venice and the person who was responsible for the censorship of the Greek books, in order to avoid any obstacles to their business activities. However, the Glykis family stood by the Greek Confraternity in the latter's controversy against Typaldos. During the crucial years, 1706-1707, Dimitrios Glykis, who had then permanently settled in Venice, participated in the Confraternity Council and allied with them against Typaldos<sup>274</sup>.

The Maroutsis family was another important Greek family of Venice that came from Ioannina and was akin to the Glykis family. These families are noteworthy, as their devotion to the Greek Nation and homeland is indicative of the attitudes of prominent Greeks in the late seventeenth century. In addition, its continuing devotion in the following centuries, as exemplified by the Maroutsis family, may explain the attitude of a great part of the Greek bourgeoisie, either as financial supporters of the Greek Enlightenment during the 18<sup>th</sup> century or as great benefactors of the newly-liberated nation<sup>275</sup>.

For many years, the Maroutsis family was active in Venice and became so wealthy that its descendants gave a loan<sup>276</sup> to Catherine the Great, the empress of Russia; other descendants were awarded with peerages by Maria Theresa of

---

affermo.-/Ego ide, qui (signature)" and in Veloudis, *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκίδων*, 169.

<sup>274</sup> Mertzios, "Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον", *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 322-324; Also, Mertzios, "Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον: Η οικογένεια των Γλυκείων ή Γλυκίδων", *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 10 (1935), 39. According to the correspondence published by Mertzios, the family of Glykis held very good relations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Archbishop of Athens, Meletios (1661-1714), who is considered as one of the most prominent scholars and had worked as a corrector in the publishing house of Glykis.

<sup>275</sup> François Charles-Hughes-Laurent Pouqueville, *Ιστορία της ελληνικής επανάστασεως, ήτοι, Η αναγέννησις της Ελλάδος*, translated by Ξενοφών Ζυγούρας (Κατερίνη: Μάτι, 2006). [First editon in French, *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce*, 4 Vol. (Paris, 1824)].

<sup>276</sup> Mertzios, "Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον", *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 172-187. In the same volume, 306-313, it is stated that in the mid 18th century the movable and immovable property of the family in Venice and Greece exceeded two million ducats.

Austria. The brothers Lampros and Simos Maroutsis were successful in trade. Their father, Panos Maroutsis, was a member of the Greek Confraternity of Venice from 1674 to 1683, in 1673 was appointed as a “governatore” and offered 50 ducati to the Church (Mertzios 179). Lampros Maroutsis, upon having cooperated from 1693 to 1700 with the Glykis business, set up his own business. The two brothers, by virtue of their last wills and testaments, bequeathed great amounts of money both to the Confraternity of Saint Nicholas of Greeks and Gionmas School of Theology in Ioannina. Lampros’ wish, as explicitly mentioned in his will, was the further growth of science<sup>277</sup>. His last will and testament, permeated by his deep love for education and his country, three times refers to the concept of the Greek “nation” and once refers to the “fateful loss of the Greek State”, which abolished by the Turks led to the loss of the “permanent bases” for scientific documents. He obviously meant the ancient Greek and Byzantine culture. In addition, special reference is made to Greeks and, of course, to the Church. The wish of the deceased was so clear that too many years later, in March 1776, his descendants, by virtue of a request filed to the Greek Confraternity of Venice with regard to the School of Theology in Ioannina, state: “It is a work that contributes to the praise of God, the

<sup>277</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 157. In his last will and testament, he states: “As my deepest wish is to support the studies of sciences in the School of Theology (in Greek ‘Ἱεροδιδασκαλείο’), established by Manos Gkionmas, I bequeath the amount 5,000 ducati (in the page 157 it is referred the amount of 500 ducati. We consider this a printing mistake as next, in pages 181 and 184, it is referred to the amount of 5,000 ducati)”. On page 184 there is an extract of applications filed by Maroutsis’ descendants: “in order to be deposited in public institutions by my inheritor and trustee within one year from my death, and generate as much benefit as possible. I wish this capital to be deposited in the name of the Saint Nikolaos School and Saint George School and such income to be annually collected by the members of the Council of the Confraternity, whom I beg to accept such burden and collect the balance of the aforementioned amount and give it, for the sake of Greek youth, to a prominent and proficient teacher, who shall be obliged to teach in the city of Ioannina the following courses: calculation, physics, metaphysics, theology – to those who wish to study theology – mathematics both in Greek and Latin, as I reckon that the teaching of the Latin language is necessary for the success of Greek students. Greek students were the ones mostly aggravated by the fatal loss of the Greek state, something that led to the fatal loss of main bases of scientific documents. With regard to the aforementioned teacher’s destination and election – who shall receive the amount above - , the archbishop of Ioannina and two prominent citizens shall be entitled to vote. [...]. I also order my inheritor and trustee to deposit to the Public Institutions, the School of Saint George and the School of Saint Nikolaos, the amount of 2,500 ducati each, just after my death. Each Sunday, ten pounds out of the annual difference arisen to be provided as charity to our Church’s charity box for the poor Greeks who reside at our church, as I would like to abolish the phenomenon of begging, as beggars wander around our church and hinder believers who attend the holy mass. I also request from the guardians and deputies thereof, to appoint a Greek who would be responsible to stop any beggar and give him the amount of ten solidi from the aforementioned amount. The remaining difference shall be provided to our church”.

benefaction and the grace of the Greek Nation, objectives that would have been set as his own goals, as a Greek”<sup>278</sup>.

---

<sup>278</sup> Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχεῖον”, *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936), 182-184.

## CHAPTER THREE: THE ETHNIC IDENTITY OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY IN VENICE

-----

### 3.1. Preliminary argument

Typaldos' fate was sealed by the fact that he tried to change the long established religious and cultural beliefs founded by the Orthodox faith and Greek origins of the Greek community in Venice, and to convert them to Catholicism. Although the Greeks in Venice were emigrants or exiles from a country occupied by the Turks, they retained a strong sense of Greek identity through their Orthodox faith and their language.

The Greek community of Venice could be defined as a community of people in the sense of Tönnies<sup>1</sup>: it was a group of people with some common, basic interests, able to direct the action of its members according to shared expectations, values, beliefs and meanings. Also, it offered to its members a sense of belonging, through which they could distinguish themselves from the members of other social groups.

Generally speaking, the notion of community is highly symbolized, "with the consequence that its members can invest it with their selves. Its character is sufficiently malleable that it can accommodate all of its members' selves without them feeling their individuality to be overly compromised. Indeed, the gloss of community which it paints over its diverse components gives to each of them an additional referent for their identity"<sup>2</sup>. Thus an intimate relationship between community as a collective of people and identity is established. This relationship motivated many scholars<sup>3</sup> to argue about a collective self, since they confirm that individuals conceptualize their self in relation to a self-conscious community.

Collective identity has been shaped by the repetitive use of some social representations. In the long run of a social community the repetitive use of some shared representations transforms them from simple images of the world to symbolic stereotypes, such as common symbols, rituals, ideas, beliefs and values; through

---

<sup>1</sup> Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Society* (Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1957).

<sup>2</sup> Anthony Cohen, *Symbolic Construction of Community* (London, Routledge 1989), 109.

<sup>3</sup>Theodore Schwartz, "Cultural Totemism: Ethnic Identity Primitive and Modern", in *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuity and Change*, ed. Lola Romanucci-Ross and George de Vos (Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975), 106-131, esp. 108. It should be noted that here the notion of collective identity is connected with the notion of collective consciousness.

them, representations are passed on from generation to generation contributing in this way to the social integration of the community as well as to its connection with its past<sup>4</sup>. The symbolic character of social integration has been stressed firstly by Turner<sup>5</sup>, who studied the rituals among some tribes of Africa, and later by Cohen and Handelman<sup>6</sup>. All of them argue that symbolic stereotypes and rituals have an instrumental and an emotional dimension. From the moment members of a social community become aware that their boundaries -for distinguishing them from others foreign to them- are defined only by their traditional rituals and stereotypes, they use them for constructing, confirming and strengthening their ethnic identity. As Cohen writes, “the symbolic expression of community and its boundaries increases in importance as the actual geo-social boundaries of the community are undermined, blurred or otherwise weakened”<sup>7</sup>. In the future, the Confraternity and the Orthodox Church use the community’s ethnic identity with the intention to mobilize people to achieve certain political ends<sup>8</sup>.

When a community has established an ethnic identity it is called “ethnicity”, or according to Smith, has been transformed to an “ethnie”<sup>9</sup>. The notion of “ethnie” is used by Smith in his argument about the emergence of the nation-states and it comes to enrich a vast literature which has been created in the second half of the twentieth century regarding the subject of nation, national identity and mainly that of nationalism. The connection of the ethnic identity with the ethnie, as it is herein conceptualized, makes it differ from other interpretations of ethnicity used today by the most of the political scientists researching ethnic politics<sup>10</sup>. The latter usually adopt the definition of Horowitz, who sees ethnicity as a concept that “easily embraces groups differentiated by colour, language, and religion: it covers ‘tribes’, ‘races’, ‘nationalities’, and ‘castes’”<sup>11</sup>. Horowitz’ definition refers to contemporary

---

<sup>4</sup> Geert Hofstede, *Cultures and organizations* (London, McGraw-Hill, 1991).

<sup>5</sup> Turner, *Forest of Symbols*.

<sup>6</sup> Of course all anthropologists recognize their debt to Malinowski about the psychological effectiveness of rituals. See Victor Turner, *Forest of Symbols*.; Anthony Cohen, *Symbolic Construction of community*; Don Handelman, *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>7</sup> Anthony Cohen, *Symbolic Construction of Community*, 50.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Reicher and Nick Hopkins, *Self and Nation* (London: Sage, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford Blackwell, 1986), 32.

<sup>10</sup> See Kanchan Chandra, *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Daniel Posner, *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Ashutosh Varshney, *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

<sup>11</sup> Donald L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

ethnicities and cannot capture the meaning of the pre-modern ones; therefore, for the purposes of the current analysis, it seems pertinent to identify ethnicity with that of “ethnie”, as it is defined by Smith.

As the intention of the present chapter is to comment on the ethnic identity of the Greek community in Venice at the end of the seventeenth century, before the establishment of most of the European nation-states and the rise of nationalism, our analysis will not be based on the argument of the respective literature on nation and nationalism. Indeed, as Kidd argues referring to many important writers of nation and nationalism<sup>12</sup>, “nationalist thinking was alien to the early modern era. The word ‘nationalism’ itself was not coined until the last decade of the eighteenth century, and thereafter enjoyed a most precarious and marginal existence, appearing in lexicographies only from the late nineteenth century”. However, it is considered necessary to comment briefly on the literature of nationalism, since one could find in it illuminating insights into pre-modern forms of collective cultural and religious identities such as those incorporated by ethnic communities.

### 3.1.1 The literature

The classic field of “nation” and “nationalism” has been created by two opposed streams of thought<sup>13</sup>. The first one follows a rather instrumental-constructive orientation. As stated by it, nation and ideology of nationalism have been invented in late modernity. Gellner claims, nationalism is a phenomenon that appeared in modernity within the social and economic turmoil of capitalism<sup>14</sup>. According to him, culture in pre-modern societies was peripheral to political and economic life, despite the power of the church and of religion as a spiritual source for the conduct of the personal life. On the contrary, during modernity, nationalism emerges as a by-product of a new social order in which “culture” rather than “structure” determines an individual’s place in a changing world. Other scholars, belonging in the same instrumental stream, but followers of a Marxist tradition, such as Eric Hobsbawm and Miroslav Hroch, do not also accept any relation between “ethnic group” and

<sup>12</sup> Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism*, 5.

<sup>13</sup> Eriksen, “Ethnic Identity”, 42-70; Sandra F. Joireman *Nationality and Political Identity* (N.Y: Continuum 2003).

<sup>14</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change*, 147-178.



“Nation”<sup>15</sup>. They believe that whenever a political leadership invokes the ethnic group’s ideal, it is because politicians motivate the masses around their own targets. Some others, such as Karl Deutsch and Eugene Weber, as well as Benedict Anderson<sup>16</sup>, connect the rise of nationalism with the explosion of “mass media” of communication. In the same, instrumental-constructionist stream of thought, one could also classify some rather idealist writers. They connect the notions of nation and nationalism to the romantic tradition derived from Herder and thereafter<sup>17</sup>.

Here are acknowledged the seminal work and research of the above mentioned instrumentalist-constructionist theorists of nation and nationalism. However, as these theories overemphasize the role of the forces of production (e.g. print capitalism - Anderson) or social relations in industrialism (e.g. Gellner who claims that the modern division of labour requires a nationally homogenous society) devaluating in this way the importance of other factors<sup>18</sup> such as culture, another stream of thought developed in parallel, trying to capture some other, deeper causes of nationalism.

This second stream of thought, argues about continuity in the evolution of the national consciousness. This current, supported mainly by anthropologists and characterized as primordial, interprets “nation” as the result of a long-historical process: nation started as a “race”, began its common descent, passed through the phase of “ethnic group” and ended up as the nation. Supporters of that view<sup>19</sup> deny the discontinuity of “nation” that historians and political scientists have invoked for Western countries<sup>20</sup>. The most of them argue about the relationship between culture and ethnicity, claiming that cultural systems are self-sustaining and self-organizing,

---

<sup>15</sup> Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*; Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

<sup>16</sup> Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1966); Eugen J. Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: the modernization of rural France, 1870-1914* (London: Stanford University Press), 1979; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>17</sup> Isaiah Berlin, “The bent twig: on the rise of nationalism”, in *The Crooked Timber of Humanity* (London, Knopf, 1991); Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism* (London: Hutchinson, 1985).

<sup>18</sup> Nikos Chrysoloras, *Religion and Nationalism in Greece*, Paper presented in the Second Pan-European Conference, Bologna, 24-26 June 2004, <http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-bologna>.

<sup>19</sup> Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*; Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*; Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity*; Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*.

<sup>20</sup> Miller, *On Nationality*, argues also about the existence of “Nation” in the pre-modern states. For his argument he claims that the idea of Nation is met in the teaching of the medieval colleges of France, as well as in the English literature of 1460. He refers to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989), 231, which cites a passage from the work of Sir John Fortescue (c. 1394 – c. 1480), *The difference between Absolute and Limited monarchy*, 1460. Fortescue describes the Scots, the Spaniards, and other such peoples as “nations”. For the same argument, see also Llobera, *The God of Modernity*.

thus, they are autonomous and independent from political manoeuvres. Culture or language fix our identities, therefore they are stable and cannot be changed<sup>21</sup>.

In the midst of these two streams of thought are located some other scholars, who accept the continuity of identity while they are far from the primordialists' views concerning the omnipotent character of culture and the unchanged nature of identity. Regarding continuity Armstrong, for example, after a long exploration of pre-1789 nationalism, states that the ancient Greek polis and Roman patria, and later, some medieval cities, provided a template for the territorialisation of identity<sup>22</sup>. He also demonstrates how in pre-modern European communities particular lifestyles, images and myths, as well as sacred languages and scripts, were strongly articulated, mainly by religious authorities, in a way conducive to ethnic identity formation. Anthony Smith's theory of ethnosymbolism is another example of this view. While he does not deny the reconstruction of national identities during the modern era, he rejects the claim that nations are invented, and insist that modern nations have deep roots in older forms of ethnic identity. Smith particularly, asserts the antiquity and longevity of "ethnicism" that pre-modern ethnies had developed and from which, later, during modernity, nationalism had emerged. More concretely, he writes:

It is ethnies rather than nations, ethnicity rather than nationality that pervades the social and cultural life of antiquity and the early middle Ages in Europe and the Near East. These ethnies existed within or alongside various polities, and were quite often divorced from politics and the state, or, in becoming politicized, acquired dominion, like the Persians and Medes, over many other ethnies. Alternatively they constituted culturally diverse enclaves within the large empires of antiquity and the Middle Ages persisting independently of any congruent state formation<sup>23</sup>.

Smith's theory, despite the fact that it does not touch the political aspect of an ethnic identity, could be viewed as a bridge "between stark modernist theories defending the recent, invented and constructed nature of nations and nationalism (Gellner, Hobsbawm, Anderson), and primordialist theories emphasizing the

<sup>21</sup> Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*; Clifford Geertz, *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Africa and Asia* (New York: The Free Press, 1967). Edward Shils, "Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties", *British Journal of Sociology*, 8/2 (1957), 13-45; Harold Isaacs, *Idols of the Tribe* (N.Y. Harper, 1975); Pierre, L. Van den Bergue, *The Ethnic Phenomenon* (N.Y. Elsevier, 1981).

<sup>22</sup> John A. Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

<sup>23</sup> Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 89.

permanence of nations (Shils, van de Berghe, Geertz, Isaacs)<sup>24</sup>. As will be confirmed in the rest of this chapter, the ethnosymbolism of Smith has been used to a high degree for our interpretation regarding the ethnic identity of the Greek community of Venice.

In the last decades, the field of “nation-nationalism” has been enriched by new studies, drawing on the canons of deconstructionism<sup>25</sup> and feminist studies<sup>26</sup>, proving that the subject has not exhausted its dynamic. This dynamic is due to the fact that insurgencies and conflicts for national independence, the creation of new nations and identities have not stopped<sup>27</sup>, giving social scientists the need to examine nationalism afresh.

In spite of the differences regarding the roots of contemporary nations and nationalism, nowadays most of historians and social scientists accept that national as well as ethnic identities are cultural entities, appropriated and transmitted in a straight line to descendants; additionally, they are none the less authentic facets of the human experience<sup>28</sup>. The connection of ethnic identity with human experience is emphasized by Eriksen<sup>29</sup> and other anthropologists<sup>30</sup>, who, in this way, give to the subject of identity a phenomenological understanding. According to them, individuals internalize their ethnic identity during their childhood. Interacting with the members of their community the individuals incorporate the shared representations of their social milieu in relation to their ancestry and culture.

From the moment members of a community become aware that these communal and traditional stereotypes distinguish them from “foreign others”, their ethnic identity has been established. In sum, the intimate, experiential world of the everyday not only contributes to the awareness of the individuals in regard to their

---

<sup>24</sup> Montserrat Guibernau, “Anthony D. Smith on nations and national identity: a critical assessment”, *Nations and Nationalism*, 10/1-2 (2004), 126.

<sup>25</sup> Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Craig Calhoun, *Nationalism* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997).

<sup>26</sup> Sylvia Walby, “Woman and Nation”, in *Mapping the Nation*, ed. Gopal Balakrishnan (London: Verso, 1996), 235-254; Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage, 1997).

<sup>27</sup> See for example the conflicts that took place in the first decade of the twenty-first century, in Northern Mali, Sudan, South Yemeni, or the incessant conflict of Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

<sup>28</sup> Eugene T. Gendlin, *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning* (Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1962).

<sup>29</sup> Eriksen, “Ethnic Identity”, 42-70.

<sup>30</sup> Anthony Cohen, *Self Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1994); Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity* (London: Routledge, 1996).

personal and social identification, but also connects them to a particular community of people. In this way, the life-world could be viewed as the foundation for the building of a collective identity. As Eriksen repeatedly claims, “nothing comes out of nothing”<sup>31</sup>. The same thought is expressed by Smith, when he states that: “Without ethnics and ethnicism, there could be neither nations nor nationalism. For nations need myths and pasts if they are to have a future, and such pasts cannot be forged out of nothing, nor can myths that will have resonance be fabricated”<sup>32</sup>.

Ethnic identity, as product of historical conditions and of human experience, is not timeless, but flexible and mutable, or, as Eriksen says, it is situational and negotiated according to specific and changing social contexts<sup>33</sup>. That is, despite its solidified form, it could be said that in macro-perspectives it is of a rather fluid character. However, as long as an ethnic identity is valid, its internalization and solid consistency by the members of one community contribute to the standing of these members confronting the world and, more specifically, to their communicating with other human beings and social groups.

### 3.1.2 A Common Ancestry

For the majority of anthropologists and social researchers<sup>34</sup> the notion of ethnicity alludes to the sense of common ancestry, internalized by a group of people. This sense becomes evident when it is externalized in the members' social interaction with others<sup>35</sup>. However, the sense of common ancestry does not refer only to the everyday interactions, but it is also pronounced by some authors who believe that ethnicity is mainly represented as “ethnic sentiments which need no justification other than common 'blood'. They are couched in terms of 'our people' versus 'them'”<sup>36</sup>. Up until today nationalism emphasizes the importance of ethnic survival in

<sup>31</sup> Eriksen, “Ethnic Identity”, 42-70.

<sup>32</sup> Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 214.

<sup>33</sup> Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*.

<sup>34</sup> See Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*; Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism*; Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity*; Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*.

<sup>35</sup> See Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity*, 165.

<sup>36</sup> Pierre van den Berghe, *The Ethnic Phenomenon* (New York: Elsevier, 1981), 4. Van Den Berghe belongs to the primordial stream of ethnicity and specifically he is the author of “kin selection”. The more genes we share with another individual, the more altruistic we are toward him/her. And the less kind we are toward our more distant kin. He does not see fundamental boundary between family, ethnic group, and race, therefore he argues about an “ethnic nepotism” to describe the human tendency to favour “our people” at the expense of others.

order to create an “ethno-history”.

The importance given by a people to a presumed common ancestry and shared historical memories, as well as their connection with a specific homeland and a developed sense of solidarity, does not derive only from identity politics, but also from the desire of people for security and rootedness; also, from their need for dignity and respect<sup>37</sup>. These human needs have been used not only by nationalist politics but also in the pre-modern years by ethnic politics in order to obtain social cohesion and centralization. The members of a group of people, through historical memories and legends about their distant ancestors, cultivate the myth of their common origin, which, in continuity, becomes the focus of identity politics.

However, the myth of common origin is not only connected with ancestors, but usually with a common region of origin. The region, related with the notion of homeland, is the main component of their feelings and the trace of their common descent to individuals who once inhabited this region<sup>38</sup>. The Greek territories of the Byzantine Empire became for all Greek emigrants in the European countries after the Fall of Constantinople their common land of origin and evidently of their common ancestry. As Smith argues<sup>39</sup>, ancient Greek ethnicity was “constituted, not by lines of physical descent, but by the sense of continuity, shared memory and collective destiny, i.e. by the lines of cultural affinity embodied in distinctive myths, memories, symbols and values retained by a given cultural unit of population”. Nevertheless, for the Greek emigrants this tradition had been slightly changed in their exile as it was connected to the feelings of their lost homeland. In this way the myth of their common ancestry acquired an important dimension. This is revealed from the common use of the term “genos”<sup>40</sup> used by Greeks all over the world before the establishment of their national state<sup>41</sup>. Even Greeks who were not Orthodox but had

---

<sup>37</sup> Anthony A. Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 155.

<sup>38</sup> Kanchan Chandra, “What is Ethnic Identity?” in *Constructivist Theories of Ethnic Politics*, ed. Kanchan Chandra (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 78.

<sup>39</sup> Anthony A. Smith, *National Identity* (Nevada: University of Nevada 1991); Anthony A. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism* (Oxford: Taylor and Francis, 2003), 192.

<sup>40</sup> See Introduction, subnote 29.

<sup>41</sup> Latins in Typaldos’ era used the word “Greco” (Greek) in the following three meanings: a. people of Greek nationality, b. followers of the Orthodox dogma, c. Catholics who followed the Greek rituals, that is, unionists. Regarding the last category they add also a word indicative of their nationality, that is it Greco-Italian, Greco-Albanian, Greco-Ruthenian, etc. [see Antonis Fyrigos, “Accezioni del termine ‘Greco’ nei secoli XVI-XVIII”, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, 44 (1990), 201-216, esp. 212]. As Fyrigos explains in the page 215 -after a research made by him for the Greek students registered in the Greek College of Rome between XVI-XVIII centuries- the different meanings depended on the proselytistic purposes of the College as well as the cultural politics of Vatican.

embraced Catholic doctrine, such as Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, use the term “genos” to refer to all Greeks<sup>42</sup>.

Particularly, the ethnic identity of the Greeks of Venice, that is, of a population subordinated to a larger state -of Venice- and organized in kinship and segmentary social systems<sup>43</sup>, complies with that of the Greek habitants in the mainland of Greece. It was articulated around the Greek territory of their origin and the Orthodox religious dogma, as the common use of the term “genos” by all the Greeks of the European Diaspora proves. However, “genos” transcends its function as a link of Greeks with their homeland; it is better understood as notion of higher order which connects the present individual experiences of a people with their past. It is for this reason that during all the long period of the Ottoman occupation, “genos” -a symbol generated in a pre-modern era- operated for Greeks as a unifying element, since it was not simply a semiotic code but a word with a mystic power<sup>44</sup>.

In any case, historians, sociologists and anthropologists are today far from a pre-Darwinian biology, rejecting as pure ideology the idea of a common descent. They agree that “common ancestry” is a culturally constructed belief and expresses the faith of the community which it traditionally claims<sup>45</sup>. This is verified in the past and even today, with many ethnic communities which lived in empires or live and grow today in large nation states. Whilst their ethnicity is based on the myth of common descent, many times, this myth is transcended by the sentiment to unify diverse communities which have common historical and cultural features, in short, common tradition. The transcendence of the myth of common origin is also confirmed in the manifesto of a Greek intellectual and revolutionary personage, Rigas Velestinlis, at the end of eighteenth century, some years before Greek Revolution. The manifesto of Rigas invited all Orthodox communities of a different ethnic origin, to collaborate for their liberation from Ottoman occupation and for the

<sup>42</sup> See the letter by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras, subsection 4.3.4.

<sup>43</sup> The “segmentary social differentiation” refers to a social system when its parts are horizontally divided in subunits, usually locations, which are organized in much the same way and fulfill the same functions [see Nicklas Luhmann, *The Differentiation of Society* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1982)]. In Ottoman Empire the divisions into territorial units were primarily based on religious classifications. More concretely, the corporate identity of all the Ottoman Empire’s Orthodox Christian subjects were placed under the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch as *millet bashi*, or “ethnarch” [see Just R. “Triumph of the Ethnos”, in *History and Ethnicity*, edited by Elisabeth Tonkin, Malcolm Kenneth McDonald, and Maryon Chapman (London: Routledge, 1989), 71-88, esp. 78.

<sup>44</sup> Jonathon Friedman, *Cultural Identity and Global Process*.

<sup>45</sup> Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism*; Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity*.

building of a new confederate state<sup>46</sup>.

### 3.1.3 Identity politics

The majority of sociologists agree with Simmel's principle that a conflict with the exterior reinforces the internal cohesion of a group, contributing to the increase of its centralization<sup>47</sup>. Eriksen<sup>48</sup> invokes this principle in order to argue about the enhancement of ethnic identity in circumstances of external pressure. According to him, an ethnicity embedded in the rhetoric of kinship and in cultural characteristics produces a degree of commonality necessary for the confrontation of the actual or imagined enemy. Their members find in the structured or symbolic space of the ethnic community the appropriate space for their sense of belonging and the means of mobilizing their collective activities. On the contrary, shared experiences, myths and rituals across boundaries reduce the risk of conflict.

Exactly because identities can be used either as promoters of reconciliation and social integration or as producers of conflict, different elites -of the government or of the Church- used them strategically for the success of their purposes. However, all of those who use identity politics, since they need representation, are obliged to convey a sense of authority and legitimacy for the justification of their respective activities<sup>49</sup>. The more legitimate and stable the political elites are, the more they contribute to the stability of ethnic or national identities. On the other hand, their political instability and de-legitimization contributes to an ethnic identity's crisis with fatal consequences for the existence of that community.

The truth of the above statement was confirmed in the case of the Greek community of Venice. One can easily observe that in the Greek community of Venice, the structure of legitimate authority -controlled mainly by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and its local representative, the Orthodox Archbishop, as well as by the presidency of the Confraternity- remained the same as in the country of origin of

---

<sup>46</sup>Rigas Velestinlis, *Τα Επανάστατικά* (Athens: Επιστημονική Εταιρεία Μελέτης 2005), 65-70.

<sup>47</sup> Georg Simmel, "Conflict" in *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliation* (New York: Free Press, 1955); Lewis Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict* (New York: The Free Press, 1956). According to the aforementioned writers, conflict "clears the air" (in Coser, p. 41), and allows for the smoothing of hostile dispositions. In this way conflict serves to the maintenance of relationship between antagonists.

<sup>48</sup> Eriksen, "Ethnic Identity, National Identity and Intergroup Conflict", in *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, ed. Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, David Wilder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 42-70.

<sup>49</sup> Friedman, *Cultural Identity*.

its members, despite the emigration of the members to a country with a different social structure, such as Venice. This old established political structure of a pre-modern-segmented society<sup>50</sup> contributed to the consolidation and preservation of its ethnic identity. Once the political structure is disrupted, the community is destabilized, leading to a political, social and religious crisis<sup>51</sup>.

### 3.1.4 Religion

It is difficult to give a definition of religion<sup>52</sup>. Usually it is interpreted as a set of beliefs and practices generally held by an individual, involving adherence to codified beliefs and rituals and study of ancestral or cultural traditions (writings, history, and mythology), as well as faith and mystic experience. Even if the definition of religion is a rather tenuous act, to lead somebody to an explanation regarding religious identity without illustrating the subject of religion is a difficult task. Any approach to defining a religious identity is engaged to take into consideration some basic explanation of philosophy and sociology of religion.

For the needs of the present inquiry, it could be said that there are two basic streams of thought able to give an answer to the subject of religion. The first one, rather philosophical, is connected with subjective factors and, more concretely, with the deeper feelings of an individual that have emerged from his lived existential encounters with the world in general, as John Dewey and Williams James argue<sup>53</sup>. This kind of feeling is similar to the “oceanic feeling”, a concept coined in a letter of 1927 from Romaine Rolland to Freud<sup>54</sup>. Rolland considers oceanic feeling as the basis of religion and he describes it as a sensation of an indissoluble bond, as of being connected with the external world in its integral form. The second one, based mainly on the writings of Durkheim<sup>55</sup>, is sociological, objective and functional. According to Durkheim, from the time when religious feeling (that is religiosity) has been invested

<sup>50</sup> Ernst Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty: Civil society and its rituals* (Hamish Hamilton London, 1994).

<sup>51</sup> Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*.

<sup>52</sup> Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (Orlando, Florida: Harcourt, 1987).

<sup>53</sup> John Dewey, *A Common Faith* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934); William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Modern Library, 1902).

<sup>54</sup> Jon Mills, “The Ontology of Religiosity: The oceanic feeling and the value of the lived experience”, *Religious Humanism*, 33/3-4 (1999), 20-41.

<sup>55</sup> Émile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1984); Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).



with rituals, this feeling is enhanced because the sense of the individual is transferred to the collective level<sup>56</sup>. However, with this transfer, on the one hand rituals and other symbolic forms become means that sustain and facilitate religiosity, and on the other hand, they contribute to the formation of religion and its institutionalization, enhancing its social role and functions. Some of these functions are: (a) the consolidation of the members of a society; (b) the offering of a transcendental relationship that promotes security; and (c) the facilitation of identity functions<sup>57</sup>. Summarizing the Durkheimian thesis, all religious systems “may serve the common function of drawing people together in devotion to religious symbols and rites that make them aware of their common dependence on the society of which they are a part”<sup>58</sup>.

The importance of symbols is also emphasized by Geertz<sup>59</sup>, who defines religion as: “(1) a system of symbols which acts to (2) establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men by (3) formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and (4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that (5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic”<sup>60</sup>.

It seems likely, that the philosophical, as well as the sociological and anthropological approaches of religion referred to above, that is, the semiotic, sentimental and functional character of it, are captured by Thomas Luckmann<sup>61</sup>, when he interprets religion, on the one hand, as a human constant, as the transcendence of the biological nature by human organism, and on the other hand, as a social institutionalized form of church-related religion.

In any case, in the pre-industrial societies of the early modern Europe, religion could be seen, as von Greyerz argues, (who cites the above definition of Thomas Luckmann<sup>62</sup>), as a socially constructed, more or less solidified, more or less obligatory system of symbols, that combine the legitimating of natural and social orders and meanings with practical instructions given to the individuals on how to

---

<sup>56</sup> Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*; Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*.

<sup>57</sup> Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*; Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*.

<sup>58</sup> Lewis Coser, “Introduction”, in Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, xviii.

<sup>59</sup> Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 87-125.

<sup>60</sup> Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 90.

<sup>61</sup> Thomas Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion* (London: MacMillan, 1967), 49.

<sup>62</sup> Kasper von Greyerz, *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 4.

live. As an example of this definition, one can mention the commercial dealings of the countries of the Reformation, where the commercial transactions were associated with the will of God as taught by Calvin (religion as socially constructed), or the saint icons and sculptures in the Catholic and Orthodox Churches accompanied by the religious rituals of the believers (solidified system of symbols). That is why modern scholars of identity integrate religious faith with culture and consider both as constitutive elements of ethnic identity<sup>63</sup>. In any case, “religion in history must be seen and understood always and without exception, as a cultural phenomenon”<sup>64</sup>. Only after the secularization of modern national states religion has been separated from the culture of society. This separation has been intensified during the 19th and 20th centuries, when ethnic identity evolved and became national, accompanying thereafter the modern state. However, in pre-modern societies, religion is strictly tied with culture and henceforth with ethnic identity.

Both –religion and culture– use symbols and rituals, not only for the constitution of a signification structure<sup>65</sup>, but also as “structural couplings”<sup>66</sup> for their interconnection. Both contribute to the formation of the community’s worldviews and their mutual interdependence makes it difficult to distinguish between the two. Through the signification structure created by them, a community views and interprets the world around it. Nevertheless, religious rituality has an additional meaning related to culture: it implies the sacred hidden in different things and places. Durkheim was the first to emphasize the importance of religion as a means for the separation between the sphere of the profane, -that is the realm of everyday utilitarian activities- and the sphere of the sacred -that is the area that pertains to the transcendental, the extraordinary<sup>67</sup>. Using the symbolic world of rituality, a group or

<sup>63</sup> Gerd Bauman, *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National Ethnic and Religious Identities* (London: Routledge 2004); Claire Mitchell, “The religious content of ethnic identities”, *Sociology*, 40/6 (2006), 1135-1152.

<sup>64</sup> Greyerz, *Religion and Culture*, 4; Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 87-125.

<sup>65</sup> Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*.

<sup>66</sup> The term “structural coupling” is used by Umberto Maturana in Humberto R. Maturana, and Francisco Varela, *Autopoiesis and Cognition* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980) for structure-determined (and structure-determining) engagement of a given unity with either its environment or another unity. As Maturana refers (p. xx of introduction): “It is a phenomenon that takes place whenever a [...] unity undergoes recurrent interactions with structural change but without loss of organization”. In our case, religion and culture could be seen as separated systems, which through their interactions the one influences the structure of the other without changing the organization of it. For example, orthodox rituals are interconnected to the Byzantine architectural style, or Catholic rituals are interconnected to the Gothic style without anyone of these two factors losing its basic organization.

<sup>67</sup> Lewis Coser, *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in historical and social context* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 136-139.

a community of people prescribes “formal behaviour for occasions not given over to technological routine, having reference to beliefs in mystical beings or powers”<sup>68</sup>.

Due to the above described reasons, especially in non secularized societies such as those of pre-modern Europe religion played a leading role in the community's attitude towards others, to the point that one may refer exclusively to religious identity. Often in these cases, religious faith not only acted as a guide for perceptions and behaviours, but took on the characteristics of an ideology that could lead to open warfare between different religious believers. Of course, religious identity is not in itself a reason to cause friction with other communities. Instead, it may be argued that it facilitates the communication between the members of a community as long as a clarification of similarities or differences has been firstly acknowledged.

However, as empirical data reveal, religious conflicts continue to be the main cause of contemporary wars<sup>69</sup>. When a religion is deeply rooted in social life, religious identity is so closely related to beliefs and dogmatic thought, as well as to religious rituals and sacred territories, that any threat of detachment is perceived as an assault on identity. All the constituents of religious identity contribute towards the manipulation of this identity by politics<sup>70</sup>. After the politicization of the religious identity, in the case where a religious traumatic event unfolds it becomes the centre of the political and social life, as happened in the Greek community of Venice with Typaldos' apostasy, the members of the community responded to this trauma violently, explicitly or implicitly, and then, “violence becomes the crux of religious faith”<sup>71</sup>.

Certainly, religious faith, just like language, does not always differentiate one ethnicity from the others. Different ethnicities may share the same religion and the same language. Only when religion or culture is accompanied by a shared belief, as previously mentioned, about the common descent of its members, the formation of ethnic identity takes place. In the case of Greeks in Venice, as will be shown in the next chapters, on the one hand, a deep faith in their common origin, and on the other hand, a long tradition of religious, Orthodox rituality, both engraved in their consciousness through their repetition from generation to generation, contributed to

---

<sup>68</sup> Turner, *Forest of Symbols*, 19.

<sup>69</sup> Scott R. Appleby, *Ambivalence of the Sacred* (New York: Rowan and Littlefield, 2000).

<sup>70</sup> Heinrich W Schäfer, “The Janus Face of Religion: on the religious factor in new wars”, *Numen*, 51/4 (2004), 407-431.

<sup>71</sup> Marc Gopin, *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 58.

the creation of a powerful ethnic identity. Moreover, identity politics, elaborated by Orthodox Church, contributed to the maintenance and enforcement of this tradition and consequently to the forging of their ethnic identity.

### 3.2 The Greek ethnic identity

The focus of this dissertation on the ethnic identity of the Greeks of Venice is not inspired by a conservative traditionalism. Despite the fact that other interpretations -social and political- are also investigated during the analysis of the reactions of the Greek Confraternity of Venice towards the Typaldos' apostasy, it seems that the endangering of ethnic identity is the most significant reason for these reactions. The combination of representations related to origin, religion and culture constituted a repertoire of their tradition and therefore, of their collective-ethnic identity. The latter is further enforced thanks to its embodiment in a structure of legitimate authority<sup>72</sup> –that of the Orthodox Patriarchate. Specific identity politics which the Patriarchate put into operation for a long period of time -such as the establishment of Greek schools and Orthodox Churches- greatly contributed to this strengthening.

In the almost four hundred years of Ottoman occupation, the Greeks, wherever they were, apart from trying to survive, also fought hard to maintain their religious, and consequently, their ethnic identity. The re-appearance of this identity, according to well-known foreign and Greek historians<sup>73</sup>, has its origins in the last two centuries of the Byzantine Empire. Specifically, the Byzantine resistance against the crusaders of the Fourth Crusade, after the fall of Constantinople in 1204, marked the emergence of modern Greek identity, as the spiritual leader of the remaining Empire turned to the ancient Greek models in order to strengthen the people's morale. Since then, the restriction of the Byzantine Empire to mainland Greece, along the shores of the Aegean and the Black Sea, and on islands where they had established ancient Greek colonies, made the Byzantines feel Greeks. It is indicative that Nikitas Choniates, whose testimony is the most authoritative source on what happened during the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders, says that he cannot use "history", "the

---

<sup>72</sup> Friedman, *Cultural Identity and Global Process*, 92.

<sup>73</sup> Steven Runciman, *Η Τελευταία Βυζαντινή Αναγέννηση* (Athens: Δόμος, 1991), 33-34, 37; Norman H. Baynes, N. and H. St. L. B. Moss, *Βυζάντιο, Εισαγωγή στον Βυζαντινό Πολιτισμό* (Athens: Papadimas, 1986), 82; Hélène Ahrweiler-Glykatzi, *Η Πολιτική Ιδεολογία της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας* (Athens: Psychogios, 1992), 127; Ioannis Karagiannopoulos, *Το Βυζαντινό Κράτος*, V.2 (Athens: Ερμής, 1988), 148; Vakalopoulos, *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία*, 12; Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition* (Cambridge U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

best invention of Greeks, for describing barbaric acts against Greeks”<sup>74</sup>.

The premise of the Greek identity is officially made by Emperor John III Vatatzis (1222-1254), when addressing Pope Gregory IX who called him Greco (Greek), he answered: “The Emperor Constantine the Great conceded the empire of Rome to the “genos” of Greeks”<sup>75</sup>.

It should be noted that in the Byzantine Empire, there was bilingualism – in that there was the language spoken by people and the Church and that used by the official state. Church and people spoke and wrote Greek, while the public administration and the army used Latin. Bilingualism was abolished by Emperor Heraclius in the 7th century AD, when Greek became the official language of the state. Certainly, until the last crusade, the unity of the empire was based on the Orthodox Christian religion. The combination of religion and language, after 1204, facilitated the turn to ancient Greek literature and the emergence of Byzantine Hellenism<sup>76</sup>.

The strengthening of ‘Greekness’ as a unifying element of the Greeks’ ethnic identity was enhanced by the fall of the Byzantine Empire and the Ottoman occupation. Folk memory gave birth to legends<sup>77</sup> and folk songs that fuelled the collective consciousness with particular reference to the history of the last centuries of Byzantium that is the period of Byzantine Hellenism or the “Paleologos Renaissance as it is usually called”<sup>78</sup>. The emergence of an ethnic consciousness that

<sup>74</sup> Jan L. van Dieten (ed.), *Χρονική Διήγησις του Χωνιάτου Κυρ Νικήτα, Αρχόμενη από της Βασιλείας Ιωάννου του Κομνηνού και Λήγουσα Μέχρι της Αλώσεως της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 11.1, Series Berolinensis; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975). The phrase of Choniates in Greek is: “πῶς ἂν ἔγωγε εἶην τὸ βέλτιστον χρῆμα, τὴν ἱστορίαν, καὶ κάλλιστον εὕρημα τῶν Ἑλλήνων βαρβαρικῆς καθ’ Ἑλλήνων πράξεσι χαριζόμενος”. It is cited from the chapter “Βασιλεία Αλεξίου του Δούκα του και Μούρτζουφλου”, vers. 580. It could also be mentioned that in the text of Choniates there more than 20 references to the name “Ἕλληνας” and to the “φωνή ελληνίδος” (In English: to the name “Greeks” and to the “Greek language”).

<sup>75</sup> Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Πηγές Ιστορίας του Νέου Ελληνισμού* V.1 (Thessaloniki: Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 1965), 50-53.

<sup>76</sup> Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*. At the end of his introduction (p. 9) Kaldellis writes: “By the late thirteenth century the labels and reception of Hellenism had experienced such transformations (and ironies) as to make the period covered here conceptually satisfying. The Hellenic nationalism of the Emperor Theodoros II Laskaris (d.1258), with which I conclude, stands philosophically between the anti-barbarian Hellenism of the Persian Wars described by Herodotus and the romanticism of the Greek revolution”.

<sup>77</sup> For the legend of the last Palaiologos, emperor during the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans, see Donald M. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor: The life and legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last Emperor of the Romans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>78</sup> The period between 1261-1453 is known as the “Palaiologos Renaissance”, during which the emperors of the Byzantine Empire belonged to the family of Palaiologos. In that time Byzantine art and philosophy is flourishing with a turn to classical antiquity. Main exponents of this period are George

was since then not only dominated by the Orthodox faith but also by the sense of common ancestry, demonstrates the use of the term “genos”<sup>79</sup>, as already noted, found in most oral and written tradition of all Greeks, whether they live the main areas of Greece or in cities of Western Europe. The expansion of the concept of “genos” is a strong argument that Greeks, just before and certainly after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, had been aware of their ethnic identity and used it for their self-recognition<sup>80</sup>.

The Greeks of the Diaspora, however, also expressed feelings common to all emigrants. Such sentiments were the shared sorrow of displacement and anxiety that the younger generations would be assimilated linguistically and religiously by the host country. That is why the Greek Diaspora communities attached great importance to the Greek education of their children, to their Christian Orthodox worship, the Eucharist (or according to the Greek language, to their Liturgy), and to the preservation of their traditional rituals and customs<sup>81</sup>. On one hand, they participated actively in the economic and cultural life of their environment, and on the other, they persisted with keeping educational and cultural processes in general, in order to preserve the “genos” from foreign interference and enrichment with the new creative ideas that had already started circulating in Western Europe<sup>82</sup>.

There is enough evidence for the awareness of the Greek emigrants in regard to their ethnicity. For the purpose of assessing such evidence, it should be noted that during the post-Byzantine period, two ideological streams flourished within the Greek Diaspora, that of scholars and that of middling urban segments, each of which supported the preservation of the Greek identity in its own individual way. The first one was formed by the scholars that spoke ancient Greek and disseminated ancient Greek literature in Europe, mostly in Italy. Ianos Laskaris was one of them, who thought that anyone who had studied Greek letters was actually a Greek by virtue of

---

Gemistos Plethon, Theodore Metochites, Manuel Moschopoulos, Maximus Planoudis, etc.: see Edmund Fryde E., *The early Palaiologean Renaissance, 1261-c.1360* (Boston: Brill, 2000).

<sup>79</sup> See Introduction, subnote 29.

<sup>80</sup> From the mid eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century, shortly before the Greek revolution, the term acquired a particularly importance. Under the influence of the ideas of the Enlightenment and the optimistic outlook for the creation of an independent Greek state, the concept of the “genos” escaped the boundaries of ethnicity and was identified more or less with that of the nation: see Nikos G. Svoronos, *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος: Γένεση και Διαμόρφωση του Νέου Ελληνισμού* (Athens: Πόλις, 2004), 22.

<sup>81</sup> See Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 44-51.

<sup>82</sup> Information about it is given in some chronicles published in Venice in the seventeenth century (see Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 86-89).

the respect they showed<sup>83</sup>. Other scholars stood out for their patriotic poetry and their urges to the European powers, as a cry for help for their nation in bondage<sup>84</sup>. Chryssa Maltezo claims that “in the consciousness of the expelled scholars, antiquity confirmed their historical origin and continuation; it was the source of their food for thought”<sup>85</sup>. To verify her argument, she makes a number of references such as the “παραμυθητικός λόγος” (“Letter of Condolence”) by Gerasimos Vlachos, who encouraged Tsar Alexis Michailovitz to liberate the Greeks and the Romans<sup>86</sup>. Maltezo explains that the use of the terms Roman, Greek, Graekos had not been clarified. For example, in the Greek church of Saint George in Venice, there is a sign dating back to 1564, according to which the church had been dedicated to Jesus Christ and Saint George by “*the Hellenes, colonists of Venice*”. Later, in 1619, another sign into the temple also refers to “*the Hellenes, residents and colonists*”. Both signs had been written by Greek professors at the University of Padua<sup>87</sup>. However, regardless of the connotations of the terms Roman or Greco, what matters is that the Greek communities, especially the one in Venice, are self-identified as “Nazione Greca”. One could assert that scholars were for the term “Hellenes” or “Greci” that is why they use “la lingua Greca”. By contrast, the plebeian segments use the term “Romii” (harking back to the Byzantine continuity with Romans) and speak the more conversational “Romaic language”<sup>88</sup>. Contrary to the scholars, who were devoted to the ancient Greek tradition, most of the plebeian segments of Greek emigrants would speak and write the Greek vernacular<sup>89</sup> mixing their national awareness with the traditions and memories of Byzantium enriched by the myths of Homer and Alexander the Great<sup>90</sup>.

<sup>83</sup> Anna Meschini (ed.), *Giano Laskaris: Epigrammi Greci* (Padova: Liviana, 1976), 65-67, 155-158.

<sup>84</sup> Manoussos Manousakas, *Εκκλήσεις των Ελλήνων λογίων της Αναγεννήσεως προς τους ηγεμόνες της Ευρώπης για την απελευθέρωση της Ελλάδος* (Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1965).

<sup>85</sup> Chryssa Maltezo, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση: Η ιδεολογική συμπεριφορά των Ελλήνων της Βενετίας*; introductory speech on her election as member of the Academy of Athens. Public session on September the 27<sup>th</sup> 2012. It should be noted that prof. Chryssa Maltezo, with rich research and writing work, has been for 15 years the director of the Greek Institute of Byzantine and post-Byzantine Studies of Venice.

<sup>86</sup> Chryssa Maltezo, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*.

<sup>87</sup> Chryssa Maltezo, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*.

<sup>88</sup> The term “Romaic language” was introduced by Leonardos Delaportas, poet: see Manoussos Manousakas, *Λεονάρδου Ντελλαπόρτα, Ποιήματα 1403-1411* (Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 1995), comment in page 387.

<sup>89</sup> Chryssa Maltezo, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*, 148. Maltezo lists on page 148 rich bibliographical references and comments.

<sup>90</sup> A typical example is the popular poem “Ιστορία του Βελισσαρίου” (“History of Velissarios”) which was published in six editions in Venice from 1525 to 1577. The poet presents Velissarios as the new



Despite their obsession with the ancient and Byzantine tradition, Greeks were not stuck to their past; they were active enough within the Western world, participating not only as intellectuals, but also as traders and entrepreneurs in the societies in which they lived. While they were becoming wealthy and powerful, they remained concerned with their occupied homeland and, at the same time, they cooperated with the Orthodox Patriarchate by funding schools and universities, establishing printing houses, translating documents of the Greek literature and exerting diplomatic influence whenever they were given a chance<sup>91</sup>.

Apparently enough, Greek colonists had gradually drawn up an educational policy in order to save the Greek language and culture and for indirectly supporting the Greek “genos” which was under the Ottoman occupation. This policy was warmly accepted by the Orthodox Church as long as the motivation was love for the enslaved homeland and the desire for its liberation combined with the Orthodox faith and prayers to the saints of the Orthodox Church. A typical example is the poem that the scholar and later Bishop of Kernike and Kalavryton Elias Meniates, at the age of just 19 years, a student then at the Flanghinian School, composed and dedicated to the Virgin Mary on the day of the Annunciation, on March 25, 1688. In his lengthy poem, Meniates pleads with great fervour and emotion to the Virgin Mary to liberate Greece and the Greek “genos” from the Ottoman yoke<sup>92</sup>. Moreover, the poem is a clear proof that the Greeks of the European Diaspora were aware of their ethnic identity, namely of their ancestral roots and Orthodox religion.

For the Orthodox Church, education became an ideological mechanism, able to maintain Orthodox religion and to keep the Greek population under the power of Patriarchate. It is already suggested that the Church had acquired a lot of power during the Ottoman rule due to the privileges granted by the Sultan to the Patriarch to have full jurisdiction over the education of the Orthodox Christian populations in the Ottoman Empire<sup>93</sup>. The Ottoman government addressed the Patriarch as ‘Ethnarch’

---

Achilleus and Alexander the Great, who, when arriving to England, encourages his co-patriots to give a brave fight in order to safeguard the status of the Greek Nation. More specifically he states: “Ελλήνων παῖδες εἴμεθεν, ὡς Ἕλληνες φανώμεν” (English translation: “We are the children of Greeks. We must act as such”); see Arnold F. van Gemert, *Constructions of Greek Past Identity and Historical Consciousness from Antiquity to the Present* (Groningen: Hero Hokwerda, 2003), 185-191. The same extract is used by Maltezou, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Ἀλωση*, 138.

<sup>91</sup> As detailed hereunder in the subsections of section 3.3.

<sup>92</sup> Elias Meniates, *Διδαχαί και Λόγοι* (Thessalon: Rigopoulos), XX.

<sup>93</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*; Patrinelis, *Εκκλησία και Ορθοδοξία*, 92-113, 123-134; Melisseidis, *Επιβίωση*.

(“Εθνάρχης”), a term attributed to the political leader of an Ethnos<sup>94</sup>. The Ottomans and the Patriarch shared their suspicion and hostility towards the West. Both feared the Pope’s intentions to expand his sovereignty towards the East, as well as the launch of new crusades. Even though this ‘alliance’ between the Patriarchate and the Ottomans was not obvious immediately after the fall of Constantinople; it became evident in the second half of the seventeenth century after the defeat of the Ottomans in Vienna. Nevertheless, the privileges of the Patriarchate had given the Patriarch room for manoeuvring<sup>95</sup>.

The Patriarchate instituted a political system in the heart of the Ottoman Empire. As with any institution, the Patriarchate formulated for many centuries a correct religious discourse, disseminated to all the Orthodox peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, and mainly to the Greek population, since the language of this discourse was Greek. Through religious politics, the Patriarchate not only kept alive the religious and, consequently, the ethnic identity of the Orthodox people, but also repulsed Rome’s proselytizing pressure. As has already mentioned there was Catholic propaganda, often in the form of “Unia”, to embrace the Orthodox Greek and Slavic world<sup>96</sup>.

The most successful policies of the Patriarchate were those that were connected with education. Immediately after the fall, the academies and schools of Greek studies were functioning within and outside the boundaries of the Greek populated areas. Most of them were founded and funded by the Church. However, the development of trade and of a middle class also played a significant role. Rich merchants, in accordance with the Church and the Greek elites of the territories conquered by Ottomans funded the establishment of schools. Nevertheless, even those that were funded by the rich merchants of the Diaspora had the ‘blessing’, that is, the approval of the Church. Exactly because the educational apparatus was not only in the hands of the religious authorities, but also of political centres, composed by citizens with great influence in their communities, the teaching was not limited to religious subjects, but it was also extended to the ancient Greek grammar and literature. The teachers of the Greek schools were eminent scholars, well educated in

<sup>94</sup> It is already mentioned that the word Ethnos - a synonymous of “genos” - corresponds to the Latin word “Nation” (see Introduction, subnote 29).

<sup>95</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*; Patrinelis, *Εκκλησία και Ορθοδοξία*, 92-113, 123-134; Melisseidis, *Η Επιβίωση*.

<sup>96</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*.

the Greek language, able to transmit their knowledge to the new generations<sup>97</sup>.

In sum, the Greek educational institutions in the most well-known European cities of the Greek Diaspora, in the centuries after the fall of Byzantine Empire till Greek liberation, had created an educational network able to diffuse an ethnic discourse among all Greek emigrants. Among other places many Greek schools were established in the Balkans, Russia and the Black sea<sup>98</sup>. This network was responsible for the preservation of the “genos” identity by using ideological means, inextricably intertwined with religion. In this way, the Greek consciousness was ready to react to any initiative aiming to alienate Greeks from their tradition and religion.

Recognizing the importance of the Greek educational system in the creation and preservation of ethnic identity, in the next subsection a brief overview of it will be presented. Through this brief overview, the identity politics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as well as of some distinguished persons of the Greek Diaspora will be better understood. Of course in this presentation, the Greek schools of the state of Venice occupy a central position. Additionally, it is believed that a short description of the educational system will clarify, on the one hand, the environment in which Typaldos developed his ideas and activities, and on the other hand, the deeper reasons for the reactions of the members of the Greek Confraternity, as well as of the Patriarchate regarding Typaldos’ politics and activities.

---

<sup>97</sup> Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to West Europe* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), 53-61.

<sup>98</sup> Trifonos E. Evaggelidou, *Η Παιδεία επί Τουρκοκρατίας* (Athens: Α.Π. Χαλκιάπουλου, 1936); Karathanasis, *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Βαλκάνια και την Ρωσία*.

### 3.3. An overview of the educational system

The Greeks that lived outside the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire were particularly sensitive about education. They had experienced the advantages brought by freedom of thought and financial independency due to the growing possibilities of commerce which led to more social mobility<sup>99</sup>. As a consequence, new social conditions emerged. A new class of merchants and entrepreneurs came in contact with the West through commercial exchange, a phenomenon that kept strengthening up to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the Greek Revolution broke out<sup>100</sup>. Also, numerous Greek students began to study at big universities of Europe, mostly in Italy, getting in touch with the concepts of the early Enlightenment.

More specifically, during the seventeenth century, when Spinoza, Locke, Bayle, and Newton were active, new ideas, not only philosophical but also scientific were emerging in the new cultural and social settings of Western Europe. European universities had become the ideal place for the fostering of such new ideas. The new sciences, especially those connected with nature, such as astronomy, physics, medicine, exerted a strong influence on the Philosophy. Aristotelian scholastic philosophy slowly gave the way to the concepts of pre-Enlightenment. Greek students of those universities, coming either from the Greek regions occupied by the Ottomans or from cities of the Greek Diaspora, took part in such emerging concerns<sup>101</sup>.

However, it is interesting to comprehend how the new ideas were transmitted in the Greek milieu, in the Greek speaking regions which were under Ottoman administration, and in the Greek communities of Diaspora. It is important to know that after the fall of Constantinople, the Greek scholars taught or participated in the educational activities of the cultural institutions of the West, particularly of Italy, trying to consolidate ancient Greek thought with their Orthodox dogma. Their aim was not only the revealing of the truth, but also to establish a strict connection of themselves with ancient Greek philosophers, and in this way to present themselves as the legitimate heirs of the ancient Greek civilization.

When new ideas diffused by the new sciences were transmitted to the cities of

<sup>99</sup> Liata, *Ένας Έλληνας Έμπορος στη Δύση*.

<sup>100</sup> Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 310-314.

<sup>101</sup> One can refer to Alexander Mavrokordatos, Methodios Anthracites, Antonios Katiforos, Vincentios Damodos and others. See section 2.3, and subsection 2.3.1; also Petsios, *Περί Φύσεως*.

the West -particularly in the Italian Universities, such as of Padua, Pisa, or Bologna- the Greek teachers and students adopted them but they tried to connect them with their traditions based on Aristotle and their Orthodox religious dogma<sup>102</sup>. The writings of the Greek scholars represent an attempt for making the new ideas compatible with the Orthodox dogma and the Greek intellectual tradition in the writings of Greek Neo-Aristotelian scholars, particularly of those who graduated from Padua University. As it is already referred in section 2.3, special reference has already been made to the fact that the University of Padua had become a centre of neo-Aristotelianism. Greek students from rich families all over Greece were attracted by the fame of the teaching and by the spirit of tolerance assured by Venice. By the middle of the seventeenth century the role of the University of Padua was framed within the large European cultural and university network. It is well to remind that this university was that of Copernicus and Galileo, and for that reason, it expended its research and teaching even further with the establishment of the Astronomic Observatory and the creation of new teachings (Chemistry and Agriculture).

The current of “religious Aristotelianism” created by the Greek scholars in Padua<sup>103</sup> demonstrates the difficulties of them and in general of the Greek educational system, to introduce the new ideas in the different communities of the Greek “genos”, dispersed all over Europe, and mainly in the Greek regions under Ottoman occupation, that is, in an “ethnos”, which did not have its own state.

It should not be overlooked that the teaching and writing of the Greek scholars did not only develop within a new cultural and intellectual context, but during an era of fierce political changes. The vast expansion of the Ottoman Empire resulted in the use of many Greeks, the well-known “Fanariotes”, who stood out for their skills in administration or economy<sup>104</sup>.

Nevertheless, Fanariotes insisted on seeking for higher Patriarchic offices and engaging in ecclesiastic and other national affairs, the ultimate leader of which had

---

<sup>102</sup> Dimitris Dialetis, Costas Gavroglu and Manolis Patiniotis, “The Sciences in the Greek speaking regions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: The process of Appropriation and the Dynamics of Reception and Resistance”, in *The Sciences in the European Periphery during the Enlightenment*, ed. Costas Gavroglu (Dordrech: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999), 41-71. Also, *Archimedes*, 2 (1997).

<sup>103</sup> See section 2.3.

<sup>104</sup> See section 2.2, subnote 70.

always been the Ecumenical Patriarch<sup>105</sup>. Another part of the Greek population, the traders of the Greek Diaspora, had also acquired through their commercial and maritime activities, plenty of wealth and powers. All these parties would compete with each other and with the Patriarchate, in an endeavour to consolidate their status.

Attachment to one of the two centres of power – either the ecclesiastic or the political/secular one – was the ambition of parents and children. Some preferred the Patriarchate but others opted for the secular powers, expressed through wealth and administrative offices. Thus, one can say, that until the middle of the seventeenth century, there were two reasons that a child from the Greek mainland studied in the schools of the West. The one reason was related to the belief of Greek parents that graduates of the Western schools were better equipped to deal with the anti-Orthodox religious propaganda, wherever it was coming from<sup>106</sup>. The other reason was connected with the desire of Greek parents -especially during the late seventeenth century and after- to see their sons well educated not only in theology and philosophy, but also in sciences, so they could be well prepared for the mercantile affairs of the new era. Therefore, the educational politics were no longer exclusively organized and practiced by the Orthodox Church, but also by social groups with significant economic and administrative activities<sup>107</sup>.

### 3.3.1. *The Greek schools in East and West*

Any account of the educational institutions of the era has to begin with the Academy of the Patriarchate in Constantinople, which is known as the “The Great School of the ‘genos’”. It started to function shortly after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans (towards the end of 1453 – beginning of 1454). The financial needs of the Academy were covered by the Patriarchate as well as by donations of the rich Greek merchants. The Academy was trying, apart from the dissemination of Greek literature and of course the religious views of Orthodoxy, to follow the developing sciences of the West. The educational activities of the Academy during the seventeenth century (1624) were also important, particularly when the Patriarch was

<sup>105</sup> Paparrigopoulos, *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, 518; Svoronos, *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος*, 87-89.

<sup>106</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 213.

<sup>107</sup> Dialetis et al., “The Sciences in the Greek speaking regions”.

Cyril Lucaris<sup>108</sup>.

Lucaris immediately realized the value of literacy and scholarship as an element of strength that gave ample possibilities to the Greeks within the Ottoman Empire. At the same time, he wanted to avert at any cost the spread of the propaganda of the West. As soon as he resumed office he ordained Meletios Syrigos as a priest, one of the most scholarly personalities in Constantinople. The Patriarch Cyril Lucaris also called in Constantinople the Athenian philosopher Theofillos Korydalleus (1570-1646)<sup>109</sup> requesting from him the reorganization of the Academy of the Patriarchate and its transformation into an institution of higher education.

In Italy, where there were many Greek confraternities who took refuge in the Italian cities after the fall of Constantinople, the zeal for the preservation of the Greek language and religion manifested itself very early<sup>110</sup>. Over the years many Greek institutions were established that taught the children of Greek emigrants the Greek language, history and religion. All Greek Humanists and Neo-Aristotelians, even if they were emigrants, even if they spent their life in Venice, or Rome, or they had close ties with, and were honoured by Italian Academies, continued to present themselves as Greeks. This is an evidence of their self-consciousness regarding their common ethnic identity. Also, it is a confirmation of the thesis of Smith<sup>111</sup>, that ethnic identity is a result of a sense of continuity, shared memory and collective destiny, i.e. the lines of cultural affinity embodied in distinctive myths, memories, symbols and values retained by a given cultural unit of populations<sup>112</sup>.

---

<sup>108</sup> Biographical details of Lucaris are given in section 2.2, where there was an extensive report of the approach of the Protestants.

<sup>109</sup> About the philosophical ideas of Korydalleus see subsection 2.3.1.

<sup>110</sup> As early as the late fourteenth century, Peter Gafranós, a Cypriot merchant and knight, established a scholarship for four young Greeks in Italy. The Procuratori di S.Marco, Procuratori de Supra had the overseeing of the endowment. The legacy ceased to exist in 1571 with the occupation of Cyprus by the Turks and the seizure of the property of Gafranós (Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 24).

<sup>111</sup> Smith, *National Identity*, 29.

<sup>112</sup> Kottounios, for instance, presents himself (natione Greco) in his *Oratio Liminaris* (Padova: Paulus Frambottus, 1638). D. Bembo presents Marjounios as “di nazione Greco”; see Karamanolis, “Was there a Stream of Greek Humanists”, subnote 12. The philologist Markos Moussouros, teacher of Erasmus and professor of the Greek language in Venice and Padua, connected ancient Athens and Constantinople with Venice. See Antonis Pardos, *Οι άζονες της ιδεολογίας του Νέου Ελληνισμού στην άλλη Κωνσταντινούπολη. Η παρακαταθήκη του Βησσαρίωνα: Λάσκαρης και Μουσούρος ανάμεσα στους Έλληνες της Βενετίας* (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1998).

The importance of this effort is that the Greek thinkers of the Diaspora tried, for the first time, to connect the teachings of the Byzantine Fathers of the Orthodox Church with the thought of ancient Greece<sup>113</sup>. In this way, not only did they open the minds of their students to the concerns of their time, but they also strengthened their ethnic identity and pride, enabling them to understand that they were carriers of a century-old intellectual tradition, which enjoyed utmost attention from Western thought.

Among the schools that continued to operate in the seventeenth century, was the Greek Saint Athanasius College in Rome, which had been founded in November 1576 by Pope Gregory XIII. As previously mentioned in detail<sup>114</sup> the Pope believed that through a unionist educational process it would have been possible to reunite the two Churches. The basic part of the curriculum was constituted by grammar, rhetoric, philosophy and theology, according to the teachings of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas as well as apophatic or negative theology<sup>115</sup>. During the seventeenth century, the establishment of schools by bishops and traders in the various places that Greeks lived and successfully worked continued. Thus, in Typaldos' period schools were operating in Ioannina, Arta, Macedonia and the famous Academy of Dimitsana in Arcadia of Peloponnese. In Asia Minor, Greek schools were not established because the Turkish authorities were not particularly tolerant<sup>116</sup>. However, Greek Orthodox schools were established and successfully operated in other countries, such as the College of Kiev founded in 1631 by the Eparch of Kiev, Petro Mogila. Even though the main language in the College was Latin, it is included by Gerhard Podskalsky among the Greek educational institutions<sup>117</sup>. In addition, Greek studies flourished respectively in

<sup>113</sup> Giannis Christianidis, Dimitris Dialeitis, Georgios Papadopoulos, and Costas Gavroglou, *Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία και Επιστήμη: από την αρχαιότητα έως τον 20ό αιώνα*, V.2 (Patra: Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο, 2000), 319-362.

<sup>114</sup> See section 2.2.

<sup>115</sup> The term "apophatic" or "negative" theology is referred to the Christian dogma which attempts to approach God only by negation; that is, to speak only in terms of what may not be said about Him (*Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*). Contrary to the "positive dogma" which makes a positive statement about the existence of the God, negative theology, accepts that the Divine is an abstract experience that human beings cannot describe in words, the essence of the perfect good that is unique to the individual, nor can they define the Divine, in its immense complexity. The Cappadocian Fathers of the 4th century, and also Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor are considered supporters of the apophatic theology.

<sup>116</sup> Paul Ricaut, *The present state of the Greek and Armenian Churches, anno Christi 1678 written at the command of His Majesty by Paul Ricaut, 1679* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Digital Library Production Service, 2003).

<sup>117</sup> Podskalsky (*Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 93) calls the College 'New Athens' of the Orthodox world mainly because in the seventeenth and eighteenth century it became a model for many



Bucharest and Iasio, with the foundation of Academies<sup>118</sup>.

Summarising this short review, it could be said that the educational institutions contributed significantly to strengthening the ethnic identity of the Greeks. Apart from the number of students trained in the Greek language and history, many distinguished thinkers and teachers graduated from these schools. One can mention some scholars who completed their studies in the “Great School of the ‘genos’” in Constantinople<sup>119</sup>, such as Damascenus the Studite in sixteenth century, or, Cyril Lucaris and Theophilos Korydalleus in the seventeenth century, who have been already mentioned. In the areas of the Greek Diaspora, however, one has to mention distinguished Greeks that excelled in the fields of theology, philosophy and science, such as Katiforos, Mitrou, Anthracites and Damodos<sup>120</sup>. All of them, with their actions and writings, putting sometimes in danger their personal life, they visited or went to live in Greek areas occupied by Ottomans. In this manner, they contributed to the introduction of the new sciences and of the early enlightened ideas in the Greek regions, even if, as it is previously commented, they were transformed in order to avoid a strict rupture with the ancient Greek thought and Orthodox dogma. The accommodation of the new ideas to the Greek conditions had two different results: first, it did not permit the development of the scientific thought in Greece, except mathematics, philosophy and theology<sup>121</sup>; second, it contributed to the conception of the uninterrupted continuity of the Greek thought, and what in general could be called “Greekness”, from the ancient

---

educational institutions that were founded by Bishops. In the College there were Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek students.

<sup>118</sup> In Moldova and Wallachia the first efforts to establish higher schools took place during the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Among educational institutions which were founded in various locations near river Danube stood the Hegemonic Academy of Bucharest and the Hegemonic Academy of Iasi. In 1690 the old Greek school in Bucharest was reorganized and named Academy. See Athanasios Karathanasis, *Οι Έλληνες Λόγιοι στη Βλαχία (1670-1714)* (Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2000).

<sup>119</sup> The most of the important teachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, traveled a lot between Constantinople and Venice, or they had strong ties with personages of both cities, either as teachers and priests, or as writers. For example, in sixteenth century, Manuel of Corinth was famous, who wrote against of the Neo-platonists Pletho Gemisto and Bessarion and against the Latins. He spoke and wrote very well in Latin and was probably trained in Corinth. Also Manuel Malaxus who wrote the history of the Patriarchate which had been translated by Krousios, Patriarch Jeremiah II and the layman Michael Cantacuzenus; see Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*.

<sup>120</sup> For Katiforos, Mitrou, Anthracites and Damodos see subsection 2.3.1.

<sup>121</sup> The situation changed a little during eighteenth century and the rising of the Greek Enlightenment. However, even then, distinguished scholars such as Iosipos Mosoiodax (1725-1800), who believed that Aristotelian physics should be fully substituted by the Copernican system and presented a new theory regarding the motion of the Earth, was obliged to moderate his thesis, saying that this imitated the Pythagoreans, and in this way to keep its connection with antiquity; see Paschalis Kitromilides, “The idea of science in the modern Greek Enlightenment”, in *Greek Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science*, ed. Pantelis Nicolakopoulos (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1990), 187-200; Paschalis Kitromilides, *Ιώσηπος Μοισιόδαξ* (Athens: M.I.E.T, 2004).

and Byzantine times. In this way, the confidence and pride of the Greek people in their glorious origin could be enhanced.

### 3.3.2. Greek schools in Venice

In 1593, the Greek Confraternity of Venice founded the “Greek School”. Children of Greeks who lived and worked in Venice, could study there, free of charge. It should be noted that the Greek school did not always work systematically and showed significant deficiencies in courses and resources. In 1664, the Flanghinian School of Venice came to cover these deficiencies; therefore it has been considered by many the first systematically organized Greek school in Venice. It is founded in accordance with the will and endowment left by another rich lawyer and merchant coming from Corfu and Cyprus, Thomas Flanghinis (1578-1648)<sup>122</sup>.

Flanghinis was a good example of the double identity of Greeks in Venice during that conflicting era. As a successful lawyer and merchant, he had established a very important social status. He was working for the Republic. At the same time, he owned a thriving trading business, especially with Cyprus, his mother’s birthplace. The latter had Catholic relatives but Thomas Flanghinis chose the Orthodox faith and became a great supporter of the Orthodox Church. He was the kind of Greek who identified religion -in his case Orthodoxy- with the ethnic group to which he belonged. He was a man of letters and art, an owner of a great library of almost 1,200 books, written by ancient Greek philosophers, Italian and other Western thinkers. Also, he was a famous collector of a number of paintings<sup>123</sup>.

<sup>122</sup> A.S.V., Senato Terra, Reg. 90, fols. 1v-2r ; Comnenus-Papadopolus, *Historia Gymnasii Patavini* 136. His father and grandfather came from a noble, albeit poor, family in Corfu. His grandfather was the chaplain in the church of Saint George of Venice and his father was a member of the Greek Confraternity in Venice. His mother –the last name of whom he chose to go under- came from Cyprus and was probably Catholic, as was her brother and her cousin. Flanghinis studied in Padua and was a doctor of Roman Law. He practiced Law for a while and then he was offered the position of the Public Prosecutor in the Serenissima. He was hired in the service of the Procuratori all’ Armar and performed significant work, as stated in a decision issued by the Venetian Senate, in March 6, 1620; see Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 35 passim.

<sup>123</sup> Among others, two paintings of Tintoretto belonged to his private collection; see Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 43.

In a letter addressed to the Doge<sup>124</sup>, Flanghinis asked permission on behalf of the Confraternity to establish a Greek school in Venice. Among other requests, he proposed a new system of taxation that would apply especially to Greek merchants. The objective was that every Greek who was commercially active in Venice should contribute so that the school could be built.

This point, however, needs to be explained further. One could argue that the main reason for such a suggestion was the preservation of their Orthodox belief. They wanted, of course, to protect the new generations from slipping into other religions, since Orthodox believers were a minority in Venice. The religious factor is a viable explanation, yet it is not the only one.

In fact, in the letter to the Doge, Flanghinis proposed the establishment of a Greek School, pointing out the danger of the Jesuit expansion. He warned of a twofold danger: one for Venice and another one for the Greeks. He cleverly informed the Venetian authorities that the Jesuit policy was to win over to their side young Greeks by enrolling them in their schools. The main problem, as stated in Flanghinis' memorandum, is that the Jesuits wanted to elect an Orthodox Patriarch in Constantinople who would be friendly towards them and through him they would govern those of Greek origin. Also, the Jesuits would probably have bad consequences for Venice, because they were teaching disobedience to their students' Greek descent and Venice as well. Thus, the Jesuits were seeking to make young Greeks despise their homeland, religion and Venice, and meanwhile, by giving special privileges, they were succeeding in turning many educated Greeks into enemies of their "genos"<sup>125</sup>.

Additionally, in his letter, Flanghinis suggested establishing Greek schools that would serve as a 'hotbed' for training young Greeks. The graduates of this school would then be granted higher ecclesiastical privileges in Greece, while maintaining their loyalty to Venice. When they were ordained as the new Bishops, they would constitute "de facto" the election body of every new Patriarch and then the fruits of the Serenissima would mature, because Bailo could finally appoint a person of trust in Venice and so the circle would close with the election of a Patriarch who would act in

---

<sup>124</sup> A.S.V., Rif, Filza 369.

<sup>125</sup> A.S.V., Rif, Filza 369; Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 46.

a friendly manner towards Venice. Flanghinis devised a plan agreeable to ‘republic’ with benefits for both sides as he noted in the details.

Nevertheless, except for religious issues, Flanghinis also invoked other, political reasons, for the operation of the school, such as the increasing growth of trading with Greek lands that were still under Turkish domination. Finally, his letter includes an element that shows his dedication to the common vision of the Greeks to liberate the Greek nation from the Ottomans. He clearly stated that the graduates of the school would help the growth of education among Greeks in the mainland of Greece, which was under Turkish occupation.

It was a letter that -apart from its other virtues- highlighted Flanghinis’ skills, because he astutely presented all of his demands as if they were for the good of Venice. He wanted to earn the right for Greeks to have their own school, to learn their own language and to use that knowledge for awakening the consciousness of Greeks who still lived under Ottoman rule. Speaking for the good of the Republic, he proposed to the Venetian authorities a practical point of view: to make use of their influence to elect an Orthodox Patriarch who would be friendly to the Venetian State, precisely because the Jesuits were trying to elect a figure friendly to them, in that crucial high ranking and influential position.

There is no doubt that to achieve his purpose to create a school for Greek children, Flanghinis believed in every single sentence he wrote. However, he failed to persuade the Venetian authorities. The Venetians were strict with foreigners at that time. Some decades later, in the decades at turn of the century, a totally different approach was put into practice. After Flanghinis’ death, the Senate asked the “Riformatori di Padua”<sup>126</sup> to introduce a proposal following Flanghinis’ will: namely to found a Greek school in Venice. The two members of the committee (Girolamo Bucchion and fra Giovanni Pietro Bortole) who judged their proposal were positive about the request. Furthermore, this positive reaction is of great importance. It gives a clear picture of the Venetian point of view regarding the ethnic identity of the Greeks. In its proposal<sup>127</sup>, the committee showed its respect for the “difficult times” that

<sup>126</sup> “The reformers of Padua” was a powerful directory of the Venetian state, which was responsible for the function of Flanghinian School, according to the will of Thomas Flanghinis –the founder-testament.

<sup>127</sup> A.S.V., Senato Terra, Filza 691, without numbering; Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 56.

Greeks were facing. These were difficult times in their homeland: there were few schools, few teachers and very few educated priests and men of letters to teach the young. So they said “yes” to what Flanghinis had asked for twice, the second time in his testament. They said yes to the petition to allow the foundation of a new school. In their decision, they underlined how “in those difficult times the Greeks will consider this act as a gift of providence”<sup>128</sup>. This is because Flanghinis, in his testament as well as in the previous letter addressed to the Doge, wanted the alumni, or some of them, to become Orthodox priests who could serve and teach in the territories occupied by Turks.

There is one more significant point in the committee’s proposal. They refer to the Greek community in Venice with praise, writing that if the State gave its permission to found a Greek school, then the Greeks in Venice will no longer have to send their children to other schools. They deserved to have their own school and “merita li piu accurate riflessi della publica prudenza”<sup>129</sup>.

The school would eventually be founded with Flanghinis’ funds many years later and after his death. The Flanghinian school would be one of the most important schools for Orthodox Christians outside of Greece, and as mentioned above, it would be the school at which Meletios Typaldos studied (1665-1669) and taught (1671-1673), and which he finally ran as a director of studies (1677-1685).

The Flanghinian School was not the only Greek one. Venice allowed the operation of two other Greek schools in the seventeenth century. The first was founded in 1632 (“Collegio Veneto dei’ Greci”) in Padua. It was named Paleokapa’s college<sup>130</sup>, after the name of Iosafat Paleokapa, bishop of Kissamos<sup>131</sup>. It is worth mentioning that the Jesuits wrestled over the administration of the College with the Dominican monks who had run it until then. The Venetian authorities then decided to take over the College and use the money for creating a new, purely Greek school in

---

<sup>128</sup> A.S.V., Senato Terra, Filza 691, without numbering; Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 56.

<sup>129</sup> A.S.V., Senato Terra, Filza 691, without numbering; Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 56. English translation: “deserves them more accurate reflections of public prudence”.

<sup>130</sup> Tsirpanlis, *Οι Μακεδόνες σπουδαστές του Ελληνικού Κολλεγίου Ρώμης*, 56.

<sup>131</sup> ., Rif, Filza 501. The bishop had bequeathed his fortune to the Saint Athanasios College in Rome where many Greeks had been studying since 1577, when it was instituted. According to Paleokapa’s will, 24 Greeks from Cyprus, Crete, Corfu and other Ionian islands would study “per la divina misericordia” (for the grace of god); Tsirpanlis, *Το Ελληνικό Κολλέγιο της Ρώμης και οι μαθητές του*, 207-208.

Venice. It was certainly an act of resistance on the part of the Venetians against the Jesuits<sup>132</sup>. At the same time, it was a lesson for those who did not respect its citizens. In fact, their decision to establish a New Greek School in Venice, instead of disposing of the money for other purposes, was proof of respect by the Venetian authorities toward the Greek community. The second school was the “Kottunianos School”, founded in 1653 from Ioannis Cottunius (1572-1657), a teacher of philosophy at the University of Padua<sup>133</sup>.

Regarding Venice, one could clearly notice “one of the new happy ironies of History”<sup>134</sup>. Venice, which destroyed the Byzantine Empire in the Fourth Crusade, was now the place that would save the Greek culture. Greek books printed in Venice and the University of Padua were important poles of attraction for young Greek students. Many of them -specifically those who came from the Greek regions to study medicine- after their studies returned to their countries to practice the profession of physician. Due to their profession, they came in contact with Ottoman families and through their acquaintances they had the opportunity to protect other Greeks when they were in danger<sup>135</sup>. In the course of the years, some of them left the medical profession, and they turned their interest to writing and teaching<sup>136</sup>. Some other students wanted to enter the hierarchy of the Church. Apart from studying in the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople they also chose studies in the West and particularly in the University of Padua, as has been repeatedly mentioned.

<sup>132</sup> A.S.V, Rif, filza 501; A.U.P , B. 605, fol. 25r.

<sup>133</sup> These two Colleges merged in 1784. All three, including the Flanghinian School, closed in 1797 after Napoleon’s abolition of the republic. The Kottunianos College and the Flanghinian School opened again in the *nineteenth* century and closed definitely the first in the early years of the *twentieth* century and the second in 1944.

<sup>134</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 210.

<sup>135</sup> Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 213.

<sup>136</sup> Anastasios Goudas, *Βίοι Παράλληλοι των επί της Αναγεννήσεως της Ελλάδος Διαπρεψάντων Ανδρών*, V.2, second edition (Athens: Παιδεία, 1874), 25.

### 3.4. Preserving the Greek identity in Venice

#### 3.4.1. *The struggle for the preservation*

Although some information has already been given, the interest of this chapter is focused on the efforts made by the Greek Confraternity of Venice, by using specific educational and religious politics, to adapt and grow its membership in a foreign, even hospitable social context, while keeping intact their Orthodox faith, ethnic memory and customs.

There is no doubt that Greeks constituted in Venice a social group with its own ethnic identity, with its proper culture and religion. However, it is a question if, at that time, Venice could be viewed as a multicultural society. Despite the fact that in Venice there were many ethnicities (Albanian, Serbian, Armenians, Dalmatians, Jews, etc.), it is difficult to characterize it as a multicultural society. The latter, is a society “at ease with the rich tapestry of human life and the desire amongst people to express their own identity in the manner they see fit”<sup>137</sup>. That means that in a multicultural society all groups have the same degree of freedom and independence.

Nevertheless, it is also difficult to characterize it as a plural society. According to the theory of pluralism, -as Eriksen argues<sup>138</sup> summarizing the views of Furnivall about a plural society- this kind of society was composed of groups which were socially and culturally discrete, which were integrated through economic symbiosis and the political power of one dominant group -the colonial master- but which were otherwise socially distinctive, as well as being disconnected concerning language, religion and customs. There were no shared values in a plural society, and so the groups were held together in a political system that was the coercive force of the state.

Of course, Venice in no way could be considered as a colonial state. However, if one wanted to compare Venice with some model of today, it may be possible to liken it to a plural society, with the exception of seeing it as a colonial state. Venice was an independent state of that époque, with different ethnicities coexisting within

---

<sup>137</sup> Kevin Bloor, *The Definitive Guide to Political Ideologies* (Milton Keynes: Authorhouse, 2010), 272.

<sup>138</sup> Eriksen (*Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 48) comments on the theory of pluralism of John S. Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1948). Furnivall developed his theory investigating the Dutch and British colonies in South-East Asia.

its boundaries, voluntarily and freely, but always under the political hegemony of Venice. All these ethnic groups had built their collective identity inside the area of their own community but were at the same time citizens of the Venetian state. “La Nazione Greca” had already gained important positions in the city and played a crucial role in the Venetian social life. Without forgetting their roots, Greeks (usually traders, ship-owners and sailors, more rarely as lawyers and academics) were acting simultaneously inside two social fields: in the Venetian state and in their own community within Venice.

Most of the Greeks in Venice were seeking a better life; the economic prospects were still good. Shipping and trading with the East were very profitable and by the end of the sixteenth century, many foreigners living in Venice had gained considerable benefits. Educational institutions and universities were flourishing while printing had become an important industry and a factor in developing education and letters.

As already mentioned<sup>139</sup> Greeks had already been in Venice by the middle of the fifteenth century, immediately after the fall of Constantinople. With the passing of the years they had gained many economic and social privileges. They were an active foreign community having their own jobs and occupying other high social positions. The population of around 5,000<sup>140</sup> Greek people was an important presence in almost all aspects of social life. The Greek Confraternity was successful in solving problems of the Greek community and, in general, in maintaining the community’s collective identity.

It should not be forgotten that the Greeks of Venice were emigrants or refugees. Migration tends to distance people from their roots. There is a loss of foundation from their lives which are usually based on a system of cultural values offered by their homeland. Usually, a decision for migration comes after a destabilization which happens between a human being and his surrounding world. From the moment that individuals do not feel well-matched to a social environment, do not see any opportunity for the continuation of their lives, or the links between them and the

---

<sup>139</sup> See subsection 2.4.1.

<sup>140</sup> See subsection 2.4.1, subnote 191.



others have been broken, they do not hesitate to migrate<sup>141</sup>. At that time and maybe for the rest of their live the immigrant resembles Janus<sup>142</sup>, the Roman God with two faces on his head: one looking to the future making a great effort to survive and live a new life in a new land, and the other looking back to past, full of memories.

Greeks of the Diaspora found themselves in a similar situation. On the one hand, their collective memory and tradition, language and religion were calling, and on the other, their social position in their host country demanded their activity and attention. Briefly, there was a kind of internal conflict between social status and psychological needs. Two frames of reference were colliding within them: the social, which however was dividing the people in professions and work places, and the cultural, which determined their ethnic identity, that is, a factor able to integrate the isolated individuals and to answer the questions of who they were, where they were coming from, and what culture they represented.

This dilemma posed by a new identity faced the Greek emigrants to the city-state of Venice, and as we are going to see, they tried to confront it while keeping the necessary balances. In order to understand the Greeks' persistence on preserving their ethnic identity, it should be taken into consideration that within the Greek community of Venice there were already two powerful Greek centres settled, able enough to impose their will on the entire community -the powerful individuals of the Confraternity and the Patriarchate<sup>143</sup>. The first one consisted of wealthy merchants and ship-owners, that is, successful businesspeople, who had acquired an important social status. The eminent members of this centre preferred to keep their Orthodox and Greek identity as their trading activities were expanded not only to the West, but far into the Ottoman Empire and the Aegean Sea. It was easier for them to negotiate with Ottomans as Orthodox Greeks rather than as Latin and Catholics. The second centre was not composed only by the court of the Patriarchate and the Orthodox clergy but also from intellectuals, scholars of philosophy and theology. These intellectuals had deep relations with the Patriarchate not only because of faith but also

---

<sup>141</sup> Neal P. Ritchey, "Explanations of migration", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2 (1976), 363-404; Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and other Essays* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

<sup>142</sup> Ana Maria Araujo, "Η διαπλοκή του κοινωνικού και ψυχικού στη συγκρότηση των ταυτοτήτων μας", in *Ταυτότητες: Ψυχοκοινωνική Συγκρότηση*, ed. Klimis Navridis and Nicolas Christakis (Athens: Καστανιώτης, 1997), 101-104.

<sup>143</sup> See subsection 3.1.3

because of the opportunity that they gave their knowledge to have a significant advancement in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Consequently it is evident that these were fervent preachers of the Orthodox doctrine. Both of these two centres had created respective institutions for the exercising of their politics: the former had established the Confraternity by controlling its presidium and the latter exercised their policy through schools and the Orthodox Church.

Additionally, it is good to take into consideration some other reasons, mostly ideological, which enhanced the will of the Greek centres of power for the maintenance of the Greek ethnic identity. For historical reasons, intellectuals and clergy were proud of their origin from ancient Greece and the Byzantine Empire, while they had an almost hereditary aversion to Catholicism. One should keep in mind that before the fall of Constantinople, people and clergy cried that a Turk's turban would be preferable to a Catholic's tiara<sup>144</sup>. This ideology contributed to the failure, a decade before the fall, of the agreement between the political authorities of Constantinople and Rome for a united Church. Of course, for evident reasons, this aversion did not exist anymore in the Greek Confraternity of Venice. Many of its leaders and distinguished members adopted a rather friendly stance towards Catholicism<sup>145</sup>. However, simple members of the community, mostly the emigrants who came from the Greek mainland, were still dubious about the Catholics. Such doubts were motivated mainly by circles of the Orthodox Patriarchate, whenever they wanted to strengthen the bonds of their members with the Orthodox Church and empower their religious identity<sup>146</sup>.

Of course, the Greek Orthodox Church played a prominent role in the application of these political strategies. Both institutions, Confraternity and Church, were struggling to retain the "imaginary" of their members with their repertoire of

<sup>144</sup> Dialetis et al, "The Sciences in the Greek speaking regions".

<sup>145</sup> Dialetis et al, "The Sciences in the Greek speaking regions".

<sup>146</sup> The hatred of Greek Orthodox against Catholics had as starting point the conquest of Constantinople by the Franks in 1204. After the 1453 Fall of Constantinople, when religious privileges and political authority were granted by Ottomans to the Orthodox Patriarchate, the latter maintained this hostility to the West, attempting to stabilize relations with the Ottomans. See Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 165-185; Theodore H. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels, Scaldis Publishers, 1952).

ethnic tradition<sup>147</sup>. This strategy verifies what Castoriadis said<sup>148</sup>, that the social imaginary cannot be maintained without an institution to take care of it. Community and Church, as long-standing institutions with great experience, knew that the social imaginary cannot be maintained through virtual, but through tangible, material rituals and symbols. The partial constitution and reproduction of the social imaginary with rituals and their components, enhances the argument that ethnicity is not an imagined community, as Anderson claims<sup>149</sup>, but a real institutionalized entity created by concrete social practices and social relationships, inseparably coupled with elements of the Symbolic.

In this case, an individual was not only called upon to participate symbolically in two different cultural systems, that of Venice and that of the Greek Confraternity, but in reality he was asked to participate fully. And that was because he was not only the receiver of an educational procedure that conveyed their inherited social representations; he was also a participant in rituals, especially religious, structured on the basis of real objects, gestures and events, for example the ceremony of baptism, marriage, the worship of icons, and others, which had the power to be deeply etched in his soul because they required his entire presence.

Precisely for these reasons, where the authorities of a Greek community were strongly inspired by a sense of ethnic identity and the Orthodox Church was strong enough to impose the canons of its liturgy, the Greek emigrants for many years maintained their customs and beliefs and were not assimilated. This happened in the case of the Greek Confraternity of Venice, in contrast with the Greek communities of other Italian cities<sup>150</sup>. In Venice, the board of directors of the Greek Confraternity and the Orthodox Church, succeeded in the seventeenth century, a century of several religious conflicts and upheavals among the various Christian dogmas, as already mentioned, to maintain the Greek consciousness of the community in which they

---

<sup>147</sup> The word “imaginary” herein does not mean something socially imagined, that is, something socially grasped by fantasy. It means the aggregation of the collective representations of a group of people which are entered in the social context and which are able to guide the social conduct. See Cornelius Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1998). In order to be maintained the imaginary feeds upon rituals; it is not reproduced only discursively, but by real symbols, such as objects, gestures and events existed in the actual world.

<sup>148</sup> Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*.

<sup>149</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>150</sup> As it is reported in section 2.2, note 95, in confraternities of other Italian cities, such as Napoli, Ancona and Livorno, a lot of conflicts occurred among members of them for religious purposes: see Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*.

presided. This was facilitated by the good relations of the Greek community and Church with the government of Venice. Although Venice was a Catholic society, its economic interests also extended to the Ottoman Empire, a fact that enabled the polis-state to develop religious neutrality that facilitated the survival of other religious dogmas. On this neutrality rulers of the Greek community and Church built their relationships with the Venetian authorities.

The Church did not put aside those who participated in the ceremonies of both Churches instead they were always considered as members of the flock. They were admitted to the Orthodox Church's rituals since usually the reasons for their conversion corresponded to a practical need, as for example the marriage of an Orthodox man to a Catholic woman<sup>151</sup>. A fact that firmly confirms the tolerance of the Orthodox Church is revealed by the Russian diplomatic records regarding a visit of the Russian ambassador to the Archbishop of Philadelphia Meletios Hortatsis in 1663<sup>152</sup>. When the ambassador visited the church of Saint George, he was surprised to find out that the congregation of the Church included Catholics, both priests and laity. Also, the Catholic priests attended the Mass standing in front of the altar itself. Such an occasion for the Venetians was merely an example of religious tolerance within a society that allowed the co-existence of several dogmas, whereas for the Russians it was an indication of social "anarchy".

The tolerance of the Orthodox Church towards Catholic Greeks can become comprehensible after a thorough inquiry into the meaning of symbol and ritual<sup>153</sup>, and more than that, into their connection with the respective institutions responsible for their manipulation. As Banton argues, referring to Geertz, "the anthropological study of religion is[...] a two stage operation: first, an analysis of the system of meaning embodied in the symbols which make up the religion proper, and second the relation of these systems to socio-structural and psychological processes"<sup>154</sup>. It is arguable that the socio-structural processes lead to the shaping of institutions, religious or political, with their own structure and function. Institutions not only use rituals and symbols for achieving their goals and imposing their power, but also they establish absolute

<sup>151</sup> B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol.74r *Relazione a Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XI, op. cit.* fol. 74r

<sup>152</sup> Philip Longworth, "Russian-Venetian Relations in the Reign of Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, V. 64/3 (1986), 380-400.

<sup>153</sup> See ch.2, 154f, definition of rituals according to Turner, *Forest of Symbols*.

<sup>154</sup> Michael Banton, *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* (Oxon: Tavistock, 1969), 42.

authorities, whether this is a religious commandment or a divine inspired leader<sup>155</sup>. For that reason, should any Orthodox Greeks follow the Catholic dogma, the Orthodox Church would be less worried, provided that those converted would accept the Patriarch as their religious leader. On the contrary, it was really concerned and intensely opposed to the imposition of “Unia” by Typaldos, as, despite the fact that no changes were made in the rituals, the institution and its leader would change; for the Uniate Dogma would recognize the Pope as its religious leader.

It should be stressed that the tolerance demonstrated by the Orthodox Church in Venice was a characteristic of the Greek Confraternity too, which would accept the co-existence of Catholic and Orthodox believers, as long as such co-existence did not jeopardize their own religious dogma. However, the Greek Confraternity was strongly opposed to Typaldos’ initiatives for the “Unia”, as their religious dogma and its attached ethnic beliefs would collapse<sup>156</sup>.

The reaction from the Orthodox Church leadership, the clergymen and theologians against the “Unia”, and mostly by the Greek Confraternity turned dramatic in the case of Meletios Typaldos. On the one hand, the Catholic Church, and along with the Catholic Church, Typaldos, by supporting the policy of “Unia” seemed to understand the symbolic power of stereotypes. That was why they did not manage to bring significant changes in the rituals of the Orthodox liturgy. They insisted, however, on having the Pope as head of the Church instead of the Ecumenical Patriarch. The reaction of the Patriarch was intense because such action would undermine his authority. Proclaiming the eternal truths of Orthodox doctrine as well as the struggle of the Church of Constantinople against heresies, they were fighting passionately to preserve its validity.

The Greek Confraternity of Venice, in spite of the ultimate acceptance by Venice of the positions of the Pope<sup>157</sup> continued to deny them by insisting on the Orthodox faith and ethnic identity. This is confirmed by a letter to the authorities of Venice, in July 7, 1707, where denying the imposition of the Catholic decrees of the Council of the Ten, in 1534/1542, according to which the vicars of the church of Saint

---

<sup>155</sup> Turner, *Ritual Process*, 195 passim.

<sup>156</sup> See details in chapter 2.4.3.

<sup>157</sup> As evidenced by the re-application of the decrees (1534/1542) and the letter of Michelangelo Farolfo (see chapter 4).

George must be Catholics. The promoter of these acts of 1534 and 1542 was the Latin-friendly monk Arsenios Apostolis<sup>158</sup>. The decrees of 1534 and 1542 were no longer effective as of 1549, when Pope Paul III granted the Greeks again with the right to elect Orthodox priests and archbishops for the church of Saint George. This right was revoked 150 years later, in 1708, with the intervention of Meletios Typaldos before the Venetian Authorities<sup>159</sup>. In addition the Greek Confraternity raises the demand for “freedom of conscience”<sup>160</sup>.

The Confraternity also took great care to appoint well educated individuals who enjoyed general acceptance as heads of the church of St. George as well as of the Flanginian School. There was also a well developed system of social welfare administered by the Greek Confraternity. This helped to preserve social cohesion.

Finally, the Greek Confraternity was engaged in preserving the collective memory and consequently, the ethnic identity, of the Greeks in Venice, mainly through education. Therefore it is now necessary to examine more closely some historical decisions and statements of the Greek Confraternity, so that the role of the politics of “ethnic identity” in the failure of Typaldos plans can be better understood.

### 3.4.2. *The Greek Confraternity*

There were several different ethnic groups existing at the margins of the official nation of Venice. The most numerous were Greek people, that is, the culturally and linguistically Greek inhabitants of the Ionian Islands. Molly Greene, summarizing the thoughts of Maria Fusaro, comments: “In reality (Greek merchants) were Venetian subjects”<sup>161</sup>. In the late sixteenth century, the Greek mercantile world of Venice spread in all major cities of Europe, and of course, in the Ottoman Empire, without renouncing either their religious faith or their Greek origin and language. Moving

<sup>158</sup> Apostolis was a former Bishop of Monemvasia, and was punished by the Patriarchate of Constantinople by anathema. He went to Rome at first where he created a good relationship with the Papal Court and subsequently to Venice where he incited various incidents against the Greek Orthodox Church, including the famous decrees of the 30<sup>th</sup> March and 30<sup>th</sup> May 1534, whereby he became predicant of Saint George church and the election of two Catholic priests was prescribed.

<sup>159</sup> See Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 24-26, 59-68; Ploumidis, “Αι Βούλαι των Πατριαρχών”, 231-234, 238-250.

<sup>160</sup> See chapter 4 for details and analysis of the Letters of the Greek community in 1707.

<sup>161</sup> Greene, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 43.

across the Mediterranean as merchants, or ship-owners and sailors, Greeks crossed areas and seas with different religious dogma, such as Catholic, Protestant and Islamic, resting on a tenuous partnership between the Venetian Republic and the Ottoman Empire. But their “religion was not in abeyance. It was there, simmering just beneath the surface”<sup>162</sup>. Also, Greeks had never cut their ties with their particular place of birth, or of their origin, which was called “patris”<sup>163</sup>. This was especially true among merchants and men of letters who were frequent travellers. They carried their fatherland in their minds and souls. The word “genos” is a notion larger and different than “πατρίς”. It is not connected with a place, but, as it is already told, with a common ancestry, and also, common culture, religion and history. “Genos” is a synonym of “Ethnos”, translated in the Latin languages as “Nation”. At the end of fifteenth century, the Greek population of Venice numbered about 4.000 individuals. It was then, exactly in 1498, when two simple emigrants, a carpenter from the island of Lefkada and a retailer from Corfu, were the persons who submitted to the Venetian authorities an application for the constitution of their ethnic minority as an official community of the “Nazione Greca”<sup>164</sup>. Despite the fact that not much is known about the first years of the Confraternity, during the following centuries, the myth of its connection to Constantinople had been developed and mainly that the church of St George had been constructed by Constantinopolitans. This is not true, as many Greeks, from many places in Greece and of different origins, contributed to the construction of the church and the establishment of the Confraternity<sup>165</sup>. On the other hand, the myth reveals the Greek Confraternity’s intense reminiscence of the Byzantine Empire and the hope for its revival.

In the Greek Confraternity, made up of people with a common language and religion, cultural and ancestral affinity found its expression. Otherwise, Confraternity

<sup>162</sup> Greene, M. *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants*, 51.

<sup>163</sup> In the Greek language the word “πατρίς” (fatherland) comes from the word “πατήρ” (father). The connotation is obvious in Latin speaking languages: “Patria potestas” is the father’s authority on the members of its family. Patris for the Greeks of the sixteenth and seventeenth century had the meaning of the place of birth. Therefore, in the “nazione greca” there were included six patrie, that is, six regions from whence derived most of the members. These six regions were: Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean islands, Nafplion and the Monemvasia, Zakynthos with Cephalonia, Corfu, and Central and Northern Greece see Chryssa Maltezo, *Η Βενετία των Ελλήνων* (Athens: Μίλητος, 1990), 54.

<sup>164</sup> The word “nazione” for the simple Greek emigrants, meant an association of individuals of common “genos”. Initially, it was used by the groups or confraternities of the foreign students of the Italian universities. See Chryssa Maltezo, “Ελληνες Μέτοικοι στη Βενετία μετά την Άλωση, Ταυτότητα και Εθνική Συνείδηση”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 35 (2005), 175-184, 175; Bobou-Stamati, *Τα Καταστατικά του σωματείου των Ελλήνων φοιτητών*, 16, subnote 4.

<sup>165</sup> Maltezo, *Ταυτότητα και συνείδηση ιστορικής συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*, 141.

was for the Greeks a matter of ethnic identification. They shared the same country of origin, language and religion. The Peloponnesians knew that they differed in attitude from the Greeks of the other regions or “patrie”, for example from Cretans and the people of the city of Lepantos (or Nafpactos in Greek), from the Epirotes or the Constantinopolitans. These internal differences were less important than those they had with other ethnicities or other religions. And overall these were internal differences which in a way connected them with a variety of common traditions<sup>166</sup>. To have common and long-lasting traditions was a way to express and confirm the existence of a collective, ethnic identity. These characteristics strengthened their resolve to form a Confraternity of Greeks away from Greece. It was the formation not only of a known way of government, similar to that of their old communities, but also a place for interacting with compatriots, which gave the opportunity to every member of the Greek community to revive their customs and memories. At the same time, they could prove to themselves and others that their desire for preserving their Greek identity was still profound and lasting.

In a careful reading, the reasons stated for the establishment of a Greek Confraternity were not only religious and philanthropic<sup>167</sup>, such as their willingness to serve the Orthodox faith, to create a sense of belonging, and to help the weaker members of the community, but also cultural, since Greeks consistently invoked their “Nazione” (or “genos”) in any request to the Venetian Authorities. More concretely, Greeks argued that many soldiers of their “Nazione” had helped the Venetian State by participating in the wars as “stradioti”. The same argument was used on October 4, 1511, when the Greek “stradioti” asked permission from the authorities to build their own Greek Orthodox Church, dedicated to Saint George, patron saint of the warriors<sup>168</sup>. Additionally, if we compare the applications of the Albanians, Dalmatians and Greeks for the establishment of their own Confraternity, and the respective “articles of association”<sup>169</sup>, we see that while the Albanians put forward as the cause of their application the worship of their patron saints and, in general, acts of

<sup>166</sup> For example, there are many differences in the local customs of preparing or feasting the marriage ritual. But there is no doubt that all Orthodox people share the same marriage ceremony.

<sup>167</sup> See subsection 2.4.1.; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 15; Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 106.

<sup>168</sup> Pelidis, *Morire per honor di la Signoria*, 32-33.

<sup>169</sup> The “articles of association” and every activity of the confraternities were written in a book called “Mariegola”.



philanthropy, the Dalmatians as well as the Greeks were also referring to the philanthropically inspired actions taken among the members of their communities, but, moreover, to their “genos” and to the services they had given to the Venetian state during the previous wars<sup>170</sup>.

The request for establishing a Greek church was made at a critical time for the survival of Orthodoxy in Italy. Venice might have kept a neutral position on religious issues and needed the financial and military support of the Greeks, but this was not the case in other Italian cities, where there was a common policy for proselytizing to Catholicism<sup>171</sup>. We have already seen that the situation in the Greek colony of Venice was different, as the authorities were tolerant towards all main religious groups. If Greeks didn't want to build their own ethnic Confraternity they could have done something else: either participate in an existing Confraternity (the so-called “scuole”) among the many that were active at that time, or they could refer only to the charitable nature of the Confraternity about to be established, as the Albanians did.

As has already been discussed<sup>172</sup>, the Greeks wanted to maintain their ethnicity and religion. Being Orthodox, they wanted to be viewed as different from Catholics, Jews or others. However, there were some Greeks, usually members of the higher social classes, who were participating in Catholic religious confraternities, usually for philanthropic reasons<sup>173</sup>. As will be explained later, that kind of two-way religious activity was related to the social life and status of prominent Greek Venetians. The main point is that some Greeks, who participated in Latin confraternities, even if they were Orthodox, had also chosen to be active members of the Greek Confraternity. This situation proves that the Greeks of Venice did not have any personal interest for participating in the Greek Confraternity, except their strong feelings towards maintaining their ties with their homeland and “genos”.

However, one should not forget that in Venice, despite the religious neutrality and the conflict with the Pope, the latter was still a powerful figure, towering over people and even rulers<sup>174</sup>. Most of the Venetians were Catholics. The Catholic

---

<sup>170</sup> Mavroidi, *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής Αδελφότητας Βενετίας*, 7-11.

<sup>171</sup> See subsection 2.4.1.

<sup>172</sup> See subsection 2.4.1.

<sup>173</sup> See subsection 2.4.3.

<sup>174</sup> See subsection 2.4.1

Patriarch was the eye of the Pope in the region of Venice. The Greeks, due to their Orthodox dogma, were called “Schismatic”<sup>175</sup>. They were viewed as Christian opponents of the ecclesiastic reunion. For that reason, they were considered as foreigners twice. Every little move by the Greeks in Venice was treated with suspicion and even enmity<sup>176</sup>.

The policy of the “Unia” aimed at the exploitation of such a situation. It promised that the acceptance of the Uniate dogma would render the Greeks of the “Unia” into Catholics and therefore prominent citizens equal to the Venetian Catholics, enjoying the same social benefits instead of being seen as of dubious social status or marginal parties. This theme emerges forcefully in a letter (“Lettera”) of Typaldos addressed to an unknown Venetian official, in 1699, discussed in detail in the next chapter. There is little doubt about the willingness and the associated preparations of Typaldos to adopt the policy of “Unia”, but it is not clear whether his actions were inspired only by his personal ambition. The analysis of his personality as well as the political, religious and ideological context of the era, however, suggest that one of the reasons for his plan was the desire that the Greek people ruled by Venice should receive the privileges of the Venetian people.

In summary, we could say that the Greeks of Venice, did not refuse Orthodoxy, but on the contrary, made great efforts to earn the right to have their own Orthodox church and follow the service in the Greek language and from their own priests. From the fall of Constantinople until the first decades of the eighteenth century, they made considerable progress. First, they succeeded in having their own ceremonies, but in a Catholic church that the authorities permitted them to use. Not long after, they had permission to build their own church; by the seventeenth century, they already had a bishop, the so-called Archbishop of Philadelphia, who represented the Patriarch’s Exarch in the Western World.

In any case, religious faith was at the heart of the conflict to maintain their identity as a particular collective. For that reason well elaborated politics had been shaped: from the Orthodox Church, and from the presidency of the Confraternity. In

<sup>175</sup>See “Lettera” of Typaldos to a Venetian official in subsection 4.3.1

<sup>176</sup>To give an example: the Catholic priest of the church close to the Greek Orthodox church of Saint George was complaining to the Catholic Patriarch even for the bells ringing on Easter day.

Venice, the Orthodox Church was present but, as we have seen so far, out of the three most important schools of that period, two of them were created by two secular figures. Yet, the role of the Church was important. As mentioned in Flanghinis' will, one of the purposes of the School was to provide education to Orthodox priests. The alumni who would eventually become priests should go back to Greece and teach others and so it happened in many cases. Among the teachers of the schools, were several enlightened clergymen<sup>177</sup>. Orthodoxy was obviously considered one of the most essential features for the characterization of an individual as a Greek, that is, for the attribution of the Greek identity.

Now we can understand more fully what was jeopardized in the early years of the eighteenth century, when the then archbishop Meletios tried to turn the Greek community to Catholicism. The immediate and violent reaction of the Confraternity against Meletios not only confirmed the deep Orthodox belief among Greek settlers in Venice, but also, their fear that their annexation to Catholicism would mean their incorporation into a foreign, although friendly environment. Of course, this is not to devalue the economic interest of wealthy Greek merchants and ship-owners, especially those who crossed the Mediterranean Sea, from the Ottoman to Spanish coasts. As it is already mentioned, this interest was connected with their ease as Orthodox believers, to come in contact, and negotiate for buying and selling with the Ottoman authorities who had until then a strong position in the commerce of Southern Europe.

### ***3.4.3. Maintaining the Greek language***

Many members of the Greek colony, apart from Greek, were also speaking Italian, since this was the language of the Republic. Some Greeks, especially mariners, could speak Turkish and other languages. Merchants and men of letters were usually multilingual. Obviously they were using the language of their trade or the language of public services but it is equally obvious that they tried to preserve their own language.

---

<sup>177</sup> See subsection 2.3.1

The effort of the Greeks to maintain their own language is shown by establishing Greek schools and hiring the most well-known Greek intellectuals to teach there. Particularly, the Greek Confraternity of Venice decided in 1593 to hire a Greek language teacher.<sup>178</sup> A number of important Greek scholars taught there, like Liverios Zakras, Theofillos Korydalleus, Gerasimos Vlahos and others. It is true, that “the Greek language never stopped being taught in Venice either by public and private teachers or by the Greek school of Venice”<sup>179</sup>. This fact indisputably testifies that the objective of this activity, as well as of publishing Greek books (as will be commented below), was to preserve and maintain the consciousness of the Greek people in both the members of the Greek community of Venice and the dispersed Greek regions under Venetian and Genoese occupation, such as Crete<sup>180</sup>.

Apart from the schools, which have been detailed above, another source for the intellectual activity of the Greeks and their endeavours to keep the Greek language alive after the Fall of Constantinople is the publication of books in the West, written by Greek writers in Greek and the resulting establishment of Greek printing houses<sup>181</sup>. From the Fall of Constantinople and thereafter, the Greeks were active in the field of printing, particularly in the cities of the Italian Renaissance (Rome, Florence, and Venice)<sup>182</sup>.

It is interesting to note, that at the end of the fifteenth century, Venice had become the European capital of printing, having 417 printers. This city was chosen in 1490 by the Humanist printer Aldus Manutius to establish his printing business, the famous Aldine Press of Aldus Manutius. The latter, was inspired by the vision to protect ancient Greek literature from further losses, therefore, he gathered around him an army of Greek scholars. For example, Greek thinker Markus Mousouros collaborated with him for publishing the Greek grammar of Manuel Chrysoloras, as well as the “Complete Works” of Plato (“Ἀπαντα του Πλάτωνος”). In order to promote further Greek studies, Manutius founded in 1502 an academy of Hellenists

<sup>178</sup> Mertzios, “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης”, 166-185.

<sup>179</sup> Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 27.

<sup>180</sup> Lucy A. Paton, *Selected Bindings from the Gennadius Library thirty eight plates in colour, with Introduction and Descriptions* (Athens: Cambridge American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1924), 10.

<sup>181</sup> Evro Layton, “The first printed Greek books”, *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 4/4, (1979), 63-79.

<sup>182</sup> Paton, *Selected Bindings from the Gennadius Library*; William Pettas, “Nikolaos Sophianos and Greek Printing in Rome”, in *The Gennadius Library*, 5/29 (1974), 207.

under the title, the *New Academy*. Its rules were written in Greek. Its members were obliged to speak Greek. Their names were Hellenized and their official titles were Greek<sup>183</sup>.

From the fifteenth century till the mid-sixteenth century, the efforts for the publishing of Greek books were mainly aimed at the Western European market and, to this end, emphasis was laid on the ancient Greek literature. The purchase rates of books in Ottoman-occupied Greece were really low, with no commercial interest. Also, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was powerful enough to shield Orthodox populations from ancient Greek thought, which was considered to be Pagans. Such fact had led to a difference of opinion and policy between clergymen and theologians who were inextricably dependent on the Patriarchate and the scholars who lived in the West and had become familiarized with the ideas of the European Renaissance<sup>184</sup>.

Things started changing from the late sixteenth century when in 1597 Pope Gregory XIII founded the School of Saint Athanasios in Rome where Latin and ancient Greek were taught. That was when the Orthodox Greeks of Venice, confronting the danger of the absolute expansion of Catholics, started publishing religious books on Orthodoxy, written in Greek vernacular -demotic Greek or the so called Romaic- which was widely spoken. The purchase of religious books, of course, was not confined to Venice, but spread to other Italian cities. In fact, very soon it spread to parts of Austria-Hungary and Moldavia, thereby allowing for the establishment and boom of new printing houses. However, the most important fact was that the publishing of religious books in the spoken language let the Greek publishers of Venice have access to the market of the Greek mainland<sup>185</sup>.

It should not be overlooked that, apart from books of ancient Greek writers and poets as well as theological books, the Greek publishers of Venice also expressed

---

<sup>183</sup> Nicolas Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script & Type in the Fifteenth Century* (Sandy Hook: Chiswick, 1985); Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius, Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).

<sup>184</sup> Dimitris Kitsikis, *Ιστορία της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας, 1280-1924* (Athens: Εστία, 1988), 101-111.

<sup>185</sup> Constantine Hatzopoulos, *Ελληνικά Σχολεία στην περίοδο της Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας, 1453-1821* (Thessaloniki: Vaniias, 1991), 171-172.

their interest in publishing commercial books, manuals and dictionaries, books on mathematics and letter books, all written in the Greek vernacular<sup>186</sup>.

All such publishing activity, in conjunction with educational policy, contributed to the development of the modern Greek language. From the mid-seventeenth century, there are “on the one hand a few scholars that could understand the language of Aristotle and Plato and on the other hand, a whole world, that of progressive merchants and businessmen, who used the spoken and written colloquial language or the modern Greek language. Being a safe bond with the past, language was a benchmark for the self-consciousness of the Greeks”<sup>187</sup>.

In the seventeenth century, with the progress of the University of Padua and the Flanghinian School, the printing business in Venice increased. The educational institutions of the time created a large audience of pupils, students and scholars that multiplied the demand for new texts. To understand the scale of production, it is enough to refer to an element that we already know well from the period of the early eighteenth century. Between 1711 and 1731, the publishing house of Mello in Venice printed 2,900 books<sup>188</sup>. That means one book every two and a half days, a production that rivals the current records of production of today’s Greek publishing houses.

One of the most important printing houses of Venice was that of Nicholas Glykis, which was founded in 1670. It published the “Pentecostarion”, edited by George Sougdouris. The “Pentecostarion” is the liturgical book of the Orthodox Church used between Easter Sunday and the Feast of All Saints. The first time it was published in Venice was in 1579, but in its new editions, apart from religious hymns, it also included moral teachings. Also printed were the “Grammar” and “Introduction to Logic” of Sougdouris, the “Hungarian-Vlach History” by Matthew, while later, in the mid-eighteenth century, the “Epitome for the Logic of Aristotle”. Another example was the printing house of Andrea Ioulianos. Among many others, it printed the “Practical Arithmetic” and “Greek Grammar” by the monk Agapios Rigas. There was also the printing house of Nikolaos Saros which published 212 books. Among

<sup>186</sup> Maltezos, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*, 146.

<sup>187</sup> Maltezos, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*, 148, subnote 56.

<sup>188</sup> Ioannis Chassiotis, Olga Katsiardi-Hering, Evridiki A. Abatzi (eds), *Οι Έλληνες στη Διασπορά, 15ος - 21ος αι.* (Athens: Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2006).

them the “Pentecostarion” (1704) and the “Sequence of father Spyridon” (1710), by Peter Kasimatis<sup>189</sup>.

In summary, we could say that before the seventeenth century, the members of the Greek community in Venice had very strong feelings bringing them together around the same language, ethics, culture and religion. However, at the end of the seventeenth century, there emerged a latent change of purpose in the Greek Confraternity -a turn to some hidden political aspirations. This change is evident by the opening of Greek schools whose aim transcended knowledge and ventured to open the mind of the Greek students to their ethnic identity. Thereby the Greek Schools prepared, in eighteenth century, the conditions for the Greek awareness regarding the political situation of their occupied country.

#### **3.4.4. Relation of ethnic identity with social status**

The matter of the professional activities of the Greeks in Venice, especially of the members of the Confraternity Board who played leading roles against Typaldos’ initiatives, was of crucial importance<sup>190</sup>. As already mentioned<sup>191</sup>, for the most part, they consisted of merchants. This subsection emphasized the connection of their social status to matters included in this thesis under the general title of ethnic identity, such as their obsession with their Orthodox faith and culture, as well with their sense of belonging to the Greek “genos”.

The relationship between personal identity and social status<sup>192</sup> has been stressed by eminent psychologists who insist that the personal identity of the members of a group or community is influenced by their social status and their social interactions<sup>193</sup>.

---

<sup>189</sup> Constantine Staikos and Triantafyllos Sklavenitis (eds), *Πεντακόσια χρόνια έντυπης παράδοσης του Νέου Ελληνισμού (1499-1999)-Οδηγός της έκθεσης, Η εδραίωση της παραγωγής και της αγοράς του Ελληνικού βιβλίου στον διάσπαρτο Ελληνισμό της δύσης και της ανατολής* (Αθήνα: Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2000), 22.

<sup>190</sup> See subsection 2.4.4.

<sup>191</sup> See subsection 2.4.4.

<sup>192</sup> The *Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology* states that usually sociologists define status as a position occupied by an individual in a social system. However, here, it is also related with the notions of prestige and honour: see Max Weber, “Class, Status, Party”, in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. Hans H. Gerth, and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University, 1946), 180-195.

<sup>193</sup> Henri Tajfel, “Individuals and groups in social psychology”. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18 (1979), 183–190; also Henri Tajfel, and John C. Turner, “An integrative theory of

The attitudes, memories, behaviours, and emotions that define the members of a social group as distinguished individuals, as well as their self-image, are modified by their social environment and their adopted role, and also, by the prejudices relating to their social categorization. Therefore, subjective decisions are not only defined by the structural characteristics of the group (such as their position in the social hierarchy), but, in addition, by feelings that are developed in a fixed situation from the interpersonal and intergroup interactions.

The previously noted stand of social psychologists is reinforced by the views of anthropologists<sup>194</sup> who claim that the formation of consciousness and behaviour of social group members is deeply affected by cultural concerns connected with the sense of belonging to a group of people. When it comes to “ethnie”, as Smith says<sup>195</sup>, in which they have invested the memories of their past with strong symbolic rituals, mainly religious, then the ethnic identity of an individual is connected with the deeper feelings that this individual internalizes during his socialization.

The members of an ethnicity interact with each other; as a result, strong emotional reactions and a sense of “fair play” are developed for the best achievement of mutual goals. The wealthy Greek merchants of the seventeenth century continued to act like the Byzantine leaders, offering their wealth to public works, schools and churches, competing with or mimicking each other. There was no resemblance with the Catholic grand-bourgeoisie of Southern Europe, who dedicated their profits to frivolous pleasures<sup>196</sup>, nor with the Calvinists of the Northern Europe, who, as Weber argued<sup>197</sup>, supported a rational pursuit of economic gain, the creation of a financial surplus and the reinvestment of it. On the contrary, the Greek bourgeoisie<sup>198</sup>, who affected through their wealth the social relations, the existence and the future of the Greek Confraternity, was striving for more than financial power or social distinction. By keeping their religion and culture alive, they would dedicate a great deal of their

---

intergroup conflict”, in *The social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, ed. William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel (Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1979), 33–47.

<sup>194</sup> Eriksen, *Ethnic Identity*.

<sup>195</sup> Smith, *Ethnic Origins of Nations*.

<sup>196</sup> George Ritzer, *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classical Roots: The Basics* (McGraw-Hill, 2009), 35–37.

<sup>197</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Dover, 2003).

<sup>198</sup> For the term “bourgeoisie” see subsection 2.4.4, subnote 250.



assets for preserving the Orthodox faith<sup>199</sup> and for helping the “genos” which was under occupation<sup>200</sup>.

Truth be told, nobody could disagree with Andronikos Falangas when he doubts that the Greek merchants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could be considered “as the advocates of a Greek proto-nationalism”<sup>201</sup>. In general, they were not involved in revolutionary actions against Ottoman Empire. Rather the opposite, they collaborated with them and, exactly, due to this collaboration they won wealth and power all over Europe. However, it goes without saying that their actions were dominated by a profound ethnic spirit, parallel to trading; they would actively encourage their compatriots and country. References<sup>202</sup> have already been made to Greek residents of Venice, especially the ones of eminent families, who funded members of the community Board that vigorously fought against Typaldos’ movements. Their letters and last wills and testaments clearly depict their great devotion to the “genos” and their homeland.

In any case, the members of the Greek Confraternity in Venice lived in an atmosphere and era where matters of ethnic identity were acute. Indicatively, we refer to the atmosphere prevailing in the Flanghinian School during Typaldos years, under the supervision of Thomas Kattanis (1659-1725), who succeeds Typaldos in the administration of the Flanghinian School. In 1686, the Venetian Senate elected him as a senior professor of Philosophy at the University of Padua<sup>203</sup>.

The Kattanis family had fought for many decades in support of Venice. Five of Thomas Kattanis’ uncles had lost their lives on the battlefield of Chania in 1645, his father had also fought and been captured, Kattanis’ brother, Capitano Petro, was honoured for the heroic takeover of Nafplio in 1686. Back then, Thomas Kattanis

---

<sup>199</sup> A typical example is the taxation imposed by the Confraternity on all Greek ships that harboured in Venice, for the purpose of raising the money that was required for building the church of Saint George. (See subsection 2.4.1).

<sup>200</sup> For concrete information see subsection 2.4.4 “The professions of the Greeks in Venice”.

<sup>201</sup> Falangas, *Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants*, 7-21. In the p. 16, Falangas claims that “Proto-nationalism emerged mainly out of the circles of scholars and soldiers of the Greek Diaspora, who were inspired by their humanistic background and sought to liberate their brothers from a yoke considered barbaric. They constantly preached anti-Ottoman resistance and involved themselves in ambitious anti-Ottoman plants. Some of the more famous examples are the Humanist Janus Laskaris, who died in 1535 in Rome, and Charles V’s commander and first Greek prince of Moldavia, Jacob Vassilikos (1561-1563)”.

<sup>202</sup> See subsection 2.4.4

<sup>203</sup> See subsection 2.4.4

wrote four speeches on the heroic acts of Morosini and the Venetian army<sup>204</sup>. In his third speech, he asked Venetians to immediately take actions for the liberation of Greece. He made requests for his wishes to be heard. Otherwise, Greeks were ready to fight on their own, as the souls of the Greek “genos” had been deeply ingrained with the notions of connecting the old glorious past with the future. The Greeks, feeling strong, were able to accept the “good” and throw away the “evil”. That is why Kattanis believed that religious doctrines should be taken into consideration as fair game, especially when it comes to the liberation of Greece, “which unfortunately has placed its hopes in other peoples”<sup>205</sup>.

The students of the Flanghinian School had embraced Kattanis’ spirit. After the victories of Morosini, during 1685-1687 in Peloponnese, the students and their Illesian Academy organized a special event in order to thank the Venetian Senate and also seek the liberation of the remaining Greece. Next, they published a poetry collection (*Graeciae Obsequia Sentu Veneto*<sup>206</sup>), which although printed in 1716, was written earlier, as its subject refers to the Venetian victories in Peloponnese (in 1715, Venetians lost Peloponnesus once again). The collection begins with the salutation of the editors to the “Riformatori dello studio di Padova”, describing the consequences of the Ottoman occupation of Greece and their hope that Venice could act as its liberator<sup>207</sup>.

Within such an environment, the emotional reactions and the political initiatives of the Greek Confraternity members, and mostly its presidium, should be taken into consideration. By participating in social settings, such as families, schools, churches, or communities, which are not “invented” or “chosen”, the individual absorbs in the form of stereotypes the shared representations of his community, in relation to his origin and culture. These representations are so strong, that at critical points, when they confront others that jeopardize them, this turns the persons who convey such representations into fanatic supporters. Such a phenomenon was identified within the circles of the Greek Confraternity of Venice at Typaldos’ apostasy, when their interest in the “genos” and the homeland had become strong again through the controversies that had arisen. The same interest was expressed even more intensively from the mid

<sup>204</sup> Athanasios Karathanasis, *H Βενετία των Ελλήνων* (Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2010).

<sup>205</sup> Karathanasis, *H Βενετία των Ελλήνων*, 152.

<sup>206</sup> Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique*, 132.

<sup>207</sup> Karathanasis, *H Βενετία των Ελλήνων*, 159.

eighteenth century onwards i.e. during the era of the Greek Enlightenment<sup>208</sup>. It was when such interest was closely related to the European nationalist spirit of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the liberation of the Greek “genos” from the Ottoman occupation seemed to be closer than ever.

---

<sup>208</sup> Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 177-178; Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 205-208.

## CHAPTER FOUR: THE YEARS OF TURMOIL

-----

This chapter develops and comments on basic information available about the plans of Typaldos; they are based on letters and documents kept in the archives of Vaticano and the Hellenic Institute of Venice. The vision of Typaldos for creating a Uniate Church in the Greek territories under Venetian rule provoked accusations of apostasy and forced Typaldos to apologize to the Patriarch asking forbearance and charity. At the same time, however, he wrote the “Lettera” to a prominent person of the Venetian authorities, in which it is obvious that he supports the reunion between the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Catholic Church. All these contradictions of Typaldos, at least as they are manifested in the letters exchanged between himself and the Greek Confraternity, are thoroughly analysed, uncovering not only the open conflict between the two parts, but also the intentions of both.

### 4.1. The turn towards the Catholic creed

Meletios was an ambitious man. This is confirmed early on, from the time of his youth, when he lightly decided to leave his birthplace, the island of Cephalonia, to teach at the Flanghinian School. Without hesitation he abandoned the community and all the obligations he had taken on towards it, to teach the children and to preach the word of God in the churches. Immediately after his appointment as director of the Flanghinian School, just 28 years old, he announced his candidacy for the throne of Archbishop of Philadelphia. After his failure he did not give up. He continued to prepare the ground, and a few years later he managed to prevail. In 1685 at the age of 34 he was unanimously elected Archbishop of Philadelphia. Twelve years later, and at a much more mature age, he conceived his final plan and was ready to put it into action: to convert the Orthodox population of the Archdiocese to Catholicism and align with the policy that the “Unia” was introducing during that period with relative success amongst the Orthodox populations of the Balkan countries and many Italian cities.

After a thorough research into the sources it appears that the most likely assumption is that Meletios Typaldos was really aiming high. While acknowledging

how difficult it is to interpret someone's intentions through the study of a few and yet indicative personal letters, we may reasonably conclude that his actual plan was to build a new ecclesiastical order, that of "Unia"<sup>1</sup>. The argument that Typaldos' projections were limited to delivering his congregation to the Pope's authority and keeping the mere position of just another Cardinal for himself is not convincing. One reason why this does not seem probably is that the position of a Cardinal of the Catholic Church was not higher than that of the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church. Typaldos, even within the framework of his own doctrine, already held a very high rank as the only Archbishop who bore the title of Exarch of the Ecumenical Throne in the West: A position particularly important and interchangeable -if he would choose to present it as a "trophy" to the Western Church- with that of a Cardinal. From the research so far it does not appear that there was any request as such from Typaldos to the Pope, nor do we know of a negative response from the Roman Court. We are limited only to the reports written by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, an estranged friend of Typaldos, and the subsequent scholars of the History of the Greek community in Venice, who accused him of wishing to become a cardinal. Yet, Papadopoulos, in another version of a letter addressed to Chrysanthos, suggests that Typaldos' goal was none other than the throne of the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople.

There is however no clear evidence that he did not hope to become a Cardinal. Looking in the relatively recent past of that era, the only other relevant example is that of Bessarion<sup>2</sup>. Bessarion, after his anointment as a Cardinal, while also being Archbishop of Nicaea, departed from Constantinople -where the unionists were treated with resentment- and joined the Western Church. As a Cardinal he participated in the conclave for the election of the Pope. He even put himself forward as a candidate for the throne of Rome twice (1455 and 1458), losing out by just a few votes both times. Nobody can be absolutely certain whether Typaldos' innermost

---

<sup>1</sup> An anonymous note, written after Typaldos' death, in the Greek Confraternity's archives, highlights this ambition: "On the 26<sup>th</sup> of March of the year 1685, a blessing for the Nation, the Hierarch Meletios Typaldos was elected Archbishop of St. George of the Greeks; he was trained and supported by the contribution and the true generosity of the Nation to the Flanginian School. The Metropolitan Council deems to have elected a person who, as a true son of the Church, would recognize the benefactions that were given by the Church and the Metropolitan Council that leads it. By raising to this office this most valuable Hierarch does not realize his ambitious idea, which would be to create a Patriarchate. Let us then, in this difficult moment, address him with the title of Patriarch". See Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνειος*, 99.

<sup>2</sup> Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*; Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, 25-35.

thoughts were to follow Bessarion's path, aiming at involvement in the conclave or even at the pontiff's throne. The most plausible conclusion one could reach is that Typaldos wanted as a leader to turn to the Western Church, but not alone. By pulling the population of his Church with him, namely the Greek Orthodox of which he was the spiritual leader as Archbishop of Philadelphia, he would actually gain great spiritual and political power.

The actions of Typaldos, his education and the relationships he created both with the Venetian Authorities and with many Greek scholars, suggest that the ultimate goal of his efforts -long and systematic- was to establish a third ecclesiastical pole between east and west in order to become he himself the Patriarch of this new ecclesiastic pole. The new formation would combine the Western Doctrine with the rituals of the Eastern Orthodox Church according to the standards of Uniate Churches. At the same time it would draw inspiration from Western theological and philosophical thinking<sup>3</sup>. This new ecclesiastical arrangement would include the hundreds of thousands of Orthodox population living in Venice, Italy, the Dalmatian coast, the Ionian Islands and the Peloponnese.

One view was that Typaldos sought ascension to the throne of Patriarch of Constantinople<sup>4</sup>. It does seem possible that Typaldos' deepest desire was his ascension to the throne of Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, a position that he believed to be second in rank of hierarchy after the Pope. Although such an interpretation seems excessive at the first reading, and although there is no evidence to suggest that any moves were made within the circles of influence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople -among high-ranking officials of Orthodox hierarchy- that aimed to find allies, an interpretation as such should not be ruled out without any argument.

There are at least two elements that one has to take into account during the review of the above hypothesis. The first is that the Western Church, by declaring the supremacy of the Pope, sometimes sought the union of the Churches in a violent way -such as during the Crusades- some other times through dialogue -such as in the Council of Florence. The supremacy of the Pope was never disputed, which due to the

<sup>3</sup> Concretely, in *Synthesis* he refers to Thomas Aquinas and John Scotus. See subsection 2.3.2.

<sup>4</sup> See subsection. 4.3.4, the letter of Nicholas Komninos Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras.

pressures exerted by Emperor John VIII Paleologos was temporarily accepted even by the Orthodox delegation at the Council of Florence (1439). So, occupation of the Patriarchal throne in Constantinople could be pursued in the light of the Union of the Churches. A unionist Patriarch would probably solve the theological and political differences created by the schism. However, such a move had to be assisted by powerful political actors and certainly by government entities that would be able to impose a unionist Patriarch. Since the Patriarchate was under the auspices of Ottomans, only the latter could be considered able to impose a similar change.

At this point it is appropriate to mention a plan, in a period near Typaldos' time, to take over the Patriarchate throne of Constantinople, which could be described as a "Vatican conspiracy against the Patriarchate". In August of 1671 the newly elected Bailo (ambassador) of Venice in Constantinople, Giacomo Quirini, in a report<sup>5</sup> presented to the Senate is detailing that just before leaving to undertake his duties he was visited by the Nuncio of the Holy See, who suggested a plot to overthrow the elected Patriarch and elect a unionist Bishop in his place. The Bailo's report states that he rejected the proposal of the Nuncio by saying that the Venetian aristocracy does not interfere in such matters. According to the report the Nuncio identified eight Bishops of the Eastern Church as being secretly Catholic and ardent devotees of the Union of the two Churches. Those were: Ignatius of Chios, Jacob of Andros, Joseph of Samos, Parthenios of Mytilene, Parthenios of Methymna, Zacharias of Naxos and Theophanes (not mentioning the diocese)<sup>6</sup>. According to the Nuncio these bishops were afraid to reveal their unionist feelings but they considered that the time was right to elect one of them –anyone the Propaganda Fide would choose– to replace the Patriarch.

It was a period in which every few months the Patriarch was changing, and within the Eastern Church alliances and confrontations were frequent and intense. The Nuncio also notified the Bailo that the Bishop of Naxos already travelled to Rome and made arrangements with the Holy See. The Pope in his turn would convince the Emperor of Vienna, the King of France and the Venetian aristocracy to support this

---

<sup>5</sup> Constantine D. Mertzios, "Πατριαρχικά, ήτοι ανέκδοτοι πληροφορίες σχετικά προς τους Πατριάρχας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως από του 1556-1702", *Πραγματεία της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 15/4 (1951), 79.

<sup>6</sup> Mertzios, *Πατριαρχικά*, 80.

change<sup>7</sup>. The Orthodox hierarchs -always according to the Nuncio- were unwilling to express their plan in writing, because if it fell into the hands of Turks or “Schismatics” (meaning Orthodox) their life would be severely at risk. The new unionist Patriarch would recognize the supremacy of the Pope and would expel the “Schismatic bishops” (meaning Orthodox) and replace them by unionists.

The Nuncio, in order to convince the Venetian Official that the Serenissima should follow the plan of the Holy See, refers at length to Patriarch Cyril Lucaris stressing that although he was dethroned four times, he returned to the throne five times because he enjoyed “the protection of the Dutch Ambassador”<sup>8</sup>. He also said that Patriarch Neophytos stayed on the throne for 21 years (he actually stayed for just six years 1602-1603 and 1607-1612) “thanks to the protection of the English Ambassador”<sup>9</sup>.

It is obvious that during the Thirty Years War the Holy See, irritated by the actions of the aforementioned Patriarchs<sup>10</sup> and the relationships developed with the reformers some years earlier, tried to enforce the Union of the two Churches with purely authoritarian political means. The plan failed because Venice refused to consent<sup>11</sup> and this denial gives us an additional interesting aspect. That Typaldos could not expect much from the Venetian authorities as they remained neutral in religious conflicts outside their own territories. The project was developed only 14 years prior to Typaldos’ election as Archbishop of Philadelphia and no one can rule out that he was informed about these efforts of the Pope.

After the conquest of the Peloponnese (1685) the Venetians turned to the Orthodox Archbishop Typaldos asking for his advice on how to rule the Orthodox Church of their new acquisition, not wanting to offer it to the Western Church. They knew that the Greek Orthodox of the Aegean islands and many other Greek regions were in constant conflicts with the Catholic hierarchs who tried to introduce their own

<sup>7</sup> Mertzios, *Πατριαρχικά*, 80.

<sup>8</sup> Mertzios, *Πατριαρχικά*, 80.

<sup>9</sup> Mertzios, *Πατριαρχικά*, 80.

<sup>10</sup> See section 2.2 where an extensive reference about Cyril Lucaris was already made.

<sup>11</sup> Mertzios, *Πατριαρχικά*, 79.



doctrine, and for this reason they obviously did not want to create any new social unrest<sup>12</sup>.

As a result of the above it is likely that Typaldos aimed to create a new, third, ecclesiastical order between the East and the West rather than being anointed as a Cardinal. It may not be a mere coincidence that other scholars refer to Typaldos as a Uniate<sup>13</sup>. It is probable that Typaldos wanted to become the head of all Orthodox people living in Western Greece which were under the Venetian regime. Maybe Typaldos' vision was to become a Patriarch of "Unia" in the Venetian territories extending along the Eastern Adriatic and the Ionian Sea, to Crete, after breaking up the Eastern Orthodox Church and taking away its congregation.

It is worthwhile to remember that the policy of "Unia", in order for an ethnic group to join it, was based either on political authority -as in the cases of Poland and Transylvania- or on the local highest rank hierarch (as in Romania). For all Greek populations the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople was the only religious leader and the unique spiritual guidance. Given that they were under Ottoman rule there was not any authority -religious or political- to lead them towards "Unia".

However, the Greeks at that time were unintentionally divided into two political camps: One in the Ottoman Empire under the Sultan ruling mainland Greece, Crete and the Aegean islands and the other under the Venetian authority ruling the Peloponnese and the Ionian islands. We mentioned that the Patriarch had already gained privileges from Muhammad the Conqueror, and despite the tensions with the High Porte a solution was always found between the secularist Ottoman state and the representatives of the Orthodox Church. In the West, however, the Catholic view prevailed. Here the Greek Orthodox's were considered Schismatic. Therefore, to have a new Patriarch for the Western regions of Greece and the Adriatic -under Venetian and not Turkish rule- was a plan that he believed might find allies both in the Papal Court and among the Venetian authorities.

---

<sup>12</sup> Mihalaga, *Συμβολή στην Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία της Πελοποννήσου*, 213-279.

<sup>13</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 170; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 174; B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol. 37r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore*.

Therefore, from the beginning of the 1690's, Typaldos started to look for allies. According to the Pope's records in Rome<sup>14</sup>, Typaldos wanted to be ordained by Catholic bishops after his election, surprising even the Pope. Two Latin bishops were even sent there, who arrived in Venice after his ordination by the Orthodox Bishops. According to the Vatican archives,

Di fatti sotto li 4 marzo 1686 furono dalla Congregazione di Propaganda [...] nati due Vescovi Cattolici per mandarli in Venezia a fare dette Consacrazione, ma il Tepaldi, vedendo tardare la venuta dei detti vescovi [...] ci, si fece vincere dal partito dei scismatici e nel medesimo anno [...] la consagrazione da vescovi scismatici. Ciò fece svanire tutte [...] speranze che nell'elezione di tal prelado aveva concepite la [...] onde dalla segretaria di Stato non egli nelle lettere di Officio chiamato con altro titolo, se non di Pseudo-vescovo. Diede però questo[...] vedere in una conferenza avuta col nunzio in giugno 1690 che [...] egli ricevuta la consagrazione da Vescovi scismatici fatti venire da [...] era provenuto unicamente dal non aver avuta da Roma alcuna [...] nell'istanza da lui fatta per avere i Vescovi Cattolici e che mai do[...] ciò attribuirsi a di lui mala credulità, mentre egli conservava que[...] lici sentimenti, ne' quali era stato fin dalla sua fanciullezza ed || [f.81r] in segno di che non ebbe egli difficoltà alcuna di fare sotto li 28 luglio 1690 alla presenza del Nunzio e del Sacro Inquisitore di Venezia la sua professione di Fede secondo la formola prescritta da Urbano VIII, per gli Orientali; desiderò però che tal sua professione di fede si tenesse occulta, per non irritare contro di sé l'animo dei scismatici e così torsi il mezzo da potersi dolcemente ridurre alla sana credenza<sup>15</sup>.

Since then, Typaldos acted as a Catholic bishop. This fact is confirmed by the Vatican authorities, stating that:

(Typaldos) non solamente trasse vari scismatici alla cattolica unione, ma abrogò nella chiesa di San Giorgio l'ufficio del Palamà dai scismatici tenuto per santo, e tolse dal canone della messala commemorazione del Patriarca Costantinopolitano che avevano

<sup>14</sup> Some of these details are given in Birtachas, “Στα χνάρια ενός ‘υποψηφίου Βησσαρίωνα’”, 167-182.

<sup>15</sup> A.P.F. Miscelanea Diverse V.35, fols.80v-81r; Congregazioni Particolari, vol.31, fols. 216r-216v; Acta, vol.56, fols. 52v-53r. In free translation: “Actually, on the 4<sup>th</sup> of March, 1686, two catholic bishops were elected by the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide with a view to be sent to Venice for the ordination of Typaldos. However, their late arrival urged Typaldos to be ordained by Orthodox bishops (who had already arrived in Venice). This fact displeased the Vatican Secretariat and Typaldos was consequently characterized as a ‘Pseudo-vescovo’. In June 1690, in an interview to the Nuncio, Typaldos explained why he consented to be ordained by Orthodox priests, claiming that he accepted such procedure as there was no response from Rome with regard to his request. He confessed that he maintained his Catholic beliefs with which he was educated in his childhood. He even requested from the Nuncio to sign the Catholic confession of faith issued by Pope Urban VIII. But he kept his ‘accession’ to Catholicism secret in order to be able to slowly enter the healthy faith”.

introdotta li vescovi scismatici suoi antecessori. Per questo di lui zelo non solo fu riconosciuto dalla Santa Sede per legittimo vescovo, ma n'ebbe vari contrasegni di gradimento, con essere stato dal Sommo Pontefice anche ad insinuazione della Repubblica premiato di un annua pensione di scudi due cento sopra una Badia di Brescia. Non gli mancarono però de' malevoli e persecutori, quali attribuendo tutto il suo zelo a puro interesse non solo procuravano slontanare dalla di lui comunione molti Greci, ma cominciarono a porre in dubbio la di lui giurisdizione sopra la chiesa di San Giorgio<sup>16</sup>.

Thus a secret cooperation began between Typaldos and the Nuncio who passed on to the Pope occasional requests by the Archbishop for moral and material support for his work. More concretely in the Vatican Archives is reported that:

Hora di nuovo espone l'Arcivescovo alla Santità di Nostro Signore trovarsi angustiato in coscienza per dover afaciarsi ad una Chiesa sin fora scismatica || [f. 121r] nella quale, benché habbia guadagnato aleati de principali ad unirsi con la Chiesa Latina, non gli dà l'animo di continuare [...] Supplica perciò d'essere mandato in Morea o in qualch'altra parte dove sperarebbe ad ripiegarsi con più frutto, tanto più ch'essendosi penetrato che habbia fatto la professione della fede, corre pericolo d'essere discacciato rimaner privo d'ogni mezzo per vivere<sup>17</sup>.

This attempt, which could not remain secret, started to cause reactions amongst the Orthodox Greeks living in Venice. As it was mentioned earlier, Typaldos felt the need to send a letter to the Patriarch in 1692 in order to respond to the rumours against him. Patriarch Callinicos II wrote back that he does not believe these rumours and continues to extend his support<sup>18</sup>. So in the period after that Meletios moved on

---

<sup>16</sup> A.P.F. Miscelanea Diverse V.35, fols.80v-81r, English translation: "Typaldos led numerous schismatics to the catholic union and repealed the Holy Day of Gregory Palamas in the temple of Saint George, honored as a saint by the schismatics. He also stopped invoking the Patriarch of Constantinople in the Mass, something that had been introduced by his predecessors, who were schismatic bishops. His diligence was appreciated both by the Holy See who recognized him as a regular bishop and by the Supreme Pontiff and the Republic of Venice, who gave him an annual grant of 200 scudi by the Monastery of Brescia. However, some vicious opponents attributed his diligence to purely personal interest; they tried to alienate a lot of Greeks from his circle and questioned his authority in the temple of Saint George".

<sup>17</sup> A.P.F. Acta Vol. 62, fol. 121r, English translation: "As regards the Archbishop, he is in a disturbed condition as he has to participate in a Church which has been Schismatic, || [fol.121r] and although he has numerous allies for the union with the Latin Church, he receives no encouragement to move on. [...]. Therefore, he requests to be sent in Peloponnese or any other place where he hopes that his contribution will be more fruitful, as from the time he joined the Catholicism and confessed his faith, he is in danger of not making ends meet".

<sup>18</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 756, 759-760; Also Agamemnon Tselikas, "Κατάλογος των Πατριαρχικών γραμμάτων (1546-1806) του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας μετά συμπληρώσεων και διορθώσεων της εκδόσεως Ι. Βελούδου", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 10 (1973), 229-232.

faster towards achieving his goal. Between January 1693 and August 1695 he organized the approach towards the Catholic Church.

The most important evidence of Typaldos' efforts to accomplish his plans on the unification of the Churches consists of two letters sent by Giuseppe Archinto (1651-1712)<sup>19</sup> in Sacra Congregazione (de propaganda fide) in May 1693. This is Archinto, who was later (1699-1712) confirmed Catholic Bishop of Milan when Typaldos was Apostolic Nuncio to Venice and at the same time was awarded with the honorary title of the Archbishop of Thessaloniki.

The first letter sent by Archinto on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of May 1693<sup>20</sup> reveals that Typaldos, by using Giovanni Batista Bedetti – a priest in the Church of “San Filippo de Neri” – as an intermediary, expressed his wish that the Pope approve his trip to the Peloponnese in order to accompany the Doge of Venice, Francesco Morosini, on his campaign. Archinto, as a Nuncio to Vatican, addresses the Sacra Congregazione supporting Typaldos' wish. While Archinto knew that the Greek Church in Venice continued to follow the Orthodox dogma he asserted that Typaldos' obedience to the Catholic Church was granted and that while absent he would be replaced by another Archbishop with Catholic religious views, as the Venetian Authorities would not allow the “Schismatics” (i.e. the Orthodox Greeks) to elect one of theirs as an archbishop.

However, special emphasis should be laid on the fact that Archinto, referring to Typaldos' wish to accompany the Doge on his trip to Western Greece, states that the archbishop's incentives are: “...I disegni che nordisce di procurare il bene spirituale de suoi nazionali con la riunione loro nel grembo della S.M. Chiesa et all' ubidienza de Sua Beatitudine”<sup>21</sup>. This was the first hint -by a Catholic Cardinal actually- regarding Typaldos' intentions regarding the unification of the two Churches. Archinto describes Typaldos as an honest clergyman who was not motivated by personal ambitions but by his eagerness and sensitivity to ensure that the conditions for his compatriots would contribute to their social progress.

<sup>19</sup> Elvira Gencarelli, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, V.3 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961), 767-768.

<sup>20</sup> A.P.F. Sacra Congregazione greci vol 1, fol 422r-v (more recent numbering 279 r-v).

<sup>21</sup> English translation: “to promote his plans so as his fellow nationals enjoy spiritual goods through their unification to the Church and their obedience to His Blessing”.

According to the APF records, on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May 1693, the Sacra Congregazione was convened, chaired by the Pope, with a view to discuss Archinto's request. No evidence has been found on the reply given by the Sacra Congregazione. However, the second letter<sup>22</sup> sent by Archinto to Cardinal Altieri Paluzzo<sup>23</sup>, secretary of the Congregazione, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May 1693, reveals that, although the Sacra Congregazione probably gave a positive answer, the whole plan of Typaldos and Morosini was after all cancelled.

The reason for the cancellation was that the Senate considered that such a movement could harm the interests of Serenissima, as it would cause conflicts between the Orthodox citizens -and therefore they would ally with the Ottomans against Venice- and so the Senate did not give its approval to proceed with the execution of the plan<sup>24</sup>. Thereafter the Papal Court chose to place Latin bishops in Peloponnese.

In the meantime, as Archinto assures Cardinal Altieri Paluzzo, the intentions of Archbishop Typaldos are to help: “proseguisca ne' suoi buoni propositi, come lodevolmente e con frutto va facendo nella direttione della chiesa sua nazionale, rendendosi degno della protezione e delle gratie della Santa Sede et all' Eccellenza Vostra”<sup>25</sup>.

It should be noted that Archinto had developed close personal relations with Pope Alexander VIII<sup>26</sup>. The latter was an ardent supporter of the Catholic dogma and tried to relieve the Catholic Church of anything “heretical” that could jeopardize the cohesion of the Latin Church. Before becoming a Pope, he served as a Bishop in Brescia, the region where the monastery that provided Typaldos with an annual income of 200 scudi was located. Archinto does not seem to have maintained the same relations with Pope Innocent XII, as the latter sent him to Madrid at a time when its relations with Rome were strained. As a result, Typaldos lost the advocate he

---

<sup>22</sup> A.P.F. Sacra Congregazione Greci vol 1, fol. 423r.

<sup>23</sup> Altieri (Paluzzi degli Albertoni) Paluzzo, Stella A., *DBI*, vol. 2 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960), 561-564.

<sup>24</sup> A.P.F. Acta, vol.62, fols.120r-122v; Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali, vol.512, fols. 198r-202v, 205r, 206r, 208r-209v, 211r; Scritture riferite nei Congressi, Archipelago, Balcani, Candia, Grecia, vol.6, fols. 272r-272v; Congregazioni Particolari (CP) fols. 14r, 33r-37v.

<sup>25</sup> English translation: “he keeps directing his national Church in a supportive and constructive way, becoming therefore qualified for protection and grace by the Holy See and your Excellence”.

<sup>26</sup> Armando Petrucci, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, V.2 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960), 215-219.

seems to have had within the papal environment up to that time. What is more, Morosini passed away in 1694 and Typaldos was actually left alone both within the Catholic Church and the Venetian Administration, something that forced him to seek out new opportunities for the promotion of his plans.

Among other moves made by Typaldos to realize his plans was to form a list of 44 Orthodox Greeks who joined the Catholic creed<sup>27</sup>. In the margin of this list Typaldos added another 13 names<sup>28</sup> in his own hand-writing. Amongst them we see the name of his closest associate, the deacon Elias Meniates<sup>29</sup>. Meniates, who is currently considered by the Orthodox Church as a significant hierarch, escaped the anathema, because a few years later he left Typaldos and denounced him to the Patriarch.

The exact time when Typaldos conceived his full plan is not clear. It is possible that he was working on it for a number of years. However, there are some historical facts showing when he started to have justified hopes that his plan could become a reality. During the 1680s and 1690s the Venetian forces were fighting in the Peloponnese, Crete, the Aegean islands and other regions of the Greek mainland. The Venetians started to recapture the Peloponnese from the Turks in 1685 under Francesco Morosini's leadership<sup>30</sup>. Although they gained many territories, not only in the south of Greece but in the north as well, they only managed to include the Peloponnese in their dominion in November 1698 after the Karlowitz treaty. The capture of the Peloponnese by the Venetians for the second time seems to have been the turning point for Meletios Typaldos and his further actions. In 1697 the Proveditor of the Peloponnese, Polo Nani<sup>31</sup>, requested Meletios Typaldos to prepare a report for him about the functioning of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Ionian Sea. Typaldos

<sup>27</sup> Giorgio Fedalto, "Appunti inediti sulla comunità dei greci veneziani nella corrispondenza dell'oratoriano, padre Giambatista Bedetti 1623-1697", in *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1974), 329-335.

<sup>28</sup> Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 158.

<sup>29</sup> See 2.4.3, subnote 226.

<sup>30</sup> Chassiotis, *Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως*, 19-35; Chassiotis, *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης*, 187; Vakalopoulos, *Τουρκοκρατία*.

<sup>31</sup> The brothers Polo and Antonio Nani came from a family of nobles of the Venetian Aristocracy. The Nani family left Torcello in 790 and moved to Rialto. Members of this family were army generals, Knights and Procuratori. Polo Nani, whom Typaldos is addressing, was born on 23 March 1645 and died in October 1697, just as he was nominated Proveditor General in Morea. His brother, Antonio, took the same office in 1709. See Bobou-Stamati, "Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα", 135.

handed in an analytical report about the current affairs in the Ionian region<sup>32</sup>. He also suggested ideas for the government of the Orthodox Church in the Ionian Islands and some ways to assist the Venetians in controlling the Orthodox population. He emphasized that it was in the interest of the Venetians to control the Orthodox people in the regions of the Ionian Sea and the Peloponnese. Knowing that the Greeks were deeply religious, he suggested that a way of controlling them was to understand their spiritual needs and -most importantly- to understand how to treat their priests.

The relationship between the Venetian leadership and the Orthodox Church is described in two reports written in that period. The first one is written on 13 January 1690 by Giacomo Corner, the Proveditor of the Peloponnese<sup>33</sup>. The second one was written on 12 May 1691 by the financial auditors Marino Michiel and Domenico Gritti<sup>34</sup>. Another two reports were written at the beginning of the next century. Both of them are written by people serving at the office of the Proveditor of the Peloponnese. The first one was written in 1701 by Francesco Grimani<sup>35</sup> and the second in 1708 by Angelo Emo<sup>36</sup>. All these reports describe the situation of the Greek Church, and especially of the clergymen, in the darkest of colours. According to the Venetian reports the Orthodox clergymen and their leadership were uneducated and in most cases greedy<sup>37</sup>.

Some Greek scholars (at the end of the nineteenth century) reach different conclusions in their attempt to interpret the way in which the Venetians approached the Orthodox creed in the Greek regions. Spyridon Lambrou<sup>38</sup> thinks that despite the religious tolerance which characterized the Venetians, it seems that they did not take

<sup>32</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 135-153.

<sup>33</sup> Spyridon Lambrou, “Η περί Πελοποννήσου έκθεσις του Βενετού Προνοητού Κορνέρ”, *Δελτίον της Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής Εταιρίας της Ελλάδος*, 2 (1885), 282-317; Agamemnon Tselikas, “Μεταφράσεις βενετικών εκθέσεων περί Πελοποννήσου Β”, *Πελοποννησιακά*, 17 (1989), 127-152.

<sup>34</sup> The reports of the financial auditors are mentioned for Marino Michiel, by Spyridon Lambros, *Ιστορικά Μελετήματα* (Athens: Παλαμήδης, 1884), 199-220; Tselikas, *Μεταφράσεις βενετικών εκθέσεων*, 141-160. For Domenico Gritti, see Peter Topping, “Domenico Gritti’s Relation on the Organization of Venetian Morea 1688- 1691”, in *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1974), 311-313; Tselikas, *Μεταφράσεις βενετικών εκθέσεων*, 161-171.

<sup>35</sup> Lambrou, *Η περί Πελοποννήσου έκθεσις*.

<sup>36</sup> Lambrou, *Η περί Πελοποννήσου έκθεσις*, 650, 696-698.

<sup>37</sup> Panagiotis Chiotis, “Relatione dell’ eccel<sup>mo</sup> signor Domenico Gritti, ritornato dalla carica di Sindico e catasticator del regno di Morea letta nel eccel<sup>mo</sup> Senato l’anno 1692”, *Φιλίστωρ*, 2 (1861), 227; Spyridon Lambros, “Σημειώσεις περί της εν Πελοποννήσω βενετοκρατίας”, *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 20 (1926), 64-65, 197 and *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 21, (1927) 374.

<sup>38</sup> Lambrou, *Η περί Πελοποννήσου έκθεσις*.

into consideration the severe poverty evident in the appearance of the clergymen and the destitution of most of the churches. This description, Lambrou claims, is aligned with the economic situation not only of the clergymen but of the entire region, as well. Pericles Zerlentis has quite an opposite view to the one presented by Spyridon Lambrou. He thinks that the Venetians were full of hatred against the Greek Orthodox Church<sup>39</sup>. He notes that they pretended to show respect to the Orthodox priests and hierarchs, because they wanted to have them on their side during the wars with the Turks. In fact, according to Zerlentis, the Venetians scorned the Greek Church and, because of it, they tried to establish Catholic monastic orders in the regions they conquered. In support of his views, he relates, inter alia, the fact that the Venetians had forbidden the Orthodox Churches of the Peloponnese under their rule to receive income support from the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in an attempt to break the relationship of the Orthodox Greeks with their natural spiritual leader, the Patriarch of Constantinople. This irked the Patriarch of Constantinople Callinicos II and he wrote against the prelates of the Peloponnese criticizing them for the particular zeal with which they applied the Venetian commands and were ready to secede from the Patriarchal throne<sup>40</sup>.

We should, therefore, examine the report<sup>41</sup> written by Meletios Typaldos about the Orthodox clergy in the regions conquered by the Venetians through the prism of these events and views. Most likely Typaldos saw in the face of Paolo Nani the opportunity he was looking for. Reading the introduction of his letter, it appears that he had a good personal relationship with the Venetian nobleman. After thanking him for the great honour, he proceeds to state his ideas and counsels analytically. Apart from the introduction, in the first part of his letter he speaks about the Orthodox hierarchs. He refers to the bishops of the Ionian Islands that were under Venetian rule. He obviously states his intention to take over, as the Archbishop of Philadelphia, the responsibility for that part of the Orthodox Church. He starts by advising the Venetian Proveditor to ask the bishops of Cephalonia and Zakynthos, the bishop of Lefkada and the head-priest of Corfu to present the documents of their official election. He mentions the documents issued by the Ecumenical Patriarch which the above

<sup>39</sup> Pericles Zerlentis, *Η εν Πελοποννήσω Ελληνική Εκκλησία επί Ενετών: Έτεσι 1685-1715* (Athens: Καραβίας, 1921), 8.

<sup>40</sup> Mihalaga, *Συμβολή στην Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία της Πελοποννήσου*, 195.

<sup>41</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 135-153.



mentioned hierarchs should have to legally hold their offices. He emphasizes that in case there are any violations the bishops should be subject to penalties. It is possible that Typaldos was thinking that any such violation could remove the bishops of the Ionian Islands from their thrones. His intention to become the dominant figure in the ecclesiastical arena of the region himself is shown a bit further. In his report to Nani he attaches the two Patriarchic decisions from previous years. These two texts are most likely the decisions issued by the Patriarchs Parthenios and Ioannicius, in 1644 and 1653 respectively<sup>42</sup>. In their decisions the two leaders of the Eastern Orthodox Church were giving to the Archbishop of Philadelphia the title of “Exarch”. This also includes the right to rule the whole Orthodox population living under Venetian Occupation. And, most importantly, they gave the Archbishop of Philadelphia the right to ordain bishops.

At this point we should remember a historical fact; that is, the right to ordain that was granted to the Archbishops of Philadelphia<sup>43</sup>. We are mentioning this because this privilege of Typaldos has been, in our view, the first means Typaldos used in trying to realize his goals. It had been the Patriarch Ioannicius who had extended the privileges of 1644 in 1653 and granted the Archbishop of Philadelphia the right to ordain the bishops of Western Greece without prior permission from the Patriarchate, under one condition: each elected Archbishop of Philadelphia should personally visit Constantinople to receive this right officially. However, as mentioned before, Typaldos was elected according to the customs by the Orthodox Confraternity of Venice without visiting Constantinople, obviously because the decision of Ioannicius was no longer enforceable. He was ordained within a year after his election and it took another two years for his official recognition by the Ecumenical Throne. Therefore it was obvious that the decisions issued in 1644 and 1653 were not relevant in his case. He could not claim the privileges enjoyed by his predecessors, to be the leader of all priests and hierarchs and the whole Orthodox population in all the regions occupied by Venice. So the suggestion of Paolo Nani presents to Typaldos a golden opportunity to reaffirm his privileges, by attaching in his letter addressed to him the decisions of 1644 and 1653, to indirectly suggest the following: firstly, that it was correct that Nani was addressing him, not only because he had met him and

---

<sup>42</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 135-153.

<sup>43</sup> Its history and reasoning was analytically mentioned in subsection 2.4.2.

respected him, but also because he had the leading office in all the Venetian conquests. Secondly, that he was the one that the Venetian leadership should entrust with the hierarchical ruling of their conquests from now on. And this was so because it was proper to have a Venetian subject – such as himself – ruling the Orthodox Venetian subjects. He suggested, indirectly, that he himself, being under the control of the Doge and the Senate, would be more cooperative than anyone else. He did not mention directly that it was an error to believe that these areas are ruled by the Patriarchate in Constantinople. He did not try to cause a conflict between the Venetians and the Patriarch. He took steady, slow steps.

The fact that he asked to have the legality of the election and ordainment of the bishops of the Ionian Islands and the head-priest of Corfu checked, leads to the conclusion that Typaldos, after achieving his goal, would go looking for a reason to change these persons and appoint others, under his influence. In his report addressed to Nani he called most of the clergymen uneducated. He describes their way of life in dark colours. He emphasized the issue of Simony, and suggests ways to cure the problems. At this point it is clear that Typaldos is exaggerating<sup>44</sup>. Even if one accepts the description given in the two reports of the Venetians and even Lambros' comments on the state of the clergy (as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter), it should be noted that in that period there were important persons who served as priests in the Ionian Islands who were distinguished for their virtue and activity as preachers. Further, it is a fact that Typaldos himself was also a teacher and preacher in Cephalonia, in the period after his graduation from Venice and Padua. In the same period when Typaldos was writing his report to Nani, one of the prominent figures of the Church was Methodios Anthracites, whom we mentioned before.

Typaldos was also writing about the situation of the churches. He divided the churches into three categories: the “cross-founded” which are directly under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch; the chapels; and the monastery churches. There were also private churches which were under the jurisdiction of the Senate. The latter was in charge because it accepted the request forwarded by a civilian asking for permission to build the church. Regarding the first category of churches, he proposes for them to stay under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch, so as to maintain peaceful relations

<sup>44</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 153.

between Venice and the Patriarchate. For all the other churches he proposes extensive scrutiny, to find any possible abuses. He also suggests proceeding with electing new priests who will be more educated than the existing priests. He mentions that many laymen decide to become priests or monks in order to avoid serving in the army. So he suggests enforcing more serious criteria for those who wish to become priests and use all possible means, even to pay the hierarchs. Finally he notes that it would be beneficial for the Orthodox priests to copy one of the customs of the Catholic priests: to have the obligation to lodge with the government a list with the names of the people they give the communion to, at least at Christmas and Easter.

Typaldos' report ends with the wish that his ideas will assist in the better organization and operation of the Greek Orthodox clergy, both in the Ionian Islands and the rest of the regions conquered by Venice (he obviously refers to the Peloponnese).

The fact that Typaldos is greatly interested in taking up the part of the religious leadership of Western Greece can be easily inferred from his letter to Nani. The question relates to the underlying causes that instigate such an interest. His ambition has been already identified. But no one has valid reasons to claim that he is not really interested in the living and intellectual improvement of the Greek Orthodox clergy and churches. At one point even, the letter notes, that although many of the faults he found within the Orthodox Church were incurable “nelli Greci dello stato barbaro, se moderi almeno ne Greci dello statto Christiano Veneto”<sup>45</sup>.

Creating a Uniate Church, undoubtedly would contribute to their economic improvement and their organizational betterment. As for the spiritual, it should be noted that the Catholic clergy of the time, due to the Papal discipline and control, presented qualities that were missing in the Orthodox clergy.

It was clear that for the Archbishop of Venice doctrinal differences were not of much importance. He had shown this by the way he lived his life, his pragmatism, and apparently he had accepted the logic of the powerful Western institutions, e.g. his respect to the Venetian authorities and to the Papal power. Carrying these concepts, when faced with the comparison between, on one hand, the societies of the West and

---

<sup>45</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 147. English translation: “for Greeks living in a barbaric state, at least will be moderated to be Greeks of Christian Venice”.

their rapid acculturation, the trade growth and their involvement with the ancient Greek spirit, and on the other, the Ottoman Empire and the rigidity of the Orthodox Patriarchate, Typaldos clearly preferred the first. This conclusion is reinforced by the letters he wrote during the decade of 1690, as will be seen below.

## 4.2. Accusations of apostasy

Not much information is available about him covering that period of his life. We catch up with things again before the end of the first decade of the new century. Typaldos was now being accused by some Greeks that he wants to change his mitre for a cardinal's skullcap. He was literally being accused of changing his faith, converting to Catholicism, and wanting to change the faith of the Greeks too. The first public reaction occurred on Sunday August 19 1694 when, after the ceremony, members of the Confraternity gathered and asked to repeat elections for the Archbishop, aiming to persecute Typaldos and place somebody else in this position<sup>46</sup>.

When Typaldos answered to the Patriarch<sup>47</sup> he refuted the accusations of apostasy, while in a letter to a prominent person of the Venetian authorities, as will be discussed in the following section under the title "Lettera"<sup>48</sup>, he was actually supportive of the reunion between the two Churches, the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Catholic.

In the "Lettera" Typaldos, comparing the behaviour of the Orthodox and the Catholics, found the latter to be more tolerant and more progressive. In order to prove that he was in alignment with Western culture he used the example of the calendar in his letters, declaring that whilst the representatives of the Venetian State who lived in the East were accepting the old calendar, the Orthodox Greeks who live in Venice did not accept the new calendar which was being used there.

Meletios, however, was not the first person who brought up this calendar issue. Almost a century before the Archbishop of Philadelphia Gabriel Severus had dared to request from the Ecumenical Patriarch the permission for the Orthodox who lived in Venice and generally the Catholic regions to adopt the Catholic calendar, so as to celebrate Easter at the same time. The Patriarch at the time, Jeremias, reprimanded Severus for this thought in his letter written in 1593<sup>49</sup>, and noted that the Eastern Church did not import modernizations, but faithfully kept the customs as these were handed on by previous generations. The difference between Severus and Meletios is

---

<sup>46</sup> Karathanasis, *Ανθη Ευλαβείας*, οδ'.

<sup>47</sup> This letter is published in Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9-12.

<sup>48</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera* (of Meletios Typaldos), fols. 93r-98r.

<sup>49</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 20-25.

that the former surrendered to all the suggestions issued by the Patriarchate at once, while the latter continued with his behaviour and actions to upset the customs of the Eastern Church. As will be seen in the next section, at the time his critique concerning the monolithic Orthodox doctrine, according to his view, was not limited to the calendar, but also ‘touched’ other detailed theological issues.

During this period, as it is already mentioned in the previous section, one important supporter of Typaldos was the Venetian Brother of “San Filippo de Neri”, Padre Giambattista Bedetti 1623-1697<sup>50</sup>. Giovanni Battista Bedetti, who exchanged letters with Typaldos, was a member of the “San Filippo de Neri”<sup>51</sup> of Venice, a Confraternity following Filippo Neri’s teachings (1515-1595). This order of monks had a Confraternity in Venice, established in 1657 under the same name (“Oratorio San Filippo Neri”) by Bedetti, a Catholic priest and friend of Typaldos. Bedetti thought of Typaldos as a legitimate privy to the spirit of “San Filippo Neri: *prattica la vera Scuola di San Filippo*”<sup>52</sup>.

The plan of Typaldos and Bedetti was to appoint Typaldos as head of the Orthodox Churches in the Peloponnese and the other Greek territories conquered by Venice a few years before. We saw that they even convinced the Doge Francesco Morosini. The Papal Court also agreed to the plan. From the earlier referred letter of Archinto to the Sacra Congregazione we saw that he has learned about Typaldos through Bedetti. The latter was a person highly esteemed by the religious and social structures in Venice. Bedetti was the person who delivered a confession of faith of Meletios to the Papal Legate. That writing includes the names of priests who were convinced or even pressed by Meletios to convert. A study made by G. Fedalto<sup>53</sup> analyzes the correspondence between Bedetti and Typaldos. In his letter addressed to

<sup>50</sup> Giambattista Bedetti, together with another three priests, founded the Confraternity “dell’ Oratorio” or “San Filippo de Neri”, in Venice in 1657. This Confraternity was named after the monastic order of the Oratorians that was founded in Rome in 1564 by San Filippo de Neri (1515-1595) who was canonized by the Catholic church in 1622. He founded the order of the Oratorians (Oratorium) The aim of the members of the Oratorium was to sanctify souls through teaching and preaching. “Oratorium” is the term used for the prayer chamber where the both the clerics and the laity gathered in order to discuss theological matters. They also cultivated religious music. see *Annuario pontificio per l'anno 2010*, Libreria editrice vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2010; Filippo Caraffa, and Guisepe Morelli (eds), *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, 12 volumes, (Rome: Istituto Giovanni XXIII nella Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1961-1969).

<sup>51</sup> See an overview in *Θρησκευτική και Ηθική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, vol.11 (Athens: Μαρτίνοσ, 1967), columns 1102-1103.

<sup>52</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 159.

<sup>53</sup> Fedalto, “Appunti inediti”.

Bedetti of 23 February 1697<sup>54</sup>, Meletios adopts the Filioque, and in his reply to the Archbishop, Bedetti points out that often “he is watching and hoping that Meletios will open the path towards the reunion”.

However, Bedetti was not able to assist Typaldos any further. In the last five years of his life he was put in prison and following that he was exiled from Venice. Still, they kept their communication, as evidenced by the previously mentioned letter of Typaldos addressed to Bedetti, on 23 February 1697. According to Fedalto<sup>55</sup> the relevant historical sources that would allow us to know what exactly happened to Bedetti are poor. They suggested for the implementation of the plan to set up a committee of six cardinals in which a respected Greek professor would participate, such as Nicholas Komninos-Papadopoulos, Professor at Padua or Kalliakis Nicholas, also a professor at the same University.

It is certain, that Bedetti influenced Typaldos spiritually for many years. According to Fedalto, the problem of the reunion between Greeks and Latins is therefore the interpreting factor of Bedetti's work and of the difficulties he faced in Venice<sup>56</sup>. He is basing this view on the biography written by Bedetti himself in which he reveals the plan he had to unite the Greek Orthodox and the Catholic Church of Venice “Sulla linea della Scuola Filipina”<sup>57</sup>. When the Venetian authorities found out that Bedetti had not abandoned his plans, they had him arrested on the 20<sup>th</sup> of April 1694, imprisoned and exiled him. On the 29<sup>th</sup> of June 1694, he was banished overseas, ordered never to come back. As well as Typaldos, Bedetti was also associated with other Greeks who embraced Catholicism<sup>58</sup>.

In 1697, the first sign of Typaldos' turning to Catholicism came to light. By a letter sent to Pope Innocent XII (on November 22), Typaldos proposed the publishing of a book written in Greek which would refer to the lives of Western saints<sup>59</sup>. This book had been written by Nikolaos Vouvoulis or Bouboulis<sup>60</sup>, the Catholic former

<sup>54</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 159.

<sup>55</sup> Fedalto, “Appunti inediti”.

<sup>56</sup> Fedalto, “Appunti inediti”.

<sup>57</sup> English translation: “In the line of the brotherhood of Philip”.

<sup>58</sup> Fedalto, “Appunti inediti”, 331.

<sup>59</sup> A.P.F. Scrittura riferite nei Congressi, Greci 1, 511; Thanasis Papadopoulos, “Άγνωστα έργα Ελλήνων υπό έκδοση”, in *Το έντυπο ελληνικό βιβλίο 15<sup>ος</sup>-19<sup>ος</sup> αιώνας*, Minutes of international symposium, Delphi, 16-20 May 2001 (Athens: Κότινος, 2004), 305.

<sup>60</sup> For more about Nikolaos Vouvoulis, see Karathanasis, *Φλαγγίνιος*, 251-253.

principal of Kottounianos School and former teacher of the Flanghinian School, who originated from Crete. Two months earlier (on 21/9/1697), Nuncio had sent a similar reference letter to Cardinal Febroni, secretary of the propaganda<sup>61</sup>. In his letter, Typaldos stressed that if Eastern people read the book they would be convinced of the preponderance of the Catholic Church<sup>62</sup>.

Typaldos however never stopped having this vision leading him to believe that he could achieve his purposes at some point. So, the following year he suggested conversion to Catholicism to several important Greeks living in Venice, such as the scholar Panayiotis Sinopeas<sup>63</sup>. One of the first ecclesiastical actions that created disputes among the Orthodox clergy was the abolition of the “ecclesiastical sequence” written by Patriarch Philotheos in memoriam of Gregorius Palamas<sup>64</sup>. Typaldos started to exert pressure upon the Orthodox priests to embrace the dogma of the Western Church. At the same time he demanded to select the vicars himself, whilst until that moment this privilege belonged to the Greek Confraternity of Venice<sup>65</sup>. After 1698 these pressures increased and forced the Council of the Confraternity to react to Typaldos’ plans.

More specifically, the Confraternity applied to the Venetian Authorities, asking for their intervention, as Typaldos would arbitrarily violate the Confraternity’s principles, something that shook believers. The Confraternity referred to innovations that Typaldos tried to introduce, such as the Blessing of Waters and the Easter ritual. The Venetian Authorities replied on the 16<sup>th</sup> of January 1699 (under the Venetian Calendar in 1698), by sending a special report to Typaldos.

<sup>61</sup> A.P.F. Scritture riferite nei Congressi, Greci 1, 509r.

<sup>62</sup> A.P.F. Scritture riferite nei Congressi, Greci 1, 511; Papadopoulos, *Άγνωστα έργα Ελλήνων υπο έκδοση*.

<sup>63</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*; Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, 456; Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα*, 74; Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 42-43.

<sup>64</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 48. Gr. Palamas (1296-1359) was the bishop of Thessaloniki. He was one of the pre-eminent theologians of the Orthodox faith, founder of Hesychasm, and was recognized as a saint after his death in 1360 AC. Patriarch Philotheos wrote in 1376 a commending speech to Grigorios Palamas, together with a procession and set a day for celebrating his memory on the second Sunday of the Lent, the so-called “Sunday of the Orthodoxy”; see Georgios Mantzaridis, (ed.), *Ο Άγιος Γρηγόριος ο Παλαμάς στην Ιστορία και το παρόν*, Πρακτικά Δεθνών Επιστημονικών Συνεδρίων Αθηνών και Λεμεσσού (Holy Mountain: Ιερά Μεγίστη Μονή Βατοπαιδίου, 2000).

<sup>65</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9.



In this report<sup>66</sup>, Meletios Typaldos was required to abide by the traditional customs (“uso antico e consueto”) with regard to the Blessing of Waters and not introduce any innovation. That document was supplemented by attached witness statements, signed by Confraternity members, which described specific incidents featuring Typaldos. Apart from the Blessing of Waters, such incidents described some changes that the Archbishop tried to introduce on Easter day, requiem masses held for donors to the Saint George temple, the Holy Cross procession during Lent<sup>67</sup>, as well as his efforts to impose his preferred priests who had not been elected – as always – by the Confraternity. The report refers to Typaldos’ behaviour as “outrageous” (con sollevationi del popolo scandalizzato cosi pericolosi)<sup>68</sup>. Great emphasis was laid on the commotion caused during Easter celebrations, when the president and the presidium members of the Confraternity left the ritual, being afraid of the provocation of a lethal incident (“inconvenienti etiam mortali”<sup>69</sup>).

Next, as Typaldos went on with his policy, on the 18th of August 1699, the Confraternity filed a new request to the “Collegio”<sup>70</sup>, written in the name of the ‘Nazione Greca’ and signed by the Confraternity members. In this request, Typaldos was accused of trying to change the “Ius Patronato”<sup>71</sup> in the church of St. George, among others, the request stated:<sup>72</sup>

He creates dark thoughts and infects the Council, causing conflicts to his courageous colleagues in order to exclude chaplains who are not liked by him, he prevents their election, abuses the guardian and school officials publicly with blasphemies and insults, tempts the faithful flock of the church and forces hierarchs, under the pretext of

<sup>66</sup> The report was delivered to Meletios Typaldos by Basaglia Fante (a servant of the Venetian Authorities) upon an order given by the “Advocate of the Public” (“avogador di Comun”) Vitturi (only his surname is mentioned) A.E.I.B. B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 1.

<sup>67</sup> The priest would give the cross to the Archbishop who would in turn pass it through to the president and two members of the Confraternity; thus, the three-paneled presidium would attend the ceremony; however, Typaldos dethroned them that Easter of 1699.

<sup>68</sup> A.E.I.B., B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 1.

<sup>69</sup> A.E.I.B., B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 24/6.

<sup>70</sup> “Collegio” was comprised of six members of the so-called Grandi Savi great sages of the Senate. The Signoria and the College formed the plenary college “Pien Collegio”. These institutions jointly and severally had advisory functions like suggest topics for discussion at the meetings of the various boards and update on the official correspondence of petitions and requests : see da Mosto, *Archivio*, 22.

<sup>71</sup> “Ius Patronato” is the right of patronage which has been given to the Greek Orthodox in Venice; see A.E.I.B., B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφο 4β, 18 Αυγούστου 1699, fols. 1-3.

<sup>72</sup> A.E.I.B., B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφο 4β, 18 Αυγούστου 1699, fols. 1-3.

sacred feasts, to move from their position and their divine work, if they do not wish to be confronted with unpleasant consequences.

The letter, as stated by its Greek writers at the end of the text, addressed to the Doge but had to be delivered to the “competent Savi”<sup>73</sup>. Therefore, the document was of legal nature as it urged the Savi to take position on the matter.

According to Veloudis<sup>74</sup> most of the members of the Confraternity agreed with the content of this letter. Meletios was immediately informed about the actions against him. He did not waste a moment. Taking into account the speed of those days we could say that his response was lightning fast.

---

<sup>73</sup> The title “Savi” was for individual organs of the Venetian Administration, with different competences each. There are “Savi against the sects” (“Savi all’ Eresia”), for trade, taxation, military cases, public finance etc. See da Mosto, *Archivio*, 22-23.

<sup>74</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*.

### 4.3. Written documents

In this chapter we will examine the letters sent by Typaldos to the Patriarch. First, however, we will open up and comment on the famous “Lettera” of Typaldos, in which he supports the Western Catholic Church. This will help us perceive that on the one hand Typaldos was trying to impose his views in favour of the Western Church, and on the other he was trying to keep the Patriarch unsuspecting until the timing would be right. By studying the “Lettera”, as well as the letter to the Patriarch, one can see the contradiction between his deeper thoughts and his actions and also the dissimulation of the man.

#### 4.3.1. The “Lettera”

The opening phrase of the letter (“Lettera”<sup>75</sup>) does not include the name of the person to whom it is addressed to. He is just writing “Your Eminence”. However, according to the view of Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati<sup>76</sup> and the rest of the data given by Ioannis Veloudis<sup>77</sup>, it seems most likely that the letter was addressed to Aloice Morosini, Proveditor di Comun. The intention of the letter is to inform about the decrees of the Council of the Ten, in 1534/1542 that regulated the status of the vicars of the church of Saint George<sup>78</sup>. At the beginning of the letter it is clear that the recipient is rather sceptical about the reinforcement of these decrees, and because of this Meletios notes that he is attaching a copy of that decision of 1534 to convince him. Meletios appears to strongly support these decrees, which is against the oath he took as an Orthodox Archbishop concerning his loyalty to the Eastern Church. He presents his position in three chapters. Each one of them is an attempt to promote the reasons that lead to the implementation of the decrees: a) for the benefit of religion, b) for the benefit of the Greeks, c) for the benefit of the state.

In the first chapter he extensively refers to the value and significance of the Most Serene Republic of Venice. He calls it “unique” and points out that it was faith

---

<sup>75</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera* (of Meletios Typaldos), fols. 93r-98r, is a text which is recorded in the archives with the date 1690. However, as mentioned correctly by Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati (she was the first to publish and comment on the “Lettera”, along with another two texts, the “Informatione” of Meletios Typaldos and the “Apologia” of Abate Fardella, which will be further analysed below), this text must be written in 1698 or 1699.

<sup>76</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 169-170.

<sup>77</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 84.

<sup>78</sup> See subsection 3.4.1.

that led Venice to its great conquests. He says that each Christian should seek a union or rather a unity between Faith and compassion:

Dunque ne anche vi è cosa a cui più naturalmente si porti questa republica ch' è nata christiana; ed in ciò ardisco d' avanzare questa proposizione: che la chiesa romana studia e s' affatica per l' unità della fede in virtù del suo grado e del suo officio; ma la republica di Venezia per indole, per genio, per natura<sup>79</sup>.

It is quite clear from the beginning that Meletios is trying to identify his position with the interest of Venice. At the same time his views are identical to those of the Pope, which would facilitate his religious aim. In the next paragraph he emphasizes that apart from Venice, all other places –including Greece– are host to the “poison” of various heresies.

Wileffo, Giovanni Hus, Lutero hanno accesa tal peste nelle parti più aghiacciate della terra; Calvino nella Francia, nell' Olanda, nell' Inghilterra et in questi ultimi anni per disonore della nostra età lo spagnolo Molinos in mezzo alla prima chiesa del mondo e sù gli occhi del pastore universale<sup>80</sup>.

At the end of this paragraph he refers to the split between the Churches in such a way that it would also seem like a heresy, for which the Eastern Church should be blamed. And he is a member and a high leader in that Church.

Meletios carries on describing the virtues of Venice, both in the ability to keep the purity of the Christian faith and in the attempts to reunite the Churches. This last item is mentioned as an interpretation of the Council of Florence. Furthermore he says that both in Cyprus and in Crete there are Catholic Bishops, as in Corfu and Zakynthos. And since in those places, which are conquered by the Venetians, there are Catholic Bishops, he thinks it is awkward that this is not being applied in Venice. At this point he is turning against what he himself, as the Archbishop of the Orthodox Greeks in Venice, represents. He writes the following:

<sup>79</sup>Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera* (of Meletios Typaldos), fols. 93r-93v. English translation: “Therefore, also for this republic, which was born a Christian, nothing is more natural. Thus, I would dare to express this view: that the Church of Rome works and strives to keep the unity of faith, according to its duty and mission, but the Republic of Venice does the same, as part of its character, generosity, and nature”.

<sup>80</sup>Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fols.93v. English translation: “Wycliffe, Jan Hus, Luther have nurtured this curse in the coldest parts of earth. Calvin in France, Holland, England, and in recent times, a real disgrace for our times, the Spanish Molinos is doing such things inside the first Church in the world and in front of our Ecumenical Shepherd”.

Questa si sarebbe strana che per zelo di religione nel cuore della Grecia volesse questa repubblica che i vescovi e preti fossero non solo cattolici ma anche di rito Latino e poi qui nel cuore della dominante sofferisce il vescovo e sacerdoti Greci separati dalla comunione Latina e contrarii a dogmi della chiesa cattolica<sup>81</sup>.

He also considers it an obligation of Venice to stand up for the unity of the Church in the name of the Bishop of Rome (the Pope). The first chapter of his letter ends by saying:

Non vi può dunque rimaner dubbio che il decreto dell' eccelso consiglio di Dieci non sia necessario al bene della religione professata da questa serenissima repubblica<sup>82</sup>.

In the second chapter he analyses the issue of Filioque and other differences between the Eastern and the Western Church about the origin of "light" with theological arguments. He supports the Catholic view that the Holy Spirit is related with the Son and he attacks the Eastern clergy that opposed the Councils of Lyon and Florence, by calling them a small group inside the Greek Church which does not represent the voice of all Greeks.

He considers the Patriarch in Constantinople and the rest of the Patriarchs to be secondary in the hierarchy, where the Pope presides:

le comunità ben ordinate richiedono un primo, d' onde incominci e dove vada a finire il numero ed in cui venga a rappresentarsi l' unità del governo: noi diciamo con tutta la chiesa cattolica che questo primo fra tutti i christiani e tutti i vescovi è il vescovo di Roma e lo crediamo primo non solo di ordine ma anche di giurisdizione, perche è primo e prencipe di tutti gli altri vescovi e pastori particolari della chiesa. Questo primato noi non diciamo già essersi in lui derivato ò dal favore de principi o dall' autorità de concilii; crediamo fermamente che San Pietro in virtù dell' istituzione di Giesù Christo sia stato de iure divino, capo del collegio apostolico e che essendo i vescovi di Roma successori di San Pietro, sono de iure divino primi nell' ordine ecclesiastico et ogni uno di loro successivamente capo visibile della

---

<sup>81</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.93v. English translation: "It would be really strange if this Republic, out of religious zeal, would wish to have in the heart of Greece Catholics who are even performing the Catholic ceremonies, and on the other hand here, at the heart of its dominion, to allow the Greek Bishop and the Greek priests to be separated from the Catholic community and to oppose the dogma of the Catholic Church".

<sup>82</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.94r. English translation: "there is no doubt that the decree of the Highest Council of the Ten is necessary for the benefit of the religion recognized by the Serenissima".

chiesa universale invece di Giesù Christo ch'è capo mistico dell' istessa<sup>83</sup>.

Here it is obvious that he does not consider the Patriarch capable of leading contemporary Christendom. Perhaps he formed this opinion not just for the reasons he states but because of the weakness of the administrative side of the Patriarch of Constantinople. It was not, however, a weakness that stemmed from incompetent hierarchs. On the contrary it was a weakness caused by the constant and intrusive policy exercised each time by the Sublime Porte during the elections for the Patriarch. While the Pope enjoyed spiritual and secular power the Patriarch of Constantinople was usually at the mercy of the whims of the Ottoman Empire and its respective officials. He was at the mercy of an “absolute and despotic power”, as it was described by the Venetian Ambassador Pietro Foscarini in 1637<sup>84</sup>. Typaldos understood the great contrast between Venice and Christianity on the one hand, and the Ottoman Empire on the other: “A free state against a state of slaves”<sup>85</sup>. This confirms our view that for a man of Typaldos’ intelligence his turn towards Catholic power is explained not only by the likely material benefits he could acquire, but also by the fact that he admired the organization, administration and strength of the Catholic power as well as of the Western states. It was for him reasonable and fair, since he had no theological objections to Catholicism, to believe that the establishment of a Uniate Patriarchate in Western Greece under Venetian domination would be beneficial for the people living there.

He supports the infallibility of the Pope and further on he supports the view that the leader of the “Schismatics” is the Patriarch of Constantinople. He does not actually say this directly, but he is using a clever figure of speech, the rhetorical apostrophe, writing as if this were said by the receiver of the letter. He writes:

<sup>83</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.95v. English translation: “The well-regulated communities require a Princeps, a leader, a point of reference and top for the community and a representative of the unity of authority. Along with the entire Catholic Church we support that this Princeps among all Christians and all bishops is the Bishop of Rome and we consider him the leader, not only in hierarchy but also in jurisdiction, because he is the top and the principle of all other bishops and shepherds of the Church. We do not consider that this leadership is granted by powerful people or by the authority of the Synods. We firmly believe that Saint Peter, the constitutional representative of Jesus Christ, has been de jure divino (by divine right) the head of the apostles, and given the fact that the bishops of Rome are the successors of Saint Peter they are also considered de jure divino the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and thus each one of them is separately the natural leader of the Ecumenical Church and represents Jesus Christ, its spiritual leader”.

<sup>84</sup> Nicolò Barozzi N. and Guglielmo Berchet (eds), *Le relazioni degli stati europei lette al Senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimosettimo*, vol. 5: “Turchia” (Venice: Naratovich, 1866), 89-90.

<sup>85</sup> Valensi, *Βενετία και Υμηλλή Πύλη*, 92.

Ma dov'è il capo degli scismatici? Voi mi direte il Patriarca di Costantinopoli. Voi con questa risposta mostrate subito che la loro chiesa non è più la vera, che la loro disciplina è corrotta. Costantinopoli non è, ne può essere chiesa apostolica, non essendo stata fondata da verun Apostolo. Ella è puro patriarcato: e voi sapete che metropolitano e patriarcato non sono dignità de iure divino. Il primato de vescovo Romano sì, che lo è; e la chiesa vera di Giesù Christo è quella appunto che viene rappresentata da chi fù istituito dal nostro divino legislatore e non da chi fù istituito dagli huomini. Chiara cosa dunque è che quei soli sono nella vera chiesa e nella vera disciplina che riconoscono il primato de Pontefice Romano<sup>86</sup>.

In closing this second chapter Meletios reveals indirectly and yet clearly another one of his motives. This is the need for social recognition, which he will achieve for himself and purportedly also for the Orthodox Greeks of Venice by following Catholicism:

Quando noi siamo conosciuti cattolici, habbiamo l' honore di vederli presenti con divozione e con rispetto alle nostre funzioni e godiamo della meraviglia che concepiscono in osservare quanto siano ricche e feconde d' altri pensieri e di Santi affetti le nostre cerimonie, instituite gia da primi nostri santi padri e tramandate sino a noi senza mutazione e senza corrutella. Si depongon da amendue le parti tutti quei pregiudizii che offendono la civiltà humana e la carità christiana: cessano essi di sprezzarsi, cessano i nostri di odiarli; si fanno vicendevolmente communi gli studii delle scienze, i commerci del traffico, gli affari civili, le affinità, i conviti stessi e divertimenti et apparisce sensibilmente in questa unione di credenza, non ostante la diversità de genii e de' costumi, che ambedue diveniamo una cosa medesima nel nostro capo commune, ch' è Giesù Christo et invece sua il Romano Pontefice. Ditemi sono questi beni per i Greci medessimi ò pure disavventure? Non è visibile in tutto ciò l' effetto della grazia di Dio osservabilissimo nell' amore, nella pace e nell' honore e riputazione che ne nasce alla nostra nazione<sup>87</sup>?

<sup>86</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.96r. English translation: "Who is then the leader of the Schismatics? You will reply that it is the Patriarch of Constantinople. This reply of yours reveals that their Church is no longer true, that its canons have been distorted. Constantinople is not and could not be an Apostolic Church, because it was not founded by any Apostle. It is merely a Patriarchate, and as you know, an Archdiocese and a Patriarchate are not authorities de iure divino. The leadership of the Bishop of Rome, on the contrary, is. And the true Church of Jesus Christ is the one represented by the one who was appointed by our divine lawmaker and not by humans. It is therefore clear that to the true Church and the true dogma only those should belong who recognize the leadership of the Pontificate of Rome".

<sup>87</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fols.96r-96v. English translation: "When we are recognized as Catholics we have the honour to see them attending our ceremonies with reverence and respect and we enjoy so much the admiration they feel as they observe how rich, full of reverence and depth our ceremonies are, which were established by the first

This point confirms our previous observation of his intention to achieve a system of welfare for all regions under Venetian rule in Western Greece. The social recognition by Catholics was clearly very important to an intellectual man who nevertheless was experiencing feelings of social inferiority. He also described the other benefits that might be entailed: free trade, possibilities of movement of people and ideas, development of science and research.

In the third chapter of his letter Meletios endeavoured to prove that it would be not just good, but also “necessary” for the State of Venice to reinforce the decrees of the Council of Ten, according to which the vicars of the church of St. George should be Catholic. At this point he was introducing an innovative approach. He tried to increase his reader’s concern about the future of the Most Serene Republic itself. He was introducing notions about a possible disturbance of the existing order and safety of the Republic. He suggests that the Schismatics (that is the Greeks who will not follow him) are dangerous for the state. He writes:

Niuna cosa deve più essere a cuore ad un saggio Prencipe quanto il tenersi ben affezionati gli animi de suoi sudditi, nascendo dall’ amore di questi ogni aiuto ch’ egli può promettersi nelle pubbliche urgenze. Levate dal cuore de vassali l’ amore verso del loro sovrano, voi lo troverete tutto gelo e negligenza verso il suo servizio. Che se accade poi, che in luogo d’ amarlo, passino ad haverlo in odio, non potete più dubitare che non sia in loro spenta la fede e quella ubbidienza alla quale gli obbliga Iddio e la natura. Hora statemi attento per ben intendere la disposizione d’ animo che hanno gli scismatici verso de prencipi cattolici. Gli scismatici hanno per articolo di fede che tutti i Latini cattolici sieno veramente eretici [...] come l’ epiteto più dolce che da gli scismatici si dia a Latini cattolici è quello di “cane”, e come antepongono di dare più tosto in ispose le loro figliuole ad un Maomettano, che ad un Latino. Quest’ avversione, quest’ odio, da qual fonte credete voi che venga a prodursi? Io ve’ l dirò: da un’ altra bella massima degna di quei cervelli che devano odiarsi gli eretici;

---

Holy Fathers and transferred to us unchangeable and pure. Both sides give up all those biases which offend human civilization and Christian love. They stop putting each other down, and our people stop hating them. Scientific research is being done mutually, in the same way as commerce, political affairs, relations, even symposiums and entertainment; and this makes clearly obvious to this community of faith that, in spite of our difference in customs and ways, both sides can become one and the same for the sake of our common guidance, Jesus Christ and the Pontificate of Rome. Tell me then, are such things beneficial for the Greeks or are they unfortunate? Is it not obvious in all the grace of God manifested in the love, in the peace and in the honour and reputation referred to our people?”



così che la conseguenza non può negarsi che costoro non odino i principi Latini cattolici<sup>88</sup>.

At this point Meletios had to defy a reality which was unarguable and well known to the receiver of his letter. The Orthodox Greeks had been living in Venice for more than two and a half centuries. Many of them had served it as soldiers and had been honoured by the state with several offices. The state itself had decided to grant them the right to build their own church and their own schools in recognition of their services offered and their fealty to the Doge and the leadership of Venice. However, the Orthodox Greeks are ungrateful and do not obey the rules of the Venetian authorities. It is obvious that here Typaldos is presenting himself as a faithful citizen of a secular authority which he considers beneficial to himself and others, providing that the Greeks would convert. The letter is flattering, in order to achieve its purpose. Therefore Typaldos insists on his argument about the danger caused by the Schismatics. On the other hand the letter implicitly suggests the insubordinate side of the Orthodox Greeks against these powers.

Immediately afterwards he offers another two other important points. Analyzing what he described as “hatred of the Greeks against the Latins” he notes that:

Ma come quest’ odio non è fondato, ne sopra motivi di politica, ne di affari humani [...] ma sopra la religione i di cui sentimenti si conservano tanto tenacemente [...] e tanto ciò è vero quanto per istigazione de padri passa col sangue, col latte, con le prime notizie ne’ figlioli e ne’ posterì<sup>89</sup>.

In the above paragraph Typaldos, without being able to foresee it, actually describes the main reason for the failure of his project in the future, when the

---

<sup>88</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.96v. English translation: “Nothing is of greater interest to a prudent ruler than to keep the souls of his subjects devoted to him, because their love can bring about any help needed in difficult times of public life. When you take out of the hearts of the subjects the love for their king, then you will only find coldness and indifference towards his service. If it happens that instead of loving him they hate him, then you should have no doubt that in them there is no longer either the faith or the obedience which is suggested both by God and by nature. Pay attention now, so as to understand the stance of the Schismatics towards the Catholic rulers. The Schismatics believe that all Catholic Latins are truly heretics... [...] the sweetest adjective given to the Catholic Latins is “dog” and they prefer to marry their daughters with a Muslim rather than with a Catholic. This opposition, this hatred, where do you think it originates from? Let me tell you: from a very general rule in the Schismatic minds, that is, that they must hate the heretics. Therefore, they also hate the Latin Catholic rulers”.

<sup>89</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.96v. English translation: “this ‘hatred’ is not based in political reasons or in other human affairs [...] but based in religious sentiments stubbornly maintained [...] this passes from generation to generation and is fuelled by the fathers who nurture children and their descendants with it”.

reactions of the Greek Orthodox of the Confraternity of Venice were so intensified that they annulled his plan. The religious identity of the Greeks, which was placed at risk by his own actions, was so strong that any attempt to undermine it provoked sharp resistance. Typaldos clashed with this very identity – a principal component agent of the ethnic identity<sup>90</sup> – and he lost the battle. Another piece of information about the will of the Greek people to regain its freedom from the Ottomans is given by Typaldos at a later point in his “Lettera”. It is the one that refers to the hope of the Greeks that the blond nation of the Russians will come to their rescue<sup>91</sup>. It is obvious that Meletios was trying to convince, in any possible way, the Venetian ruler to whom he was addressing the letter, even by inventing non-existent dangers for the Venetian Republic.

In the last paragraphs of his letter he is trying to present briefly the benefits for the Republic of Venice if his suggestion were taken up. And he pointed out two aspects which he thought were the most important. The first was that under the uniform mantle of Catholicism – if the Greeks turned Catholic – there was no longer a risk for Venice itself. The Pope, he mentions, would be merely their spiritual leader. Their political leader would be the Doge, whom he spoke very highly of throughout his whole letter. He wrote:

per quello che riguarda l’ interesse di stato, che pregiudizio può dare l’ essere la nostra chiesa della comunione cattolica? Noi per quel sovrano a cui Dio ci ha fatti nascere soggetti, siamo sempre pronti e per debito e per genio distintissimo che ha la nostra nazione verso la serenissima repubblica di Venezia a spargere il nostro sangue et a metter in opera ogni nostro talento sia con la lingua sia con la penna ò sia con l’ azione in suo servizio. Noi non habbiamo che fare con Roma, riconosciuta che habbiamo la sua spirituale auctorità, noi non habbiamo altro che fare che attendere alla perfezione delle anime nostre et a procurare per l’ anime de nostri prossimi lo spirito di Giesù Christo per salute loro e per gloria di Dio. Quando noi osserviamo i canoni prescitti dalla chiesa universale, il pontefice non ha occasione d’ avere sopra di noi altra cura che quella della nostra salute<sup>92</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> See section 3.1.

<sup>91</sup> The relevant extract from Typaldos’ letter is already mentioned in Section 2.1, in the argument about the “blond nation”.

<sup>92</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fol.97v. English translation: “Where the interest of the state is concerned no disturbance would be caused by the fact that our Church belongs to the Catholic dogma. We are always ready in the name of this ruler that God decided for us to be born as his subjects, as a duty and also due to the special appreciation of our nation towards the Most Serene Republic, to spill our blood and to serve him by doing all that we can through

The second was that commerce and trade conducted by Venice were not at risk from such a religious change. At this point he mentioned that the Orthodox Greeks, the “Schismatics”, were willing to trade with people from other religions for profit and to travel everywhere:

i Greci che sono scismatici non hanno punto di scrupolo per il loro guadagno d' andarsene per tutto il dominio de maomettani sino dove non si ha ne anche notizia del nome christiano. Vanno pure a Roma, a Livorno, in Ancona, in Sicilia, in Napoli, in Calabria, in Puglia, dove tutte le chiese greche pubblicamente nella messa fanno la commemorazione del Papa, assistono pure agli officii divini e si vagliono tanto quanto fanno i cattolici de sacramenti, dunque l' esser cattolica la nostra chiesa non può pregiudicar al commercio. In secondo luogo. Voi ben sapete che tre sono le cose per le quali i Greci nostri depongono ogni riguardo. Queste sono le scienze, la medicina e la mercanzia. Sono cosi vaghi naturalmente di queste professioni che le amano in qual si voglia condizione di persone e le cercano |<sup>98r</sup> in qual si voglia luogo; e come queste fioriscono distintamente in Venezia, cosi anche i Greci incontrano ogni incomodo di viaggio, di fatica, di sapea per venir essi in persona ò per mandare i loro figli ad approfittarsene. Finalmente nella materia del commercio è sempre meglio haver a fare con uno che sia unito con noi col doppio legame della fede e della carità, che con uno disciolto da noi per l' una e per l' altra<sup>93</sup>.

This last phrase is yet another significant confirmation that Meletios has already crossed to the other side. He is serving the Orthodox faith only superficially. In essence, as we can see in the whole letter, he has already joined the camp of the Catholics.

---

our skills, our speech, our writing or our actions. We recognize Rome only as a spiritual authority and the only thing we do is to care for the perfection of our souls and to beg for the grace of Jesus Christ for the souls of our fellow humans. When we adhere to the rules defined by the Ecumenical Church the Pontificate does not need to care for anything else other than our salvation”.

<sup>93</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fols.97v-98r. English translation: “The Greeks who are Schismatic have no problem of any kind to travel in the entire territory of the Muslims in order to gain profit, to even visit places where the word “Christian” is unknown. They surely visit places such as Rome, Livorno, Ancona, Sicily, Naples, Calabria and Apulia, where the Greek churches officially mention the Pope during their liturgy. They also attend religious ceremonies and in the sacraments they do the same as the Catholics. Therefore the fact that our Church would be Catholic cannot harm commerce in any way. Furthermore you know very well that the Greeks are respected in three areas. These are science, medicine and commerce. Of course they are such warm supporters of these professions that they are devoted to them and they seek them out in all places. And given the fact that these professions are so highly developed in Venice, the Greeks are willing to face any kind of obstacles whilst travelling so that they themselves or their children will have the benefit of this situation. Lastly, where commerce is concerned it is always better to have a relationship with someone with whom we share the common bond of faith and charity than with someone who does not have such a common bond with us”.

However what the letter indicates is the importance earned in that era by Greek traders, seafarers and ship owners. The significance given to them by Venice, that was prepared to put aside religious differences in order to be in good terms with them. The reluctance of Venice to collide with a community that was economically useful was what Typaldos was trying to defeat, arguing that their conversion to Catholicism would strengthen the economic ties between the Greeks and Venice. This paragraph proves, once again, that Typaldos was not just another simple priest or theologian, but a secular man, who was watching the economic and political developments, each time weighing the benefits that could be gained from them. Meletios closed his letter stating “tired from having written so many things”, in his own words, and enclosed as an attachment the text of the decrees of 1542, which he requested to be reinforced.

Procurando l' honor di Dio principalmente del 1534 a 29 maggio fù deliberato per questo consiglio, che nella chiesa di San Giorgio de Greci in questa nostra città dovessero esser due Papà, over capellani e quelli veramente cattolici: al presente etiam in conformità si vede esser inclinato e ben disposto il reverendissimo legato qui residente con l' autorità sua spirituale, e però.....

L'anderà parte, che per autorità di questo consiglio sia statuito che il gastaldo e deputati al governo di detta chiesa de Greci non permettano alcuno d' essi capellani, over papà officiar et essercitarsi in quella a cura delle anime, se prima quello non sarà stato esaminato ed approvato cattolico dal reverendissimo Patriarca, over legato che per tempi saranno, overo dal vicario suo ò da alcuno di loro sotto perna di perpetuo esilio da questa città; et cosi chiamati alla presenza delli capi di questo consiglio il gastaldo e deputati suoi li sia letta la presente parte et imposto che la debbano osservare con farne tener copia nelli libri suoi a perpetua memoria et intelligenza d' essa loro congregazione<sup>94</sup>.

More than other Greeks of the early Enlightenment, Typaldos seems to have adopted a secular diplomacy that stipulated that for administering a state entity it was

<sup>94</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), *Lettera*, fols. 98r. English translation: “Having received the Grace of the Lord before 1534, on the 29th of May this Council has decided that the church of St. George of the Greeks in our city should have two Priests, who must be true Catholics. This present decision is also supported by his Eminence the Legate, who is the official representative of the spiritual Authority...”

Therefore, the Authority of this Council decrees that the Papal attaché and the representatives of the management of the above mentioned Church of the Greeks should not allow any of their priests to conduct any ceremony for the saving of the souls if he is not certified to be a Catholic by the Eminent Patriarch or the Legate or their proxy, and the punishment will be exile for life from this city. The Papal following and the representatives have to appear before the Council's presidency, where they will have this decision read out to them, and they are obliged to keep it and to copy it in their records so that it will be an official rule for their Confraternity”.

not sufficient to depend only upon Divine Grace, but to promote a strong hegemonic authority. He proposes, more or less, to the Venetian authorities a political amorality, grounded on realistic perceptions of the development and management of power. He shows the Venetian authorities how to acquire legitimacy from the people and the support of those powerful trading and shipping groups, which happen to consist of Greeks, knowing that without them the hegemony could not be maintained. It is an indication that probably Typaldos had been imbued by the rationalist spirit of his times enough to abandon the theological principles of Orthodoxy.

#### 4.3.2. *Typaldos' "apology"<sup>95</sup> to the Patriarch*

During the period that he held the above mentioned views Meletios was also trying to maintain a good relationship with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Obviously he was concerned that the Patriarch might dethrone him before he was able to implement his plan. He sent a letter to the Patriarch Callinicos II dated 2 September 1699<sup>96</sup>. This letter seems hypocritical if one bears in mind his "Lettera" to the high Venetian official. He aimed to reply to the accusations against him made by Orthodox Greeks living in Venice, who were the first to become aware of his plan. This letter was so extensive that it looked like an "apology" of someone guilty. He was also aware of this fact, and, being an intelligent man, and he made sure to mention this to the Patriarch before such a thought occurred to him. "I have written a lot, but I needed to do it under the pressure of the accusations against me", he explained just before the end of his letter.

Typaldos began his letter with the formal address in the first paragraph. He called himself humble and referred to the proper kissing of the hand and the "bow to the ground" that is due<sup>97</sup>. This was the bow of a subordinate to his superior in the hierarchy, which was done by genuflection. In the second paragraph of the letter Typaldos made a short mention of the political events of the period. He stated his joy about the end of the war (he refers to the Treaty of Karlowitz, which confirmed the defeat of the Ottomans and the increasing power of Austria), and glorified the peace-

---

<sup>95</sup> The term "apology" here means a defence rather than apology in the nominal sense.

<sup>96</sup> This letter is published in Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9-12.

<sup>97</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9.

making God who dissolved the dark fog of war. He also rejoiced that a light of love had appeared in the world between the opposing parties, by referring to the new ambassador of the Most Serene Republic to the Gate, Lorenzo Soranzo, who was his friend. He describes the Venetian Leadership as “philhellene” and encouraged the Patriarch as “the leader and shepherd of the Greek ‘genos’” to establish a relation with the new Bailo “by word and deed”<sup>98</sup>.

In the third paragraph Typaldos asked the Patriarch to forgive him for not having written for such a long time. “Maybe the pen was silent, but the tongue, the memory and the heart were not silent”<sup>99</sup>. This is how he entered the main theme. He said that he prayed for the Patriarch daily, as the high priest of all, and asked for the power of God to keep the ecumenical throne stable. This was an indirect reply to the accusations that he no longer mentioned –as he should have done– the name of the Patriarch during the religious ceremonies. Finally he expressed his desire to meet him in person, when God allowed it. From this last sentence it was obvious that in reality he did not want to meet the Patriarch, that was why he left the possibility of a meeting to God’s will, without requesting an invitation of visiting him in Constantinople.

The fourth paragraph was the longest. He described with great elaboration the pains and sufferings he had to go through on a daily basis to provide service to the Orthodox. By depicting himself as a shepherd who worked without expecting a reward, without taking advantage of his position for personal gain, he continued working laboriously, begging God, and offering sacrifices with all his heart without asking anything for himself in return. The result was that instead of receiving any acknowledgments he faced ungratefulness and treason. He mentioned again the leadership of the Venetian State, which offered him love and trust. Thanks to the Doge, both he and others before him were saved from malicious acts that lasted for years. At this point he mentioned the abbot of a monastery in Zakynthos. He considered him responsible for the initiation of the accusations, since Typaldos refused to consent to the greedy intentions of this man to become a vicar in the church of St. George in Venice.

<sup>98</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9.

<sup>99</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 9.

The fifth paragraph starts by insulting the “genos” of the Greeks. “This is the situation of our wretched “genos” that is always rowdy and rebellious and disobedient and proud”<sup>100</sup>. The meaning of this passage is contested: on the one hand it shows the Greek “genos” standing up proudly against the dictates of power, while on the other it implies that it is undisciplined towards its leadership. Typaldos probably considered the political disobedience of the Greeks as a disadvantage, because he included himself as a member of the Greek ruling class.

He noted immediately after that he was aware that some persons had written a letter against him to the Patriarch. He called these accusations “arrows of morons”<sup>101</sup>, declaring that God would certainly help him to clear up the accusations because “our judge is a Patriarch wise, prudent, fair and politic”. At the end of this paragraph he wrote that he was not worried about himself. “I am asking and praying to the Patriarchate’s authority and majesty to humiliate these urges of the disobedient and arrogant”<sup>102</sup>; and for the Church to expel the rotten parts from its flock, otherwise these rotten parts will transfer their disease to the rest.

The sixth and last paragraph is formal. He apologizes for the extent of his letter, which he was forced to do under the circumstances so as to reply to the accusations against him. He asks for the forbearance and charity of the Patriarch and wishes him strength and health until a very old age.

#### **4.3.3 Supporters’ letter to the Patriarch**

Typaldos understood that it would be difficult to convince the Patriarch. Therefore he sought advocates. So, a short while after his letter the Patriarch Callinicos II received a new letter<sup>103</sup>. It was the turn of the Greeks from Venice who wrote to him. The letter bears the title “A report from some Greeks who share the same stance as the Archbishop of Philadelphia in Venice” and it is in line with the arguments of Typaldos.

---

<sup>100</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 12.

<sup>101</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 12.

<sup>102</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 12.

<sup>103</sup> The letter is included in Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati, “Αναφορά Ελλήνων της Βενετίας στον Οικουμενικό Πατριάρχη Καλλίνικο Β΄ για το Μελέτιο Τυπάλδο (1700),” *Θησαυρίσματα*, 15 (1978), 98-105. Bobou-Stamati expresses her suspicion that the letter had been written by Typaldos himself.

This letter, according to the document preserved in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem Library, concludes with the phrase “the undersigned slaves”, but the writers’ names do not survive. Vassiliki Bobou–Stamati, who published and commented on the letter, reverses its former chronology, according to which the letter was written in 1705. Bobou–Stamati more correctly argues that the letter must have been written before 1701<sup>104</sup>. One of the reasons is that Callinicos II, to whom the letter is addressed, passed away in 1702.

This letter, like the one from Typaldos to the Patriarch, is also long. The writers mentioned that it was impious to blame and cast aspersions on someone because of envy and malice. “As you can identify a tree from its fruits, you can identify the nature of a man judging by his works”. That was why a beneficent man received honour, whilst one who caused misfortune became inglorious. In the next paragraph they referred to Elias Meniates (1669-1714)<sup>105</sup> a priest and for many years a student, secretary and protégé of Meletios, who was then in Constantinople. There were rumours that he had spoken against Meletios. At the same time, however, they were careful not to insult the priest, knowing that he was in the Patriarch’s good graces. The writers noted that they were “devotees of Jesus and truthful”. After declaring their devotion to the Patriarch and their faith to the Eastern Church they analyzed the modest and pious attitude of Meletios. They praised his character and the fact that as an archbishop he followed the commandments of God in order to lead the flock in the right direction. Unfortunately however, they remarked, it was not possible to be liked by everyone. There were those who blamed with malice and cast aspersions indiscriminately, especially those who stood well with the authorities. The reference highlights a certain envy of Typaldos for his good relationship with the Venetian Authority. After that there is a short reference to the life of Meletios Typaldos since he was one of the first students of the Flanghinian School, then teacher and College Headmaster, deacon and Archbishop. He had always been teaching and admonishing the congregation in the way of salvation according to the beliefs of the Eastern creed.

At this point one more reference to Elias Meniates is made. The writers, supporters of Typaldos, reminded the reader that Meniates was a student, secretary and deacon of Meletios. He was also one of the members of his entourage. Indirectly

<sup>104</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Αναφορά Ελλήνων της Βενετίας”.

<sup>105</sup> For Elias Meniates, See subsection 2.4.3, subnote 226.



they stressed the very good relationship he had with Typaldos, and maybe they answered the question as to why he spoke against Typaldos by alluding to jealousy. That is why, without overtly describing Meniates as envious, their writing technique and the way the letter is constructed indicate they refer to him. Meniates is mentioned twice in the letter: right before the first reference that anyone who engenders bad incidents is characterized as “inglorious” and then follows the name of Elias Meniates as “the most reverent” among the priests. Later it is said that Meniates flung some accusations against Meletios, that he is allegedly Latin-minded. The connection between the first and the second reference to Meniates is made with a comprehensive paragraph, which describes the contrast existing between the followers of Jesus and the envious people. Envy is indicated as the motive of those who slander the Archbishop.

The letter of Typaldos’ followers to the Patriarch demonstrates some issues, while simultaneously raising some questions. Already at that time, there were widespread rumours of Typaldos’ apostasy. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the senders of the letter were supporters of the unionist policy of Typaldos, especially as they declared that they shared the Archbishop’s views. So why the contradiction?

It seems likely that the Archbishop and his people knew that they could not implement their plans for the reunion of the Churches and then create a Patriarchate of Western Greece unless they gained the support of the Greek Confraternity. Their position was not only in line with their views that a hegemonic power has no choice but to be based on the legitimacy of its people, but they were also in line with the actuality that the Greeks of Venice would react to their plans. Thus, they needed time to work properly so that slowly they would persuade prominent Greeks of Venice - people who exercised strong influence on the Greek community- that the imposition of the “Unia” was in their best interest.

They had realized that they had not only to fight against long established religious beliefs, but mainly against the cultural aspects of the ethnic identity. The cultural change required time and obviously they had understood the magnitude of the obstacles they encountered. The importance of culture and ethnicity for social

cohesion has already been discussed<sup>106</sup>. Precisely for these reasons Meletios and his friends knew that in times of crisis they could not disrupt the social cohesion. They knew that powerful people of the Greek Confraternity would put the stability of their “genos” before their financial interests. Conclusively, any early reactions of the Patriarch to their plans would condemn the whole project to a certain failure. However, their active support for Typaldos also shows something else: Their friendship, if not their love for his person, as well as their fear about his future in case of his excommunication by the Patriarch.

Typaldos knew the fate of Lucaris and his followers, such as Ioannis Karyofillis, despite the repudiation of their ideas. To counterbalance such adverse developments, therefore, he had to no longer be in need of the Patriarchate. He had to be prepared to defect from Orthodoxy, as soon as the Pope and Venice decided to establish the Uniate Patriarchate in the Venetian territories. At the beginning of this chapter, however, it was pointed out that although the Pope had agreed to a plan for establishing a Uniate Church, the Venetians refused and as a result the project did not proceed. Typaldos and his followers’ insistence shows that they still entertained hopes to dissuade the Venetian aristocracy, without, however, as it appear, having any strong arguments for this. Francesco Morosini had already died in 1694, so they no longer had the support of a high-ranking person in the Serenissima. Their only motivation now, as it seems, was to create a wave of the rich and powerful members of the Greek community that would convince the Venetian authorities to consent.

#### **4.3.4. Letters of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos**

In letters by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, written<sup>107</sup> to his student Chrysanthos Notaras (1663-1731)<sup>108</sup>, Typaldos was accused of having accepted the Catholic dogma and of harbouring irrational ambitions.

<sup>106</sup> See subsection 3.1.2.

<sup>107</sup> The letters of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras, which are quoted in this chapter, were published in Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*.

<sup>108</sup> He was born in Corinth at North Peloponnese. He learned his first letters from his uncle, Dositheos, who later sent the youngster Chrysanthos in European universities in order to study. In Paris he perfected his knowledge of astronomy and showed special zeal attending the Cassini’s lessons. He had been related with distinguished scientists, especially with the Jesuit Lekenius. He was consecrated

Komninos-Papadopoulos was a Greek of Cretan descent, who studied at the College of St. Athanasius in Rome and was introduced to Catholicism very early (1672). He joined the Order of the Jesuits<sup>109</sup>, and was appointed professor of Canon Law at the University of Padua. There, approximately during the years 1697 to 1700, he had Chrysanthos Notaras as a student. The latter was one of the most gifted Greek enlighteners of the eighteenth century, with specific studies in astronomy, and he later became Patriarch of Jerusalem. Komninos-Papadopoulos however is not a reliable person. As will be seen below the accusations of Papadopoulos against Typaldos are often contradictory; they are not relied on objective facts and principles as much as personal conflicts and passions.

One of his works published in 1726, for example, on the history of the University of Padua, includes erroneous if not false information about Copernicus, claiming that he found in the University's archives a record of Copernicus as a member of the "Polish nation". It seems that Komninos-Papadopoulos often would not hesitate even to falsify evidence in order to support his views<sup>110</sup>.

In his letter of 3 September 1700 Komninos-Papadopoulos accused Typaldos of wanting to become a cardinal<sup>111</sup>. In the same letter he vaguely mentioned that some Greeks from Venice sent a Catholic confession of faith to Rome in order to marry Catholic wives. Some days after this, on 12 September, in a new letter to the same recipient, he writes that:

The Bishop of Philadelphia is losing hope for his scheming to be successful. Rome has become fully aware of his stupidity and he became a laughing stock and despised by all in the purple court<sup>112</sup>.

Consequently Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos takes pride in the fact that he played a role in the denigration of Typaldos at the Papal Court. Obviously he was writing letters to the Curia or got others to do so, because he knew that even Tzandiris

---

Bishop of Caesaria on 5 April 1702 and in continuity, on 6 February 1707 he became Patriarch of Jerusalem. Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, 431-435.

<sup>109</sup> See Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, "Ο Χρυσάνθος Νοταράς προ της αναρρήσεως αυτού εις τον Πατριαρχικόν Θρόνον Ιεροσολύμων", *Νέα Σιών* V. 26/3 (1931): 97.

<sup>110</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 380 writes about him: "Overall Papadopoulos gives the impression of an unstable, even torn person. All the time he praises himself –directly or indirectly- about his virtue, education, love of his homeland, his correct faith, whereas his works show often major weaknesses, which is clearly non-compatible with his self-evaluation".

<sup>111</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 23.

<sup>112</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 23-24.

(probably the custodian of the church of Saint George) had sent a letter to the Papal Court in Rome, describing Typaldos as a “swindler”<sup>113</sup>. As a church custodian he was not able to send a letter to the Pope himself, so it seems likely that Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos could have mediated in order to get the letter there, but there is no evidence for that.

In another letter, of 25 March 1701, Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos characterizes the Archbishop of Philadelphia as confused because he learnt about the defamatory letters that Komninos Papadopoulos sent to Rome<sup>114</sup>. It is therefore said that on the Sunday of Orthodox Easter, Typaldos pretended that he was ill in order to avoid conducting the Mass. Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos indirectly interpreted the act of Typaldos as his attempt to convince Rome that he was sincere, and intended to abandon the Orthodox creed and create the “Unia”.

In another letter of 1701, which does not bear a specific date, Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos referred to the efforts of Typaldos to introduce the Catholic (Gregorian) calendar in the church of Saint George, which we already mentioned. At the end of the letter Komninos-Papadopoulos asks Notaras to do his best to ask the Ambassador of the Russian embassy to intervene in Venice<sup>115</sup>. The letter ends with what Komninos-Papadopoulos considers that Typaldos really intends: “He has the Patriarchate of Constantinople in mind, deceiving the Latins that his intention is to create the ‘Unia’”<sup>116</sup>.

As indicated in his letters Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos had the worst feelings towards Typaldos. His interpretations regarding the actions of the Archbishop, however, vary from letter to letter. Initially he says that Typaldos would like to put on the red biretta of cardinal; later on that he wished to be in charge of “Unia”; and finally that he aspired to the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople by deceiving the Pope that supposedly he would create the “Unia”, in order to help him become Patriarch.

<sup>113</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 24.

<sup>114</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 25.

<sup>115</sup> Chrysanthos Notaras, nephew of the Patriarch Dositheos, was sent by him to Moscow for three years (1693-96) and left the best impressions in the Russian Court. Thus he had access to Russian authorities and this possibility is being addressed by Papadopoulos.

<sup>116</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 26.

Typaldos cannot have had all three of these intentions. Komninos-Papadopoulos, being affected by his personal animosity towards Typaldos, accuses him of all three by giving each person he corresponds with a different version of the situation each time. Additionally, with the various reasons he puts forward, he attempts to render Typaldos repugnant.

However, there is also another explanation, perhaps more significant than others. In the closing of his letter dated 12 September 1700 Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos writes: “Believe that if it was not for me, he would have exterminated our ‘genos’ ”<sup>117</sup>. By this phrase Komninos-Papadopoulos brings on stage the question of the ethnic identity of a significant number of Greeks who had been living under Venetian rule, in Venice, the Ionian Islands and other territories under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Philadelphia. Komninos-Papadopoulos appears to be extremely worried about the future of the Greek nation. Otherwise it is impossible to account for the fact that within one month, in September 1700, he wrote two letters with the same subject. And a lot of others were written, as it is already mentioned, the following years.

On 19 September 1701 Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos informs Chrysanthos Notaras, in a letter, that the Patriarchate asked Typaldos to sign a confession of faith on the Doctrines of the Eastern Church<sup>118</sup>. Notaras is in Walachia, where he is closely acquainted with Prince Constantine Brancoveanu. Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos recommends, indeed, that Brancoveanu should deliver the text of the confession to Typaldos. From the content of the letter we can assume that Komninos-Papadopoulos is especially worried about which person would hand the confession to Typaldos. He wants to find the best intermediary to convince Typaldos to sign the confession. He also mentions another name, that of Nikolaos Karaioannis, “one of the finest Greeks of the Venice Confraternity”<sup>119</sup>.

In Komninos-Papadopoulos’ letter we may find a sample of the content of the confession prepared by the Patriarchate for Typaldos. Komninos-Papadopoulos notes

---

<sup>117</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 24.

<sup>118</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 26.

<sup>119</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 27.

that the confession contains a lot of “Photius’s and Palamas’s points”<sup>120</sup>. He indicates that the text repeats the positions of Photius and Saint Gregory Palamas, who criticized Catholicism. There is a reference to the Doctrine of Photius in the Filioque. Particularly Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos claims that the confession, while correctly refers to Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church, doesn’t make any mention to the Pope. For Photius the Christian Church is considered “Apostolic” because it continues the teaching of Jesus Christ and the Apostoles. Photius rejected the thesis of the Catholics that the Pope is the Head of the Church<sup>121</sup>. Anyway, Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos concludes that Typaldos would not sign such a text.

At this point it would be good to notice the role of the Greek Professor in Padua in the fate of Meletios Typaldos. Surely Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos constitutes an important link in the incidents of the life and ambitions of Typaldos. He is a multifaceted spiritual personality, yet contradictory at the same time. On the one hand he is Greek and on the other he is a supporter of Catholicism. It seems that he behaves differently according to his collocutors. For instance in the above mentioned letters his collocutor is Chrysanthos Notaras, his former student for three years in Padua and someone who is devoted to campaigns defending Orthodoxy against Catholicism. So when Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos writes to Notaras, he stands up for Orthodoxy and the Greek nation. Of course his mention on the “Papal supremacy”<sup>122</sup> shows a man who is not fanatically devoted to one dogma or the other.

Later in this letter he is concerned with when the letter containing the confession of Orthodox faith should be handed to Typaldos. If it depended on himself, he wrote, he would not hand it over right now, but as “a meticulous tailor I would guide and further prepare the matter first”. So Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos seems not to rush, but prepares the conviction of Typaldos step by step.

It is curious that Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos had a good relationship with Typaldos and seems to be on the same wavelength with him regarding his religious pursuits, as we are going to discuss later on, until the time where he

<sup>120</sup> Photius was the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople from 858 to 867 and from 877 to 886. After his conflict with the Pope, Photius excommunicated the Pope on grounds of heresy – over the question of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, the God and the Son. For Palamas see section 2.2.

<sup>121</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 27.

<sup>122</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 27.

abandoned him completely and turned against him. At that moment, in September 1701, when the count-down had started, there is mutual suspicion between the two men. In his letter to Notaras, Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos explicitly says: “we ostensibly have peace with each other”<sup>123</sup>. The text of this letter constitutes an exemplar of diplomacy of a man who balances between two opposite worlds.

In his letter Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos declared that he had an ostensible peace with Typaldos. He claimed that Typaldos discredited him in Rome for teaching that the Pope is subject to Ecumenical Councils; that he was not infallible and that his supremacy could not be verified with quotes from the Holy Bible. To answer the questions why Typaldos was reporting him to the Pope he replied:

On the other hand the cursed man is getting mad over the Throne of Constantine and he pleads me to write to Rome so that the Pope pushes the ambassadors to attack him. However neither do I consider doing this nor does the Pope, who certainly loves our ‘genos’, being a man who considers such things”<sup>124</sup>.

The accusation of Komninos-Papadopoulos that Typaldos was interested in the throne of Constantinople could be justified, taken into consideration that during the same period (1701), the theologian Ioannis Stais –who had been expelled from the Patriarchate, had joined the Catholic church, and was closely connected to Typaldos– had attempted to convince the Holy See to take the initiative for the replacement of the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople with another supporter of the union of Churches. Stais’ proposal included the idea to send Greek-Catholic priests to Moscow in order to introduce the Catholic Dogma to the area. Next, according to Stais, if the Russians turned to Catholicism, then the catholic dogma could be spread throughout Greece, given the Greeks’ appreciation and love for the Tsar. According to the records of the Vatican, Stais suggests:

alcuni mezzi per promuovere tra suoi nazionali la Santa Unione: Primo la convocazione d'un Concilio Generale o provinciale; Secondo: l'insinuazione e corrispondenza col Patriarca Greco di Costantinopoli; Terzo: L'elezione d'un Patriarca Greco Cattolico; Quarto: L'introduzione di sacerdoti Greci Cattolici in Moscovia [...] Quanto però alli tre primi mezzi prevedendo egli stesso molte difficoltà et opposizioni nell'impresa, si restringe al quarto che gli pare più

<sup>123</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 27.

<sup>124</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 27.

proprio, più utile e più facile per la buona corrispondenza che tiene il Czar con i Principi Christiani, per l'uniformità del rito de' missionariii greci che colà si mandassero, con gli ecclesiastici di Moscovia, per le conseguenze che ne verrebbero, mentre introdotta la Religione Cattolica nella Moscovia, si dilaterebbe facilmente per tutta la Grecia, attesa la stima et affetto che questa porta al Czar sulla speranza che il medesimo l'abbia un giorno a liberare dal giogo turchesco<sup>125</sup>.

Going back to the Komninos-Papadopoulos letter and given that he was a Greek-Catholic, it is evident that he makes efforts to get along with the powerful centres of the Church, both the Eastern and the Western, endeavouring not to be exposed. Ioannis Veloudis records him as a “co-follower” of Typaldos in the “Adoration of the Pope”. He notes that Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos had dedicated his book “On Mystagogical Prognosis”<sup>126</sup> to Typaldos.

Following the above it is clear that the aforementioned interest of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos that Typaldos would sign a confession of faith in the Eastern Orthodox Church was not because he wanted to bring him back to the right track. He probably wanted to achieve the opposite; to expose him in the eyes of the Patriarch. If Typaldos was confronted with the obligation to sign this confession and refused to do so, the Patriarch would then depose him immediately and would have him dethroned as Archbishop of Philadelphia. There is no evidence found whether finally Typaldos actually signed such a confession of faith to the Eastern Orthodox Church. Manuel Gedeon mentions that the confession was sent in 1701 to the Archbishop of Philadelphia, without providing any further evidence. He also wonders whether Typaldos ever signed this confession. Also in the text of his dethronement by the Patriarch, some years later, there was no such reference<sup>127</sup>.

<sup>125</sup> A.P.F, Acta 71 fol. 175v, 176r. English translation: “some means (mezzi) for the promotion of the Holy Union to his co-patriots: First, the convocation of a General or Provincial Congress; second, a gradual approach to and correspondence with the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople; third, the election of a Greek Catholic Patriarch; fourth, the introduction of Greek-Catholic priests to Muscovy [...] As far as the first three points are concerned, (Stais) himself understood the difficulties and the hardships of such a venture and only went for the fourth point, which seemed to be more approachable, suitable and manageable, due to the good correspondence exchanged between the Tsar and Christian Princes (i.e. the sovereigns of the West) and also due to the uniformity of the dogma of the Greek missionaries (rito de' missionariii greci) that could be sent there comparing to the dogma of the priests in Muscovy. The introduction of the Catholic Religion to Muscovy could have important consequences all over Greece –given the Greeks' appreciation and love for the Tsar– as the latter deeply hoped that one day the Tsar would liberate them from the Turkish rule”.

<sup>126</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 87.

<sup>127</sup> Manuel Gedeon mentions in the same extract that he holds the confession text. He characterizes it as a “glorious monument” both in theological and linguistic terms. It is written in Greek by literary



Stais' initiatives for the union of the two Churches makes Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos, in another letter of his, dated 19 July 1703; argue about his personal effort to expel Stais from Rome where he had been. He speaks again about the nation of Greeks. “We did whatever we could in order to expel him from Rome, where he did a lot of bad things to the good Greeks”<sup>128</sup>. The Professor is concerned once again about the damage caused to the Greeks.

On 17 April 1704 another letter of Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras lays out the damage caused by Typaldos and those who are influenced by him in Greece:

Why are you writing all this about the great teachers of the Eastern Church? On the one hand Anthracites, the ‘theologian well’, is drinking water from the holy leader of the Venetians, who has triumphantly conquered the whole of Greece, which he then declared Schismatic and took over completely, and was praised about this victory in old Rome as if he had conquered barbarians. Having accepted such things, Anthracites waffles theologically and sometimes sees the light and other times he becomes Latin-based and practices an amphibian approach to the dogma as a professor<sup>129</sup>.

At that time, as indicated by a letter of the Latin Archbishop of Nafplio, Carlini, the Papal Court was aware of the intentions of Typaldos. The Catholic Archpriest writes positively about the way Typaldos conducts himself. He praises him for not rushing to manifest his friendly feelings for the Latins, but he first asked the Patriarch to take sides legally and after that he appealed to the Pope<sup>130</sup>.

Komninos-Papadopoulos wrote a letter dated 12 August 1704, in which he speaks slightly about the Greeks of Venice, perhaps due to the fact that they tolerated Typaldos and they did not yet react vigorously in order to expel him. “I do not have contact with our Greeks through correspondence, because as I can see the Greeks who live in Venice have neither brain nor wisdom and they are donkeys”<sup>131</sup>. He also notes that if he did not have other things to do he would “get rid of the Colleges”. He possibly means that he would have tried to close down the Greek

---

clergyman of the Patriarchate. He intended to publish it, according to his writings, but he never did. See Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 32-33.

<sup>128</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 30.

<sup>129</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 43-44.

<sup>130</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 45.

<sup>131</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 31.

schools of Venice and especially the Flanghinian School, because they constitute “nursery garden” for Typaldos’ supporters.

On 23 March 1706 he writes that Typaldos imprisoned a poor priest-monk who was preaching the Doctrine of Photius for a living, which can be seen as an interesting piece of information about Typaldos’ personality. He describes him as a revengeful man. Typaldos, according to Komninos-Papadopoulos, imprisoned the Hieromonk Sotiris<sup>132</sup> of Athens, not for teaching the religion according to Photius, but because a youngster, son of a charlady coming from Constantinople, working for a priest named Cypriotes, preferred Sotiris’ company to that of Meletios.

In another letter, dated 18 December of unknown year (probably 1706, since he refers again to the incident of the charlady working for the Priest Cypriotes, which was already described in a previous letter), he concludes, being annoyed about the actions of Typaldos: “These have all bought dishonour to the ‘genos’”<sup>133</sup>.

The next letter of Nikolaos Komninos – Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras is dated 13 May 1706. The importance of this letter is that apart from the usual accusations against Typaldos it also reveals Papadopoulos’s inconsistencies and confusion:

Neither do Greeks love me as a Latin, nor do the Latins love me as a Greek, but the truth is that our soul is unique and by losing it we would not earn anything<sup>134</sup>.

Concerning Typaldos, he says that he is furious, because he understands that the Latins mock him. Now he argues that:

<sup>132</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*. According to Manouil Gedeon, Sotiris coming from Athens is Grigorios Sotiris, a literary man, fluent in Greek, Italian and Latin, who consequently founded a school in Athens and later was consecrated Bishop of Ganos and Chora and after 1728 was consecrated Bishop of Monemvasia.

<sup>133</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 35. Manuel Gedeon notes about the hot temper of Nikolaos Komninos Papadopoulos, especially where Meletios Typaldos is concerned. In response to the above mentioned letter of the eighteenth December (probably of 1706) Papadopoulos attacks Typaldos’ nephew, because he became a member of the Society of Jesus. He also refers to someone called Chrysoskoulos, who was a friend of Typaldos’ nephew in Rome, in order to find a way to communicate with the Papal Court. Gedeon notes that Chrysoskoulos is probably a family member of Fanariotes (families residing in Phanari/Fener) “of which the wife of the confidant of Alexandros Mavrokordatos is also a member”. So, it could be assumed that this reference of Komninos-Papadopoulos may be exaggerated or not confirmed. It is considered necessary to mention such a detail in order to form the best possible understanding of the man whose letters give us details about Meletios Typaldos.

<sup>134</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 37.

Latins do not want new persons into purple, and they don't care one bit about the Greeks, who despite their efforts are the most wretched of people throughout the centuries, may the Lord help them<sup>135</sup>.

#### 4.3.5. *The legal dispute*

After August 1699, when the Greeks of the Confraternity complained to the Venetian Authorities about Typaldos' behaviour towards them and his attempts to change the doctrines of the Orthodox population, a long conflict between the two sides began.

As mentioned above<sup>136</sup>, on the 16<sup>th</sup> of January 1699 (under the Venetian calendar in 1698), the "Avogador di Comun"<sup>137</sup> sent a letter to Typaldos asking him to abide by the traditional customs ("uso antico e consueto") with regard to the Blessing of Waters and not to introduce any modern innovation.

In 1704, the conflict between Typaldos and the Greek Confraternity escalated. It was the year that the Venetian Administration would change -more than once- its position on the matters related to the conflicts of the two sides, until it came with its final support to Typaldos.

The first deviation of the Venetian Administration from the past was noted on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of January 1704 (1703 under the Venetian Calendar). The usher Domenico Ongarato, on behalf of the Council of Ten, delivered to the sexton of Saint George a decision according to which the sexton – responsible for the order within the temple – would be obliged to follow all the orders given by Archbishop Typaldos. The same decision also states that the sexton would have to ring the bell on the day of indulgenza (the day of forgiveness according to the Catholic Church)<sup>138</sup>. On the 19<sup>th</sup> of February 1704 (1703 under the Venetian Calendar), Antonios Masganas, president of the community, expressed his opposition on behalf of the Confraternity

---

<sup>135</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 37.

<sup>136</sup> Section 4.2.

<sup>137</sup> Avogaria di Comun: this authority was set up in the second half of the twelfth century. Its members were responsible for the enforcement of the applicable laws and regulations issued by different public authorities. It would execute preliminary investigation tasks in penal cases and act as a public prosecutor. See da Mosto, *Archivio*, 68.

<sup>138</sup> A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 7.

administration. He applied to the Secretariat of the Doge<sup>139</sup>, pre-emptively asking for the Confraternity's views to be heard before the Council of Ten and no decision to be taken in absentia, if Meletios Typaldos, Archbishop of Philadelphia, requested something related to the change of Ius Patronato and the benefits enjoyed by the Saint George church. On the very next day, the 20<sup>th</sup> of February 1704, the Venetians informed Typaldos about the Greeks' request.

On the 15<sup>th</sup> of June 1704, Lauro Querini, "Avogador di Comun", orders the president<sup>140</sup> Pe(g)io Giorgio not to inhibit Meletios Typaldos, Archbishop of Philadelphia, as to the rituals that the latter prefers. For the avoidance of any doubts on Typaldos' wishes, Avogador Querini stated:

[...] volendo Monsignor Reverendissimo Archivescovo della Chiesa di San Zorzi ne giorni solenni, comme in questo delle santissime Pentecoste alla vecchia et altri celebrar in detta sua Chiesa la Santa Messa, o altro Uffico Pontificalmente<sup>141</sup> et a prepararsi pubblicamente in mezzo al coro della stessa Chiesa giusto all'antico, consueto, e solito cerimoniale di tutti I Vescovi Greci<sup>142</sup>.

This document refers to the custom, at the era of Typaldos, that the archbishop had his throne at the right place of the church, while cardinal had it at the center. Avogador Querini probably reminds that during the old years, Christian people and clergy gathered outside the church. There the priests wore their sacred vestments, and all together entered the church, where the Archbishop stood in the middle of the temple and there he blessed the believers. For that reason to stand in the middle of the church was not a foreign habit for Orthodox Church. By virtue of this document, the Venetian Authority offers Archbishop Typaldos the discretion to freely choose regarding the rituals, which clearly express the Catholic dogma. It also threatens a stiff penalty of 500 ducati to anyone who infringes such order and inhibits Typaldos

<sup>139</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 8.

<sup>140</sup> Apart from the Confraternity President, a copy of the order, was given to the church attendant of Saint George, Gregorio Maniati.

<sup>141</sup> The term "Pontificalmente" means the celebratory nature of the ritual performed by the Pope or the Bishop or any other priest who was granted with diocesan benefits. See Salvatore Battaglia, *Grande dizionario della lingua Italiana*, vol I3 (Torino: UTET, 1986), 862.

<sup>142</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφα 10 και 11. English translation: "...As the Archbishop of Saint George church wanted during official Holidays, such as the Pentecost, as per the customs (ethos), or during other days, to conduct the Mass or any other ritual, based on the pontificate way and get prepared in public, in the middle of the church, according to the old, usual and typical ritual of the Greek Bishops".

from acting at his own discretion. Querini's document bears the signature of Santo Bonoto, usher of the Venetian Authority.

It should be noted that the same authority of Avogadori di Comun that in 1699 had attempted to tame Typaldos on the Blessing of Waters, in 1704 expressed a totally different point of view. It adopted Typaldos' views and expressed its doubts on Ius Patronato of the Greeks of Venice.

The Confraternity did not delay to react. The very next day, on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June 1704, the Venetian Administration wrote a letter whereby it revoked the previous decision made by Avogadori di Comun. The order was given by the head of "Quarantia Civil Nuova"<sup>143</sup> Council. The Council's decision stated that:

D'ordine delli illustrissimi et Eccellentissimi Signori Capi<sup>144</sup> di 40 Civil N(u)ovo, stante appellatione interposta in ditto Eccellentissimo Consiglio si suspende a Voi Riverendissimo Monignor Meletio Tipaldi Arcivescovo di Filadelfia non dovendo far alcuna novita sopra li commandamenti a vostra istanza et delli Asserti Nationali Greci fatti d'ordine dell'illustrissimo signor Avogador Lauro Quirini ne giorno d'heri fatti a Domino Pegio Giorgio Guardian per nome suo e Bancali della Scuola di San Nicolò della Chiesa di San Zorzi de Greci et a Gregorio Magnati Nonzolo<sup>145</sup>.

A same order was sent to Alessandro Cieri<sup>146</sup> too, with the addition that he had to file a list of Greeks who support Typaldos within three days:

---

<sup>143</sup> The Council of 40 is one of the oldest authorities of the Venetian administration. It was established in the late twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. At first, it enjoyed a wide range of legislative, judicial and administrative competences. In the fifteenth century, it was divided into two bodies, the Quarantia Criminale and Quarantia Civile, for penal and civil cases, respectively. The latter was next split into two divisions, the Civil Vecchia and the Civil Nuova: see da Mosto, *Archivio*, 22).

<sup>144</sup> The three heads (Capi) of the Council of 40 (Consiglio dei Quaranta) with the minor council (Consiglio) and the Doge formed the Signoria. Members of the Consiglio were six aristocrats who corresponded to the six quarters of Venice. As well as the Doge's counselors, they were also entitled to check on his actions: see da Mosto, *Archivio*, 22).

<sup>145</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 13/A. English translation: "Under the orders of the prominent Heads of the Council of 40 (Civil Nuovo) and provided the appeal was filed before this council, Honorable Meletios Typaldos, Archbishop of Philadelphia, you are hereby deprived of the right and the decision issued by the Avogaria di Comun is revoked; therefore you may no longer proceed to any modernities with regard to the orders sent upon the petition filed by you and your Greek friends. This order was received by the Avogator (judge) Lauro Quirini the day before and was handed in to Mr Georgios Pegios, President and the Saint Nikolaos Confraternity Presidium, the Saint George Confraternity Presidium and Grigorios Maniatis, church attendant".

<sup>146</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 12. Alexandro Cieri is the man who filed a petition before the Avogaria di Comun on behalf of Typaldos. According to such petition, the Archbishop requested to be provided with the right to select the rituals

Item che nel termine di giorni 3 dobbiate haver dichiarato li nomi de Asserti Nationali Greci a nome de quail pure sii stato rilasciato il sudeto commandamento nec non si intima un ordine in forma et cio ad istanza dal suddetto|| Peggio Giorgio Guardian e Bancali<sup>147</sup>.

On August 14th 1704<sup>148</sup> the Greeks appealed to the authorities accusing Typaldos of violation of the rules and particularly the one giving the Confraternity the right to elect and remove the prelates of the church of St. George freely. Typaldos answered back on September 1<sup>st</sup> 1704<sup>149</sup> by accusing the Confraternity that they were the ones who violated the rules of the Church as defined by the Papal letters and the decrees of Venice. He clearly referred to the decrees of 1534 and 1542 (according to these the vicars of St George church should be Catholics) that were no longer in force and had not been for more than 150 years<sup>150</sup>.

In their letter, the Greeks of the Confraternity clearly describe the atmosphere that was created in their relations with the Archbishop. They also answer to the question why they were slow to react after four years passed since their first protest in 1699, which we mentioned above. They showed tolerance and patience waiting and expecting for Typaldos to change behaviour. But that was in vain. Typaldos ignored them and proceeded with the implementation of his plan. The Confraternity could not choose the priests of its Church and its hierarch alone. They were no longer able to expel Typaldos, although this was for decades an “inalienable right”, as is emphatically noted in their letter to the Venetian administration. The reason that led them to these characterizations is not only the ‘wayward’ nature of Typaldos, but mainly the risk of damaging their religion, as described. Their religious identity was actually threatened, since, despite the decisions of the Popes that allowed them to exercise their religious duties according to the Orthodox doctrine, Typaldos decided otherwise.

---

to be followed during the Mass or other liturgies in the Saint George of Greeks. Refer to document above, 10 & 11.

<sup>147</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 13 . English translation: “In addition, within a three-day deadline, you have to declare the names of those Greeks who support Typaldos, in the name of those that such order was issued. This order is communicated under the applicable regulations upon request of Georgios Pegios, President and the Presidium”.

<sup>148</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916) 134r-135r.

<sup>149</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916) 136r.

<sup>150</sup> See subsection 4.3.1.

Typaldos denied the allegations by saying that as a bishop he followed the approved ritual. He carefully avoided talking about the Orthodox ritual but he referred in general to the one set by the papal letters that denied the Greeks the right to follow their doctrine in the short period started by the issue of the decrees of 1534/1542, till 1549 when they stopped to be effective<sup>151</sup>. The Confraternity sent another letter on November 11<sup>152</sup>, placing the facts from their perspective. It emphasized that the proper ritual of the church of St. George was the Orthodox ritual and accused Typaldos of misrepresentation as well as the persecution of the priests who refused to sign a confession to the Catholic faith. In their letter they beg the supreme Venetian authority to preserve their rights in order for justice to prevail. They called upon the Venetian authorities to distinguish the false statements contained in the fraudulent -as they characterize it- letter of the Archbishop in order to understand the quality of the bringer of the case.

The continuation was written on February 12 1707<sup>153</sup> when the Provveditori di comun decided in favour of Typaldos. Henceforth, the priests of the Church of the Greek Orthodox should be Catholic, according to the decrees of 1534 and 1542.

In 1707 Typaldos progressed his plan for the reunion of the Orthodox Greeks with the Catholic Church quite extensively. Helpers in that attempt included his nephew Ioannis Andreas who became a member of the Jesuits<sup>154</sup>; Cardinal Colloredo and the Cretan Franciscan Michael Angelus Farolfo, a Greek from the Catholic-friendly circle of Venice, who came from the order of Friars Minor. After a trip to Rome<sup>155</sup> Farolfo informed Typaldos about what he had discussed with Pope Clement XI. The latter agreed with the plan of Typaldos to have the Greeks of Venice embrace the doctrine of Catholicism.

On July 7<sup>th</sup> 1707 the Confraternity of the Orthodox Greeks returned with an appeal asking the Venetian authorities to return to the former regime<sup>156</sup>. Actually many Greek sailors were protesting in front of the ducal palace demanding the repeal

---

<sup>151</sup> See subsection 3.4.1.

<sup>152</sup> Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, *ms. Cl. IV*, cod. 289 (916)], 138r.

<sup>153</sup> A.S.V., *Compilazione leggi*, b. 228, 345r.

<sup>154</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 83.

<sup>155</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 85.

<sup>156</sup> A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 27, ff 2r-3r.

of the decrees and the expulsion of Typaldos. In their extremist reaction, the Confraternity Greeks were supported by Francesco Diedo, a public advocate, as proven by the respective archives:

Stava fra tanto per compire il tempo del suo magistrato d' avogador di comun il mentovato Diedo et appunto per quanto si disse in quella settimana concordarono con esso i Greci della Scuola di San Giorgio che essendo venuta in Venezia di fresco una londra d' Isolani levantini andassero questi in corpo al avogaria et ivi facessero dello strepito sopra l' articolo della novità, acciò il predetto avogadore avesse fresco e ragionevole motivo di far qualche passo in collegio a loro vantaggio. Segui in effetto con ammirazione di tutta la piazza il concertato tumulto, per cui il Foscarini et altri gravi senatori del miglior senno rimasero molto turbati; maravigliandosi che l' avogadore, il quale ha famiglia armata, non facesse incontente carcerare i capi di quella comparsa<sup>157</sup>.

In their appeal of July 7<sup>th</sup> 1707 the Confraternity asked for “freedom of conscience” in response to the “unfair and bizarre”-as they called them- ordinances of the administration.

Libertà, ch'essendo di coscienza vale a dire d'un capitale il più pretioso che fin ad hora sotto gli auspitii fortunati di un tanto Principe, habbiamo inalterabilmente goduto. Sacrificassimo per lo passato come sian pronti di buona voglia a farlo per l'avvenire, sangue, sostanze, patria e aparenti, attenta sempre la publica Munificenza alla conservatione inalterabile de nostri riti ch'è l'unico fondamento delle nostre coscienze e la base della nostra religione<sup>158</sup>.

Below, they admit that the decrees of 1534/1542 actually existed but never entered into force. And they go on with:

<sup>157</sup> B.M.C.C., cod. Cicogna. 2764, fol.23. *Relazione a Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XI*, op.cit. English translation: “The aforementioned (Francesco) Diedo would complete his service in the office of public prosecutor and, based on what it had been said during such week, the Greeks of the Saint George Confraternity, on the occasion of an arrival of Levantine residents, decided to present as a group before the Avogaria and express their strong opposition against the modernity issue, so as the aforementioned public prosecutor have a rational and recent argument and make progress in favour of the Greeks. A great commotion was caused on Saint Marcus square). Foskarini and other prominent senators were really annoyed by this. They were also concerned about the fact that the Avogador (Diedo), although he comes from a family with a coat-of-arms did nothing to discourage such mobilization”.

<sup>158</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 27, ff 2r-3r. English translation: “Freedom is the freedom of conscience, the most valuable asset we have enjoyed under the protection of a Doge like him. At the past, we had made sacrifices and now we are willing to make sacrifices again, blood, property, our homeland relatives and against such sacrifices, we received as a compensation the public protection, which has always been careful about the unharmed preservation of our dogmas, which are the only foundation of our consciousness and the basis of our religion”.



l'idea della pubblica sovrana sapienza che in tutti li tempi si è sempre compiaciuta di conservare alla nostra Natione l'imperturbabile et imperturbato essercitio de nostri riti; anzi servendo la Chiesa di San Giorgio in questa città modello per toglier in punto di tanta conseguenza una tale novità e comandare che sii osservato il solito et il sempre praticato conserverà la quiete in tanti popoli che vivono con tal fede e sarà sempre benedetta la mano reggia di Vostra Serenità<sup>159</sup>.

In the same letter they made also a reference to their right for religiosity as they considered it, and adhered to the Orthodox faith of their nation, while simultaneously they declared their obedience to the government authorities. All of these however express the controversies and ambiguities of a group of people at the end of the seventeenth century. The proclamation of their religious right reveals their devotion to the traditional aspects of their ethnic identity and their denial to endanger their religious beliefs, rituals and customs.

The Venetian authorities recruited Michelangelo Farolfo to write a response. Farolfo, who wanted to trigger the sensitivity of the Venetian administration for internal security issues, took advantage of the phrase “liberta di coscienza”, used by the Greeks that supposedly suggested disobedient trends towards the Venetian authorities. As Lane notes “Venice was far from being any champion of freedom of thought in principle”<sup>160</sup>. One could live there, and be a free thinker as long as one did not attack the government. Therefore Farolfo’s argument that Greeks struggled for freedom of conscience was a very serious accusation.

The next letter<sup>161</sup> of the Greeks is their response towards Farolfo’s accusations. They explain that the term “freedom of conscience” should be understood according to the teachings of the Orthodox Fathers and of the ecumenical councils -with which all Greeks agree- and should not be interpreted as a situation where anyone follows a religion to their liking motivated by their whims.

---

<sup>159</sup> English translation: “The idea of the public wise authority that always wanted to safeguard for our Nation the uneventful exercise of the dogmas and additionally, the Saint George church serving as a model, so that we are to be relieved of such modernity and with so many effects. The Venetian Authorities should require obedience to this order and the applicable regulations so far, in order to keep the peace for so many nations that embrace such faith”.

<sup>160</sup> Lane, *Venice*, 395.

<sup>161</sup> A.E.I.B. Εκκλησία, 3. Θ.9 doc. 633, 6v.

This last phrase comes to illuminate the strong bonds between the Orthodox creed and the Greek “genos” that shaped the collective consciousness of the Greeks of Venice. It confirms that the Greeks of Venice in the early eighteenth century reacted in full consciousness to Typaldos’ attempt to convert their dogma. They are not acting as individuals -who, as stated before, are anyway moving with ease and without problems in the Catholic environment of the West- but as a community with awareness of their religious identity. This community is ready to challenge any change in the religion, because such a change is recorded in their collective mind as a risk. The fear in the face of this risk is what unites its members and leads them to join a mutual fight against Typaldos. Their reaction is not ‘on the spur of the moment’ since it lasts many years, until the completion of its goal. On the contrary, it is based in a spirit of resistance, kneaded in long historical experience, ready to emerge and expel from their social body any possible cause that threatens to remove their community from its deepest beliefs. If that cause is a person, they isolate him so that he will not be part of the Greek Orthodox community and therefore a member of their ethnicity. This is why the conflict is so intense and expands so much between the community members and the supporters of Typaldos.

The struggle of the Greek Confraternity does not have the character of a skirmish, as happened many times in the past in order to decide about the election of a new teacher or a new Confraternity management. In comparison with the case of Typaldos, those were minor skirmishes. But with the secessionist efforts of the Archbishop much more was at stake: the very existence and the continued existence of the Confraternity. Regardless of the size of their opponents and the extent of the conflict, here we have the revival of a conflict rooted in the distant past and continued in the future, between two religious worldviews and two historic orientations: accession to Catholicism on the one hand, and the preservation of the Orthodox tradition on the other.

Farolfo was the link between Typaldos and the Pope and was amongst the supporters of the Archbishop of Philadelphia as well. Having as partners his cousin Georgios Sakelaris, the only Orthodox person amongst the Confraternity who was protecting Meletios, and Professor Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, he had become

the lever for the success of this plan<sup>162</sup>. Professor Nikolaos Komninós–Papadopoulos appears, as we have previously mentioned, sometimes as Typaldos’ friend and other times as his opponent. From a certain moment onwards he began to openly fight against him. Farolfo asks Komninós Papadopoulos in a letter for some advice about his further actions. The Professor replies that he disapproves of the forcible abstraction of the confession of faith, “being concerned about the dangerous political results”<sup>163</sup>.

The relations between the Confraternity and Typaldos had suffered such a blow, that they would not communicate directly but only through the Venetian Administration. The Confraternity, through a bailiff of the Avogador di Comun, asked Typaldos to return any documents that he might have had regarding Saint George Temple and the Confraternity<sup>164</sup>.

During the first decade of the eighteenth century the Greek Confraternity experiences a great deal of disorder. The Advisors of the “Collegio” confronted Typaldos’ opponents who were Orthodox and were openly trying to expel their Archbishop. Noticing that the situation became more and more exacerbated, Michael Angelus Farolfo decided to travel to Rome in order to request an audience with Pope Clement XI. In 1708 Typaldos enjoyed another great victory in the progression of his plan. He achieved the proclamation of a decision by the Senate on 2 January 1708 and by the “Collegio” on 8 January 1708<sup>165</sup> that reintroduced the two decrees of 1534 and 1542 that were issued by the Council of Ten<sup>166</sup>. This decision forced the priests of the Orthodox church of Saint George of Venice to declare confession of faith according to the Western doctrine. Meletios, very pleased with his triumph, sends a copy of the decree to Michael Angelus, who was in Rome, and describes the new decision as “extremely spiritual and brisk, something the supporters of Photius would not like to be”. But this victory would be celebrated just by him alone. His other helpmate and friend, Professor Nikolaos Komninós–Papadopoulos, had already repudiated. On 15

---

<sup>162</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 85.

<sup>163</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 85-86.

<sup>164</sup> A.E.I.B., B’. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 29.

<sup>165</sup> According to Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία* in the subnote of p. 40, the year 1708 is wrongly mentioned. The right one is 1709 since, according to the Venetian Republic, a year was starting to count from March.

<sup>166</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 760.

March 1708 he notes in a letter: “Nothing more about the Archbishop of Philadelphia and I don’t care at all where the Greeks are concerned”<sup>167</sup>. Nikolaos Komninos–Papadopoulos had clearly foreseen that Typaldos’ plan, despite the occasional victories, was leading to failure.

The story continues in 1709, when Michael Angelus Farolfo, in one of his reports to the Pope describes in detail the plan Typaldos and himself devised “for the accomplishment of the so-called ‘Unia’”. This information is drawn from a report kept in the library of the Museum Correr in Venice:

Seguita la reiezione della supplica de Greci in Serenissima Signoria, credete il Candiotto di scoprire con sue lettere a Padova all’ abbate Papadopoli l’ animo suo inclinato ad assistere alle sante intenzioni del Filadelfo e dar mano a fare questo bene alla nazione di provederla de parochi Greci Cattolici, quali possano illuminarla: e con ciò lo pregò ancora di somministrargli lumi, ricordi e consigli et unione d’ accordo per contribuire ambidue quanto havessero potuto alla salute de nazionali communi fratelli et alla gloria della chiesa senza formalizarsi punto sul merito, che se ne fosse potuto attribuire all’ arcivescovo ò altra persona<sup>168</sup>.

At the end of the first decade of the eighteenth century (between 1706 -1709) two more important texts were written: The first one -the “Informatione”- written by Typaldos, favouring the Western Church over the Eastern Church. The second one - the “apologia”- was written as a reply to the “Informatione” by the Catholic abbot Michelangelo Fardella. The commission of writing a theological text to a significant person belonging to the opposite doctrine was very common at that time. The purpose of this, as referred by Vassiliki Bobou–Stamati is related to the following.

<sup>167</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 87.

<sup>168</sup> B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol.21r. *Relazione a Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XI*, op.cit English translation: “After the petition of the Greeks was rejected by the Serenissima Signoria, the man from Candia (Farolfo) wanted to reveal through letters to Papadopoulos (Nik. Komninos) his thoughts that were for the holy objectives of the Archbishop of Philadelphia and his tendency to help him for the sake of the Greeks (Nazione Greci) providing Greek Catholic Priests, who could convey their spirit. Also, he asked him to elaborate and consult him, so as both of them to contribute, as much as possible, to the health of our nation’s brothers and the glory of our Church, without getting stuck on details on the origin of the idea, whether from the archbishop or any other person”.

The text by abbot Fardella may have been written by Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos and was just signed by Fardella<sup>169</sup>. Komninos-Papadopoulos had helped Fardella to be elected as a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Padua in 1693. So, perhaps in gratitude for the help that Komninos-Papadopoulos had offered him, Fardella agreed to sign the text of the “apologia”, which contains knowledge and details on rituals of Orthodox religion, such as the altar bread, and historical events as the history of the Greek community of Venice, which Fardella is unlikely to have known. So Papadopoulos may refer to the Greeks in a derogatory way as “Graeculi” purposefully and in order to keep distance from any suspicions that he was the one who wrote the “apologia”, in which the defence of the Greeks was analysed. In any case, it can be said that these two texts, that were written between 1706 and 1709 and are going to be discussed later, constitute the culmination of the confrontation between Typaldos and the Greek Confraternity. Thereafter, the situation deteriorated, and the outcome would be detrimental to both sides.

#### 4.3.6. The “*Informazione*” and the “*Apologia*”

The “informazione”<sup>170</sup> while there is no doubt that they had been written by Typaldos, something that was already known at that time<sup>171</sup>, did not however bear his signature. It is a relatively small text -and anyway smaller than the “Lettera”<sup>172</sup>- about blasphemy which is addressed to the Venetian Authority. Through the “Informazione”, Typaldos wants to highlight the unifying tradition of the Orthodox Church as well as the Greek Church of Venice.

In the introduction Meletios refers to the Council of Florence, where “the unification of the Churches has actually taken place”, as he characteristically writes. He continues “there have been, ongoing and wide-ranging communications between the three Patriarchs of the Eastern and Western Church without them ever refusing –in

---

<sup>169</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 216.

<sup>170</sup> Texts of “Informazione” and “Apologia” are issued and commented by Vassiliki Bobou-Stamati in Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 170-228. The translation of the two texts, from Italian into Greek has been taken from this publication.

<sup>171</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 207.

<sup>172</sup> See subsection 4.3.1.

any private or public Assembly—, rejecting or garbling the consensus taken by the Ecumenical Council of Florence in any way”<sup>173</sup>.

Meletios pretends that he is unaware of or does not recognize the subsequent council of Saint Sophia, held in 1450 in Constantinople, whereby the Eastern Orthodox Church abjured the Council of Florence. Instead, he says that only one hierarch of the Eastern Church, Marcus Efessios, refused to sign the conclusions of the Council of Florence which unified the two Churches. He also notes that after the Fall of Constantinople the supporters of Marcus Efessios came easily in the Turks’ good graces and occupied the Patriarchate churches by keeping the unionists away.

According to Typaldos, the Greek Church was never termed ‘Schismatic’ because the Greeks are unified with the Latin Church. Anyone who supports the opposite view is blasphemous. Particularly, the Greeks of Venice are faithful to the reunion of the Churches, because they are coming from those who were expelled by the supporters of Marcus Efessios and found a shelter within the pale of the Serenissima, while others went to Rome, Florence, Naples and Sicily. At this point the argument he wrote in the “Lettera”<sup>174</sup> is being repeated, i.e. that the unionists preserved their love and faith to the Doge, and the proof of this were the territories of Cyprus and Crete. As a reward, the Doge gave the building permission for the church of Saint George. The church was a privilege given by the Doge to the Greek Catholics, i.e. those Greeks who, although they preserved the rituals, have accepted the Latin faith, in order to hold offices in religious associations, to participate in celebrations of the Catholic Church, in Jubilee, in Good Friday ceremonies and for the moribund to receive communion.

Then, seizing upon the imprisonment of Hieromonk Sotiris<sup>175</sup>, he calls on the “Authority against blasphemy”<sup>176</sup> to expel from the Church anyone who teaches “the

<sup>173</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 173.

<sup>174</sup> See subsection 4.3.1

<sup>175</sup> See subsection 4.3.3.

<sup>176</sup> “Περί της Βλασφημίας Αρχή”: “Esecutori contro la bestemmia”: the authority consisted of three members with judicial competencies who would hear offences related to blasphemy, sacrilege and prohibited games (see da Mosto, *Archivio*, 175).

opposite doctrines and the rituals of the Greek Church which is unified with the Latin one, as the priest supporting Photius who is now in prison did and taught”<sup>177</sup>.

It is clear that Typaldos considers the Greek Church absolutely identical with the Western Church. His viewpoint can be concentrated in the following phrase: “Rituals, dogma and faith are different things. Greeks have been allowed to live according to their own ‘rito’ and the Catholic faith. That’s why the Pope himself forces the students of the Greek College in Rome to take double oaths in order to certify that, no matter where they are; they would preserve their ‘rito’ from the errancy of the supporters of Photius and those of Marcus Efessios”. Also, he repeats the arguments on the Filioque and “begs”: “Your Excellence, kindly use the power that God has availed you with in order to keep safe this poor church of Saint George of the Greeks as far as possible”<sup>178</sup>.

The reply by abbot Fardella – the “Apologia”– is much more comprehensive than the “Informazione”. The “Apologia” starts with a personal attack against Meletios, though his name is not mentioned directly at all. Fardella prefers to use characterizations like “unknown writer”, (as the “Informazione” is not signed by anyone), and “ambitious one” or “mischievous one”.

The first phrase of the “Apologia” starts to discredit the authority of the writer of the “informazione” by saying: “It is a customary habit for anyone who seeks something that he does not deserve, to abandon the truth which constitutes the fundamental basis of every legal and fair demand and to adhere to errancy and fraud, the ultimate shelter of the ambitious, in order to reach the peak of the plans he contrives”<sup>179</sup>.

Fardella refers directly to Meletios’ ambition and presents it as the motivation behind his actions. Then, masterfully, with strong arguments, he invalidates one by one all those points written by Typaldos in the “informazione”. More specifically, he writes that the Greeks were faithful to the reunion only for the duration of their trip from Florence to Constantinople. Upon their return there they conducted the Council of Saint Sophia and abjured the Council of Florence.

<sup>177</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 175.

<sup>178</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 175.

<sup>179</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 192.

He said that the Pope never called the Greeks ‘Schismatic’, paying thus his respect to a devout nation and honouring the thousands of Martyrs and Eastern Church Fathers. Moreover, the Pope cannot excommunicate Englismen, Germans or Greeks in general, since among them there are many Catholics, but only the sects of Calvin and Luther, as well as the Greek Church<sup>180</sup>.

Arguing about the Greeks of Venice, he wrote that they were not stubborn, because they did whatever they were supposed to do. In addition, the foreign Greeks who had gathered here in Venice with their merchandise were larger in number than the permanent Greek residents. It would not be wise for these voyagers to celebrate Lent and Easter twice, once in Venice during their business trip and once in Greece upon their return. Finally, he asserted that devoted to the Doge and the Serenissima were all the Greeks without discrimination because they respected the freedom and the opportunities given to them by the Venetian Republic. That was why the Greeks of the Peloponnese fought against the Turks along with the Venetians, as the Orthodox Greeks did in Livadia, Thebes and Athens.

Regarding the argument of “Informazione” for the church of St George, Fardella claims that it is completely false. The fall took place in 1453. The church was founded in 1514, i.e. 61 years later. There were not many of them who were still alive. Moreover, the decree for the foundation of St George does not mention that the church is given as a present to the Uniates Cypriots and Cretans when they came to Venice. It should be noticed that Cypriot and Cretan people came to Venice in 1571 and in 1699 after the loss of their homelands. Both dates are significantly posterior to the foundations of the church. So, the writer of *Apologia* holds that the argument of Typaldos is completely incoherent. Also even if someone could accept any of Typaldos’ arguments, how would he prove that these Greeks coming from Cyprus, Crete, Moreas, the islands and elsewhere were Uniates? If so, why do they not mention the Pope in church like Greek Catholics coming from Calabria, Sicily, Malta, Rome and Livorno do? Why do their priests fall under the Orthodox Bishops and those Bishops fall under the Patriarch of Constantinople and not under the Pope of Rome? Unless someone declared that they gradually converted from Orthodoxy to Catholicism, so once again we may wonder how the Pope could permit a Church and

<sup>180</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 175.



a group of believers, in the heart of Italy, to secede without preventing them or threatening them with reprisals. If they were Uniates, there would be no necessity to enforce the election of Catholic priests, as it was now attempted. The only fact brought by the writer of “Informazione” which is not untrue is that for the Greeks “rito” and “dogma” are two different things. In 1569 a decree was issued which allowed the Greeks to live according to their own “rito” and their own “antiche opinioni” and not to be judged by the Inquisition. “Rito” means the Orthodox rituals and the exclusion from the Inquisition means that the Greek founders of the church of Saint George fell under the Patriarchate.

The Apologia continues saying that the Doge had announced his decision that the Greeks would practice their faith freely. Finally, the person who hurts the public interest, the peace and justice of the Doge and causes confusion and disorder in the Serenissima is the writer of “Informazione”.

The careful reading of texts reveals that the dispute also includes theological issues that “Apologia” treats one by one. For example, the Communion with altar bread of the Latins, which, as Fardella mentions, is accepted by the Greeks since a lot of students in Padua and Venice receive Communion in Latin Churches; the existence or not of the purgatory and how it is interpreted by each part; Papal supremacy; and finally the uncreated energy, or the spiritual nature of the light shown by the Apostles during the Transformation of Jesus, as the great Fathers of the Christian Church hold<sup>181</sup>. The closure of the dispute reintroduces the most crucial issue for the Venetian authority: the threat to the safety of the Venetian Republic resulting from Greeks who were not Uniates. That was why the writer of the “Apologia” repeated how faithful the nation of Greeks was to the Doge and the Serenissima. Both sides were aware of the fact that the suspicion of disorder in the internal affairs of the Serenissima would attract the ruler’s attention.

What was the outcome of this dispute? We have already discussed it. The officials of the Venetian Republic reintroduced the Decrees of 1534 and 1542. Their decision proves that they were more persuaded by Typaldos than by the other Greeks. It is probable that not only Typaldos’ arguments caused it, but obviously, after all these decades, being a favourite of the Venetian aristocracy, Typaldos had succeeded

---

<sup>181</sup> Bobou-Stamati, “Ανέκδοτα Κείμενα”, 204.

in enlisting a lot of powerful people in support of his request. Furthermore, we should not underestimate the political facts of the era. We saw earlier that, immediately after the conquest of the Peloponnese, Venice was careful to apply to the Orthodox Greeks the kind of administration that would not cause major reactions, as would have happened if, for example, they enforced Catholicism. Venice suspected that such pressure would lead the Greek Orthodox to ally with the Ottomans, which would cause great trouble for the Venetians in their new acquisitions. They were afraid that perhaps it would be also valid for the Orthodox living in the city of Venice. As the future proved, this was not an unfounded suspicion. In the early eighteenth century when the Venetian rulers took sides with Typaldos, vindicating his Catholic-friendly turn, some scholars<sup>182</sup> claimed that it was due to the arrogance acquired by Venice after the conquest of the Peloponnese, and the fear that the Orthodox would seek help from coreligionist Russia<sup>183</sup>. In particular, it should be noted that Russia in the late seventeenth century was a powerful force and its relations with Venice were friendly, while after the seventeenth century, when Russia lost the battle at the river Pruth, it lost some of its prestige but continued to be considered as a great power<sup>184</sup>.

This is also one of the reasons, as we will see in the next chapter, why the intervention of Peter the Great in favour of the Orthodox of Venice against Typaldos' Catholic-friendly supporters failed<sup>185</sup>. Venice after the Treaty of Karlowitz included most of Dalmatia's territory, where the majority of the people were also Orthodox. Venice felt that the Orthodox element within was now large and perhaps more influential in comparison with the Catholic. In contrast, some other historians<sup>186</sup> interpreted that as an effort of Venice to come closer to the Pope because of its weakened financial position at that time. At last, a third group of historians suggests that all this was a result of a conservative turn made by the body of Venetian aristocracy on issues of religious tolerance<sup>187</sup>. A further interpretation could be added

<sup>182</sup> Manousakas, "Επισκόπηση της ιστορίας", 258.

<sup>183</sup> Manousakas, "Επισκόπηση της ιστορίας", 258.

<sup>184</sup> Longworth, "Russian-Venetian Relations", 400.

<sup>185</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 761; Pignatorre and Pignatorre, *Memorie*, V. 2, 282.

<sup>186</sup> Efstathios Birtachas. "Un 'secondo' vescovo a Venezia: Il Metropolita di Filadelfia (secoli XVI-XVIII)", in *I Greci a Venezia: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Venezia, 5-7 novembre 1998* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2002), subnote 113.

<sup>187</sup> Koutmanis, *Χρονικά για την ιστορία της Ελληνικής Κοινότητας Βενετίας*.

concerning the extensive debate made on the issue of “freedom of conscience”<sup>188</sup>. It is good to be reminded of the note of Lanes that “Venice was far from being any champion of freedom of thought in principle [...] but men of a great variety of views succeeded one way or another in living in Venice pretty much as they pleased, and thinking as they pleased, so long as they did not attack the Government”<sup>189</sup>. It would seem that the Venetians suspected a hidden need of the Greeks for greater independence within the territory and because of that they reacted by rejecting their demands and fostering Typaldos’ attempt, demonstrating in that way the power of the Venetian State.

The reintroduction of the decrees of 1534/1542 constituted the beginning of the end both for Typaldos – as an Archpriest of the Orthodox Church – and the Greek Confraternity of Venice, as it was known up to that time. The division would be deep and would last for many decades.

Putting an end to this issue on the contrast between “Informazione” and “Apologia” we may additionally note the special reference made to the “Nation of Greeks”, especially in the text of “Apologia”. The writer, despite being an Italian teacher – under the reservation we mentioned earlier about the writer’s real identity – refers to the “Greek nation” twice, demarcating the concept of the “Nation of Greeks” from their religious identity. At that time it was usual to use the term “Greco”, “Greci” and “Nazione Greca” found in the texts of the period under consideration. These terms must be seen in their double meaning: the religious one, referring to the Orthodox, and the ethnic one, referring to those who are Greeks by origin<sup>190</sup>. The writer of the “Apologia” refers to the “Nation”. Typaldos and Chrysanthos Notaras use the same term too. We highlight this detail as an additional verification of the preceding references in Chapter 3, on the ethnic identity and the ethnic consciousness of the Greeks of Venice at the time.

---

<sup>188</sup> The debate had been developed in response to the phrase “liberta di coscienza” that Greeks wrote in their application to the Venetian Administration (see subsection 4.3.5).

<sup>189</sup> Lane, *Venice*, 395. For details see subsection 4.3.5.

<sup>190</sup> The “Apologia” of the Abate Fardella, A.E.I.B. Εκκλησία 3, 09. 191-207; Fyrigos, “Accezioni del termine ‘Greco’”, 201-215.

## CHAPTER FIVE: THE DECLINE OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY

-----

The facts presented in this chapter confirm that those who opposed to Typaldos' attempt the most were not theologians, but mainly socially active members of the Greek Confraternity in Venice, namely merchants and ship owners. Therefore, the opposition against Typaldos was neither ecclesiastical nor restricted to a certain social class. This was an opposition by the Greek subjects of Venice, faced with the danger of losing their religion and ethnicity.

The excommunication of the archbishop and his death, as well as the loss of the autonomy of the Confraternity, were the most serious consequences of the conflict between Typaldos and those opposing him. The Pope and the Venetian Authorities intervened in the internal affairs of the Greek confraternity deciding to impose a new catholic archbishop. This decision was blocked by the Patriarchate and the Confraternity. The result was that the archbishop's post remained vacant for the following seven decades and the church of St. George remained without leadership.

### 5.1. The end of the conflict

After the "Apologia" the upset within the Greek community caused by the actions of Typaldos as well as of the decisions of the Council of Ten<sup>1</sup>, was significant. The Greeks of the Confraternity responded more intensively this time. They refused to elect any new priest in the church. They were eschewing the Mass to such a degree that, during the Mass no collection plate was put out, as no believers existed inside the church<sup>2</sup>. One can imagine Typaldos as a high priest and a few rectors who were obliged to follow him conducting the Sunday Mass before vacant seats or before just a handful of friends or supporters of Typaldos.

On 23<sup>rd</sup> of August 1707<sup>3</sup>, Michael Vardas, one of the most active members of the Greek Confraternity of Venice, sent a congratulatory letter to Chrysanthos Notaras who had become Patriarch of Jerusalem. Apropos, describing the situation within the

<sup>1</sup> Particularly regarding the reset of the decrees of 1534/1542 see subsection 4.3.1

<sup>2</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 87.

<sup>3</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 40.

Orthodox Confraternity of Venice, he talks about the degradation of the nation, due to Typaldos' acts, writing:

Today a lot of people rebel against us especially against our Archpriest, who made us not only Schismatic but also heretic and also there are in our nation a lot of Arians, Nestorians, Iconoclasts and others that I cannot even describe. I think that if difficult days come then we will understand how much we hate and not love each other in our nation<sup>4</sup>.

On 17 December 1709<sup>5</sup> the Priest Abraham the Cretan, from Bucharest, writes in his letter to Chrysanthos Notaras:

I also tried to assist in the general salvation of our unfortunate nation, so as to expel the unjust influence exerted by Meletios who had turned in the wrong direction and against the proper faith in stupidity<sup>6</sup>.

During this period some Greeks, heads of the Confraternity, were trying to convince the Patriarchate of Constantinople to intervene. They suggested to the Ecumenical Patriarch to appeal to the Russian Privy Council in order to intervene with the Venetian Authorities. Their ultimate aim was to persuade the Venetians to take appropriate measures for halting Typaldos' acts<sup>7</sup>. Upon the request of the Patriarch<sup>8</sup>, Peter the Great of Russia promptly intervened in favour of the Orthodox Greeks and sent a letter to the Venetian Senate on 7 December 1710, whereby he condemned the acts of Meletios Typaldos and requested the intervention of the Senate for the rectification of the state of affairs which would release those of the same religious doctrine, the Orthodox Christians. However, the Senate, despite pressure both from the Greek Confraternity and Peter the Great of Russia, replied to the latter after six months, on 10<sup>th</sup> June 1711 without providing a solution to the issue and limiting itself to vague promises<sup>9</sup>.

Since we are dealing with the response sent to Peter the Great by the Venetians, it should be noted that during that period Russia expressed an intense interest regarding the large number of Orthodox believers living in the region of Dalmatia. This interest began during the period of the previous Czar, Alexey Michailovich,

<sup>4</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 40-41.

<sup>5</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 41.

<sup>6</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 41.

<sup>7</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 761.

<sup>8</sup> Pignatorre and Pignatorre, *Memorie*, V.2, 282; Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 46.

<sup>9</sup> Tsitselis, *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα*, 761, subnote 2.

father of Peter the Great -according to the Russian diplomatic records of that period<sup>10</sup>- who sent his representatives to Venice and Florence on several occasions, with the intention of nurturing diplomatic relations and also of acquiring significant know-how (in many sectors, from ship building to the manufacture of glass). Also, since Alexey Michailovich considered himself to be a protector of the Orthodox faith, he expressed a concern about the behaviour of the Venetians towards the Greek Orthodox of the only Eastern Church in Venice, Saint George<sup>11</sup>. In 1663 the Russian ambassador visited the Archbishop of Philadelphia, Meletios Hortatsis (1657-1677), and asked him whether the Orthodox believers living in Venice enjoyed freedom of their religious rights<sup>12</sup>.

The official intervention of Peter the Great followed as a natural outcome of the information collected by the Russian representatives in Venice, who claimed that the Orthodox believers did not enjoy the level of independence they should. According to the above mentioned Russian diplomatic records, a few years later (1718/1722), after Typaldos' death, whilst he had not yet been replaced by any Orthodox priest, but the Pope's circle was trying to place a Catholic archbishop, an Orthodox monk travelled to Russia to ask Peter the Great for further intervention. But this time the Czar did not act<sup>13</sup>.

Leonardos Kapetanakis<sup>14</sup>, Michail Peroulis<sup>15</sup>, Georgios Stamatelos, Antonios Taliapetra remain at the administrative offices of the Confraternity up to April of 1710. Defeated by the Venetian Administration, they chose to resign. The leadership of the Confraternity was taken over by Ioannis Chalkiopoulos, Georgios Zandiris and Ioannis Makolas, persons close to Typaldos. President Leonardos Kapetanakis

<sup>10</sup> Longworth, "Russian-Venetian Relations", 380-400.

<sup>11</sup> Russia was not the only Orthodox state concerned with the Greek Orthodox people living in Venice. A similar concern was shown during the first decade of the eighteenth century, by Constantin Vassaravas Brancoveanu, Prince of Wallachia, but he had not done anything in order to not disrupt the relations of his country with Venice; see Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 46.

<sup>12</sup> Longworth, "Russian-Venetian Relations".

<sup>13</sup> Longworth, "Russian-Venetian Relations".

<sup>14</sup> For Leonardos Kapetanakis, see Despoina Vlasi, "Στα ίχνη του Σπυρίδωνα και του Λεονάρδου Καπετανάκη. Αρχαιικά σταχυολογήματα", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 41/42 (2001/2012), 172-232, esp. 178-179.

<sup>15</sup> Michail Peroulis comes from a great family of aristocrats, one for the most powerful in Athens. Born in Athens, he visited Venice in the middle of the seventeenth century, where he was successfully engaged in trade. He served four times as the president of the Confraternity (1683, 1694, 1697, and 1706). See: Panagiotis Michalairis, "Ανέκδοτες Επιστολές, 1695-1696, του Μιχ. Ν. Γλυκού στον Μιχ. Σταμ. Περούλη", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 13 (1976), 244-249; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 187; Constantine Mertzios, "Οι Αθηναίοι Περούληδες εν Βενετία", *Αθηναϊκά*, 41 (1968) 1-8.

completed his office in March 1710 and refused to further exercise his duties. In a letter by Proveditori di Comun<sup>16</sup>, dated the 31<sup>st</sup> of March 1710, he was requested to proceed to elections for a new presidium. Despite the order, Leonardos Kapetanakis denied and declared that he was no longer interested in being nominated. Such denial and his resignation before even the new presidium was elected could not be but an action of great disappointment under current conditions. The minutes of the meeting note:

Per haver terminato il tempo del suo guardianato et essendo stata fatta tre ellectione in titolo di successore alla detta scolla che pero essendo stati dispensati iistando con il presente de rinunciare all'impiego sudeto rifletendo anche tal ministero per molti affari<sup>17</sup>.

The rest of the recordings of Capitolari prove that for the remaining months of 1710 there was no president and only one vice president was active, instead of two.

The long lack of leadership led the surrogate Nicolo Canachi to send on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March 1711 a letter to Proveditori di Comun asking for an audition before them regarding the case of a teacher and his compensation. On the occasion of such request, he stressed that the Confraternity still had no president<sup>18</sup>. It had been almost one year since Kapetanakis resigned. A few days later, on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March, 1711<sup>19</sup>, the Confraternity ran elections and Ioannis Chalikiopoulos, supporter of Typaldos, became the new president. Zandiris and Makolas, friends of Typaldos, also participated as simple members. Chalikiopoulos' son, Aloisios, was the protégé of

---

<sup>16</sup> Proveditori di Comun: established in 1256. At first, it would consist of three members. It would supervise the mercantile activities and therefore it was in touch with the commercial ambassadors. It would control the confraternities, the unions and would take care of public streets, bridges and small canals. From 1569 on, they took over the issuance of departure permits for ships. It would also provide citizens and foreigners with the rights of nationalization. Venice used to have two authorities for checking on the confraternities: the Consiglio dei dieci and the Proveditori di Comun. (See da Mosto, *Archivio*, 178).

<sup>17</sup> A.E.I.B. A'. Οργάνωση – Λειτουργία, 3.Πρακτικά, Κατάστιχο 8 (Capitolare VIII), φύλλο 179 r-v (181 r-v νέα αρίθμηση). English translation: "Since the office of the presidium has come to an end and since there have already been three rounds for the election of a successor (in the presidency) for the abovementioned Confraternity, which, however proved to be futile, it is hereby requested that Leonardos Kapetanakis be exempted from a further nomination due to the heavy duties he has been already charged with".

<sup>18</sup> A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφο 46.

<sup>19</sup> A.E.I.B., A'. Οργάνωση – Λειτουργία, 3, op.cit. φύλλο 186 r .

Ioannis Patousas<sup>20</sup>. Simon and Lampros Maroutsis, prominent members of the Greek and Venetian community, also participated as simple members<sup>21</sup>.

The kind of unrest that was caused within the Greek Confraternity in Venice is shown in some more letters written by Orthodox people, clergymen and laymen as well. These express a concern about the problem caused by Typaldos. There are also signs of the tendency expressed by many to leave Venice because of this disturbance. For instance, on 27 February 1711, Chourmouzius Vyzantios, a student in Padua, writes to his spiritual father, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos Notaras<sup>22</sup>:

Thy holiness has given me permission to receive the communion in Venice in the customary way of our Church. But the Romans who live here who are full of a deep hatred, together with their Archbishop, and who never attend church, are preventing me from receiving the communion and entering the church. Those who go to church are considered heretics and are deprived of the general respect. Therefore I am seeking for Thy counsel and would appreciate to receive it soon.

On 10 June 1711 the Bishop of Nafplio and Argos, Amvrosios, expresses his concerns in a letter addressed to Chrysanthos Notaras<sup>23</sup>. There was a rumour that Typaldos was planning to open a school in Argos at his own expense. Argos and Nafplio were under Venetian rule. In that sense Amvrosios is describing his concern that Meletios, whose activities he was aware of, is trying to expand into other regions under Venetian rule. Thus he is asking Chrysanthos Notaras, who is already the Patriarch in Jerusalem, that if such a school was to open, at least it should have a teacher who is faithful to the views of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Otherwise if someone goes there who has a “distorted” belief, this will neither be beneficial for the school nor for the “genos”<sup>24</sup>.

On 15 March 1712 a Greek who lived in Venice Georgios Trapezountios writes to Chrysanthos Notaras<sup>25</sup>:

There is another obstacle in living here [in Venice], the absence of church activities and the lack of a spiritual father, even though the

<sup>20</sup> Athanasia Avdali, *H “Εγκυκλοπαίδεια Φιλολογική” του Ιωάννη Πατούσα: Συμβολή στην Ιστορία της Παιδείας του Νέου Ελληνισμού, 1710-1839* (Athens: Αναστατικές Εκδόσεις, 1984), 78.

<sup>21</sup> See subsection 2.4.4.

<sup>22</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 41.

<sup>23</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 45.

<sup>24</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 45-46.

<sup>25</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 41-42.



priest Maras seems to be active occasionally ... Panagiotis (Sinopeas, Typaldos' friend), who took up the function of deacon, although during his ordainment some of the people were shouting "not worthy", is hoping to become a priest soon and to serve the Church under the authority of "Μισαδελφείας"<sup>26</sup> whose deeds you are informed about.

The lack of priests was due to the fact that the Confraternity refused to elect priests under Typaldos' authority. Members of the Confraternity were preventing people from entering the church, with the intention to protect them from Typaldos' influence. As proven by the aforementioned extract of Trapezountios' letter, when Panagiotis Sinopeas had been ordained as a deacon, some of Typaldos' opponents entered the church and shouted "not worthy" to the newly ordained cleric. In the Greek Orthodox tradition this moment is the highest attainment for a young clergyman. From the Byzantine period until today the people in the church shout "worthy" to confirm their approval to the newly ordained clergyman. It is an act of moral acceptance by those that will recognize him as their shepherd in the future. When there are voices shouting "not worthy", this means that the people in the church are forcing the new deacon into isolation and disdain.

After many years of trying, eventually the Greek Confraternity of Venice managed to have Typaldos excommunicated by the Patriarchate, which led to his dethronement<sup>27</sup>. Cyril IV decided to dethrone Typaldos after several suggestions forwarded by Chrysanthos Notaras. The Archbishop of Philadelphia, Meletios Typaldos, was dethroned on the 10th of June 1712<sup>28</sup>. Despite the pressure exerted on the Patriarchate for the dethronement of Typaldos, when it happened it was such an important event that it was almost unbelievable. Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, the professor in Padua, opponent of Typaldos for years, was informed about his dethronement much later. There are two letters in which he mentions this issue. In one of them, addressed to Dimitrios Notaras, brother of Chrysanthos, he says: "I heard that Misadelphia's Bishop was dethroned. He developed cardiac fibrillation and, if his dethronement is true, he has become a corpse"<sup>29</sup>. Komninos-Papadopoulos was not yet certain about the dethronement. He was to be informed about it soon, after the

---

<sup>26</sup> The writer here paraphrases the word "Philadelphia", a composite word of "philos" (friend) and "adelphos" (brother) and turns into its antonym "Misadelphia", out of words "misos" (hate) and "adelphos" (brother), i.e. a person who hates his own brothers.

<sup>27</sup> See section 1.2.

<sup>28</sup> Veloudis, *Χρυσόβουλα και Γράμματα* 79-92.

<sup>29</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 51-52.

death of Typaldos. In that letter Komninos Papadopoulos is writing among other things:

Now, after his death, it is said that the Pope was planning to ordain Meletios as a cardinal, as a reward for his faith and his great achievements. That's how people can get fooled, and now the poor man is in the grave, and all his cunningness and lies and tyranny were not sufficient to save him, and neither was the rest of his ambitions, he is gone. However the nation is not yet at peace. Rome is trying to put a similarly minded man in place as his successor, Stais [...]. The eminence of Rome, with many words but few actions, I am in many ways suspect for protecting the Schismatics and not encouraging the dirty works of Venice<sup>30</sup>.

Many times representatives of the Greek Enlightenment suffered discomforts caused by the fanatic religious circles of the Patriarchate, because of their modernist ideas and their teachings (there are many examples of this, such as Cyril Lucaris, Methodios Anthracites, Voulgaris, and others); this, however, did not happen with Typaldos.

---

<sup>30</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 52-53.

## 5.2. “Flowers of Piety”

During the entire period of his conflict with the members of the Greek Confraternity Typaldos was not alone, he had his own supporters. As previously mentioned, some of his supporters were particular priests who had turned to Catholicism -most of them as a result of pressure exerted by Typaldos- as well as some of the tutors and his students from the Flanghinian School. In 1708 and in the middle of the conflict between Typaldos and his opponents, students of the Flanghinian School and other scholars, who were at the time the people around Typaldos, published a compilation of poems with the title “Flowers of Piety” that was dedicated to the Archbishop of Philadelphia<sup>31</sup>. We have mentioned before that one of the customs of that era was to honour a person who was living or after his death by poems. The “Flowers of Piety”, because of the timing of its publication and its content, are considered as a promotional attempt to support Meletios<sup>32</sup>.

It is worthwhile to mention this compilation of poems for two reasons. One of them has to do with the image that the people around Typaldos carried about him. Another reason has to do with the value of the compilation not only as a product of poetry, but also as a confirmation of the vivid Greek memory, and the “Renaissance flare of modern Hellenism”<sup>33</sup>. These suggestions are mainly proposed by Constantine Th. Dimaras, one of the most important scholars of modern Greek literature. He supports the view that the collection “Flowers of Piety” shows the level of growth that Greek poetry could have reached under such cultural conditions. The poems written by young men would embrace the literary impact of the school and the impact of the Italian environment. The school gives out a vivid Greek remembrance, a sense of Greek cultural unity within time<sup>34</sup>.

In this thesis the poems of the “Flowers of Piety” are studied not as the first poetic samples of the modern Greek poetical tradition, but from the standpoint of the

---

<sup>31</sup> Georgios Valetas, “‘Τα Άνθη Ευλαβείας’: Μια πιτυμένη αναγεννητική αναλαμπή του Νέου Ελληνισμού,” *Νέα Εστία*, 64/755 (1958), 98-119; Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 74; Dimaras, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*; Mertzios, “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης”; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*; Linos Politis, “Βιβλιοκρισία στην έκδοση Α. Παπακώστα”, *Ελληνικά*, 12 (1952), 198-213; Constantine T. Dimaras, “Εισαγωγικά στην μελέτη της συλλογής ‘Άνθη Ευλαβείας’”, in *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1974), 336-349.

<sup>32</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 74.

<sup>33</sup> Valetas, “Άνθη Ευλαβείας”.

<sup>34</sup> Dimaras, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*, 148.

intense conflict between Typaldos and his supporters, on one hand, and the Greeks of the Confraternity on the other. Because of this our comments are dealing with the poems written specifically about the Archbishop, as well as some poems written about Greece, and do not deal with any poems with religious content.

Three poems of this compilation are dedicated to Typaldos; the poem “To his holiness and our most wise Archpriest, Meletios Typaldos” compares the Archbishop with the Sun<sup>35</sup>, which

always brightens the whole creation with its rays of light and as a benevolent guardian is the lord of the world and gives life to the earth; You, with your indescribable wisdom, offer light to human spirits and to the dead ones you offer life, with the power of your words you push away the darkness of ignorance [...] You, with the highness of your mind, your prudence, your piety, are the most shining figure among the hierarchs [...] whatever someone might say, it would not suffice to praise you appropriately, divine Typaldos.

The second poem under the title “Epigram”<sup>36</sup> refers to the Archbishop as:

the crown honour, which is honoured by earth as a holy divinity, with both Latin and Greek hymns [...] Is there anyone who would meet you and not see in your face the hierarch who shines with the greatest glory of all.

Lastly, the sonnet titled “To the unparalleled virtue of his Eminence Meletios Typaldos” shows some nuggets relating with the opposition against Typaldos<sup>37</sup>:

I see you standing on the seigniorial torso of the invincible Adrias as an excellent shepherd, representing the Greek virtue, and as such never beaten into submission by any weather assaults, you stable star [...] However, oh, holy Archpriest, for the refinement of the whole Adriatic Sea, thanks to you, Greece is still opening up its golden sail in the Venetian Sea.

In the last poem Typaldos is compared to the sun, a divinity and the Adriatic Sea that “was never beaten by the assaults of weather”. In this context the term ‘weather’ may have a double meaning. It may signify the winds and storms assaulting the Adriatic Sea, such as the accusations and assaults coming against the hierarch by his opponents. But he is never to be beaten, according to his students; we should not

<sup>35</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 21, poem 24.

<sup>36</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 26, poem 29.

<sup>37</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 33, poem 36.

forget that a few months before he had already won the first battles, when the Venetian Authorities forced the Confraternity to elect Catholic priests. So we may assume that this sonnet allegorically describes the events of that period and ends with the certainty of the poet—who was a student of the Archbishop’s – that thanks to his efforts the whole Adriatic region will be “refined”. Which would then suggest that his stance will eventually prevail and that Greece will continue to “open up its golden sail in the Venetian Sea”, which means those who are worthy and capable – such as Typaldos. These verses indicate the influence of Typaldos’ teachings on his students, who consider the Venetian authority in the Adriatic region to be invincible, but also include some Greeks, such as Typaldos.

The “Flowers of Piety” do not prove Typaldos’ interest in the improvement of the cultural and social life of the Greek subjects of the Venetian Republic. In his letters however, especially in a letter sent by him to Paolo Nani, as well as in his famous “Lettera”<sup>38</sup>, sent to an unknown Venetian official, together with his admiration to the Catholic Church and culture, he expresses his strong wish for the Greek community of Venice to turn to Catholicism, not principally for religious reasons, but as a means of further integration with the culturally superior Western societies.

His letter to Nani and mostly his phrase “for Greeks living in barbaric situation, at least will be moderated to be Greeks of Christian Venice”<sup>39</sup>, reveal that Typaldos was deeply disappointed by the cultural and financial statues of Greeks in the Ionian Islands and Peloponnese and recommended to the Venetian Administration to cater for the improvement of such conditions<sup>40</sup>. As already stated<sup>41</sup>, in his “Lettera”, upon having pointed the similarities between Catholic and Orthodox Church, he concludes: “Tell me then, are such things beneficial for the Greeks or are they unfortunate? Is not it obvious in all the grace of God manifested in the love, in the peace and in the honour and reputation referred to our people”? Undoubtedly, his last questions bring out his strong concern for Greeks. Finally, in another point of his “Lettera”<sup>42</sup>, not only

---

<sup>38</sup> See subsection 4.3.1.

<sup>39</sup> See section 4.1, subnote 45.

<sup>40</sup> Despoina Michalaga, “Η Ζάκυνθος στην εκκλησιαστική ιστορία της βενετοκρατούμενης Πελοποννήσου”, in *Φιόρα τιμής για τον Μητροπολίτη Ζακύνθου Χρυσόστομο Συνετό*, collective volume (Zakynthos, 2009), 625-641.

<sup>41</sup> Subsection 4.3.1., subnote 87.

<sup>42</sup> See subsection 4.3.1.

does he express his consideration for Venice but also for the powerful segment of Greek merchants and other businessmen. He specifically states: “And given the fact that these professions are so highly developed in Venice, the Greeks are willing to face any kind of obstacles whilst travelling so that they themselves or their children”<sup>43</sup>. The “Lettera” of course, addresses the Venetian Authorities. The previous extract, however, explicitly shows that Typaldos had thought of the benefits that the Greeks would enjoy if they accepted the “Unia”. As he was a scholarly person of his era, able to distinguish between religion and earthly social situations, he attempts to harmonize his personal power with the improvement of the social and cultural conditions of living for the Greek subjects of Venice.

It is sure that he actually believed that the “genos” had a better chance to survive under Venetian, Catholic rule, as opposed to Ottoman rule. However, his writings do not present any thoughts about preserving the Greek traditional, cultural features, or hope for the liberation of the “genos”. Because of this fact, although the compilation “The Flowers of Piety” shows the admiration that his students had for him and they are a proof of his passionate and progressive teaching, mainly concerning ancient Greek writers and particularly Aristotle, it does not reflect anything more about his ethnic consciousness. It is a religious poetic collection, although it included two poems dedicated to Greece, with a patriotic content, which clearly demonstrates that their writers had a developed ethnic consciousness<sup>44</sup>. The **poem** emphasizes the magnificence of Greece and the pride that all Greeks should feel about their country. Therefore, it is a clear reply by a supporter of Typaldos to all, such as Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos, who accused Typaldos of being prepared to exterminate the Greek ‘genos’<sup>45</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> See 4.3.1 subnote 93.

<sup>44</sup> Sonnet No. 20, entitled “In lode della Grecia” (English translation: “Praises of Greece”) was composed by Ioannis Voulgaris, who also participates in the collection with a poem commending Typaldos. The second patriotic poem No. 30, entitled “To Greece” belongs to Francisco Gerardo. Gerardo was Typaldos’ deacon, while according to Dimaras he was Francisco Gerardo (1691-?), who originated from Crete and was accepted as a student of the Flanghinian School at the suggestion of Meletios Typaldos. In the original edition of the collection, nine poems were anonymous – including the two ones mentioned before about Greece – which have been studied by contemporary scholars, as regards the real identity of their writer.

<sup>45</sup> Letter of Papadopoulos to Chrysanthos Notaras cited by Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 24. See subsection 4.3.4.

Influenced by the “Flowers of Piety”, Dimaras<sup>46</sup> compares Typaldos to Cyril Lucaris; he says that Lucaris envisioned the recovery of the nation with the assistance of the Protestants, as probably Typaldos did with the assistance of the Catholics<sup>47</sup>. In any case, there is not any indication that Typaldos aimed at the “recovery of the ‘genos’”. Regarding the poem dedicated to Greece, Dimaras notes that “this is definitely a scholar’s view” and continues: “Greece lives on through wisdom, but the passion for Greece is visible”<sup>48</sup>. There is no doubt about this passion. But the people inspired by such a passion were not the Archbishop, but the members of the Greek Confraternity, as evidenced by their actions.

The celebration for the presentation of the poetic compilation took place in the church of St. George, with the attendance of both Greeks and Venetians<sup>49</sup>. It was an event that praised Typaldos, during which the above poems were presented; however, such an occasion was quite customary in Italy and mainly Venice and Padua during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries<sup>50</sup>. At the end of such an event the person to whom the compilation was dedicated, would have to publish the poems at his own expenses. In this case it seems certain that Meletios paid for the publication of this compilation himself.

According to the customs of Venice at the time there should also be a foreigner participating in the publication of the compilation. Based on this, Dimitrios Georgoulis, the nephew of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos Notaras, was invited to also write a poem<sup>51</sup>. Typaldos did not select this person, who at the time was a student in Padua, randomly. Maybe, being aware of the constant war from Nikolaos Komninios-Papadopoulos and his correspondence with Notaras, he attempted to propitiate the Patriarch of Jerusalem in this manner. However, this was not achieved, as mentioned previously, since his dethronement by the Patriarchate of

---

<sup>46</sup> Constantine Dimaras the sixties thoroughly researched the “Flowers of Piety” and later published his conclusions in three studies: (a) “Αντώνιος Στρατηγός. Βιβλιογραφικές έρευνες”, *Ο Έραμιστή*, 5 (1967), 1 -8; (b) “Εισαγωγικά στη μελέτη της συλλογής ‘Άνθη Ευλαβείας’”, in *Μνημόσυνο Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume (Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο, 1974), 336-349; and (c), a study which is included in the *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*.

<sup>47</sup> Dimaras, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*, 147-148.

<sup>48</sup> Dimaras, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*, 149.

<sup>49</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 43.

<sup>50</sup> Athanasios Karathanasis, in his introductory note in Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, 33-35, notes that some of the events hosted by the Venetian Greeks and the Flanghinian School were dedicated also to Venetian persons, either participating in military actions or in scientific pursuits.

<sup>51</sup> Karathanasis, *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*, μ’.

Constantinople was initiated by Chrysanthos Notaras, who also participated in this decision.



### 5.3. The Consequences

#### 5.3.1. *The vacancy of the ecclesiastical throne*

In 1713, Panagiotis Sinopeas, a friend of Typaldos who had been frowned upon by the congregation at his ordination ceremony as a deacon, was appointed as a vicar of the church of St. George. The next year, 1714, another vicar was appointed, Ioannis Stais, a controversial person –Typaldos called him “highly educated”<sup>52</sup>– who upon suggestion of the Archbishop of Philadelphia studied in Padua at the University there.

At first, Stais appeared as a theologian and commissioner of the Archbishop of Philadelphia and was visiting several places. The Church renounced him in 1698<sup>53</sup> or 1699 whilst he was in Bucharest. In 1702 the Patriarchate of Constantinople asked him to sign a confession of faith. He refused and in a Synodic letter Patriarch Gabriel III renounced him but did not dethrone him. It seems that Stais had the approval of Typaldos and was trying to serve his purposes. From the letters of Nikolaos Komninos – Papadopoulos we know that Stais toured in Rome, Bucharest, Hungary and Malta. According to Gedeon<sup>54</sup> Stais succeeded in Malta in “subject[ing] the Greek colony to Rome”. This means that he turned the Orthodox Greeks into Catholics.

We see that also after the death of Typaldos some people around him stayed in power. One of the significant scholars at the court of Typaldos was the priest and teacher Ioannis Patousas<sup>55</sup> who died in 1713, a short time after Typaldos. Papadopoulos says that he thinks the death of Patousas and another friend of Typaldos, whose name is not mentioned, was caused by the “revenge” of St. George, who punished his enemies in this way.

During the following years, there were various problems not only concerning ecclesiastical issues, but also other kinds of issues, such as for example the printing of Greek Orthodox books, due to the departure of some printing houses from Venice, but also the censorship exerted by Venice upon Greek Orthodox books. This issue is

<sup>52</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 5.

<sup>53</sup> Pericles Zerlentis, “Ιωάννης Στάης, Εξαρχος Μελετίου του Φιλαδελφείας”, *Νησιωτική Επετηρίς*, (1918), 253 passim.

<sup>54</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 54.

<sup>55</sup> See “Introduction”, subnote 12, and section 5.1.

recorded in two letters addressed to Chrysanthos Notaras. The first one was written by Georgios Trapezountios on 15 March 1712<sup>56</sup>, and he mentions that he was asked to take up the correction of ecclesiastical books under the supervision of Panagiotis Sinopeas, a priest and close friend of Typaldos. The writer of this letter calls Sinopeas “suspect and incapable” of doing such a job, and he means that the outcome of this would be that the new ecclesiastical books would include tendencies towards the Western dogma<sup>57</sup>. The second letter is written by the priest Frangiskos Meniates<sup>58</sup>, the father of Elias Meniates mentioned above. Elias Meniates was dead and his father wanted to publish the “Speeches” of his son, which were a series of sermons. Frangiskos mentions that censorship in Venice of texts of the Eastern Orthodox Church is continuous and severe. “They cut down some speeches” he says, which means that they removed some parts which were not agreeable. As to the second work of his son, called “The cause of scandal”, which refers to the division between the two Churches, “they don’t want to see or hear about it”.

The condition of the Church after 1713 forced many members of the Greek Confraternity to move to other Greek colonies. Despite the decisions made in 1714, Vardas, who becomes president of the Confraternity again, sends on behalf of the presidium, a letter to the “Collegio”, accusing the priests of citing the Pope<sup>59</sup>. Vardas had also been president in 1699 when the conflict between the Confraternity and Typaldos had just begun. In his letter, Vardas describes vividly the seeping away of Greek believers from the congregation when the Venetian Administration established the new regime. He particularly emphasized the negative results of such decision and specifically that Greek merchants had left Venice and started exercising their commercial activities beyond the Venetian State, cooperating with Sicily, trading goods from and to Constantinople. There were so few believers left that the three Catholic priests – appointed by the Venetian Authorities – seemed redundant.

On the following day, the 5<sup>th</sup> of August 1714<sup>60</sup>, the three vicars of Saint George (Stais, Mikos and Sinopis) were called before the Council of Ten, where they got reprimanded and ordered not to introduce any innovations to the ecclesiastic rituals,

<sup>56</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 41-42, 59.

<sup>57</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 59.

<sup>58</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 59-60.

<sup>59</sup> B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2585, p.147.

<sup>60</sup> B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2585, p. 147.

like the ones they had adopted during the last two months. An interesting aspect is that three priests had not been elected by the community; they had been appointed under the orders of the Venetian administration<sup>61</sup>.

On the 12<sup>th</sup> of April 1720, the Council of Ten reached a new decision, according to which the Confraternity president had to be presented to the Council before any election procedure for vicars in Saint George<sup>62</sup>. The president himself should next order the nominated priests to come before the Catholic Patriarch of Venice or a representative thereof or Nuncio, who would check if the nominated vicars actually abided by the Catholic dogma. Then, upon a respective approval, the vicars would have to present before the three heads of the Council of Ten in order to be approved by the Venetian Authority. It was more than obvious that the system had become as strict as it could get.

The departure of the Greeks from Venice and their displacement to other Greek colonies had been encouraged after the edition of new decrees in 1720 and in 1722 which imposed a confession of faith to the Pope<sup>63</sup>. Many dozens of families of merchants who had built their life and their businesses in Venice for decades started to migrate to Livorno and Trieste, where they were able to build new communities and churches. Later on they moved to Pest, the Peloponnese and Vienna<sup>64</sup>. On 13 February 1728 a letter is written by Radoulos and Constantine Vassaras Cantacouzenus from Vienna addressed to Chrysanthos Notaras in Jerusalem<sup>65</sup>. They ask him to allow the liturgy to be conducted in their home. They say that they have the permission of Bishop Moses (the Bishop of Belgrade), but they also want his consent. They bring up two reasons: one is their poor physical condition and the need to change residence frequently; and the second reason is related to the events in Venice, which two decades later are still disturbing the Orthodox Greeks.

---

<sup>61</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 182.

<sup>62</sup> A.S.V., *Compilazione leggi*, B 228, fol. 438 r, 12 April 1720.

<sup>63</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 89.

<sup>64</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 90.

<sup>65</sup> Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 56.

In September 1728, Chrysanthos Notaras sends the Bishop of Belgrade Moses a letter<sup>66</sup> in which he advises allowing the Orthodox Greeks to conduct the liturgy in their homes, with an antimimension<sup>67</sup> wherever there are no Orthodox churches.

The rich merchants who for many decades used to offer donations to the church of St. George started to direct them to churches in Jerusalem, Holy Mountain, Ioannina and other Greek cities<sup>68</sup>. It is quite significant, that out of four hundred families of Greek merchants who lived in Venice at the time of Meletios Typaldos, a few years after his attempt to convert their dogma only seventy families were left<sup>69</sup>.

### 5.3.2. *The disputes for new ecclesiastical leaders*

When the Venetian State perceived the financial damage it suffered, it decided by decree of 9 August 1741 to allow the remaining Greek Confraternity in Venice to elect an ecclesiastical leader, who was called “Vicarios”. The person elected was the Greek Catholic Petros Antonius Mouatzos, who originated from Cephalonia. He was a prudent and well educated man and he governed the Orthodox Greeks with serenity<sup>70</sup>. When he died in December 1758, he was succeeded by Spyridon Millias, who originated from Corfu. Millias was a Greek Orthodox, a writer of philosophical essays and ecclesiastical teachings. His election was opposed by Pope Clement XIII and objected to by the Venetian Senate. The Venetians were watching unfortunate

<sup>66</sup>Gedeon, *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία*, 5.

<sup>67</sup> “Antimimension” in ecclesiastic terminology means a piece of cloth on which are painted various holy pictures and symbols. Its function relates with the replacement of the Altar when it doesn’t exist or when it exists but it cannot be used for the Liturgy because two Liturgies are being conducted. The word “Antimimension” comes from the Greek word anti and the Latin word Mensa, which means Table. When there were reasons for the Liturgy to be conducted in places out of the sacred churches, they invented a movable Altar, called Antimimension. It was made of wood or most often cloth. It is possible that it started to be used during the Iconoclastic period, when the Orthodox were prosecuted and could not conduct the liturgy in the churches. They were forced to do it in houses or in the countryside. Nowadays, “antimimension” is used for the conducting of the Liturgy in non-inaugurated churches, in army camps, in small churches or in the countryside, where this movable Altar is used. Also “Antimimension” is used in all the churches, whether they are inaugurated or not. The centre of Antimimension depicts the burial of the Lord, because the Altar symbolizes the Lord’s Tomb. At the corners it must have knitted holy remains of Martyrs, because it replaces the Altar which always contains holy remains of Martyrs: see Aimilianos Simonopetritis, “Αντιμνήσια”, in *Σιμωνόπετρα: Άγιο Όρος*, ed. Aimilianos Simonopetritis, Vasilis Dimitriadis and Theochari Maria (Athens: Ελληνική Τράπεζα Βιομηχανικής Αναπτύξεως, 1991), 248-250.

<sup>68</sup> Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It. 2257 (9919) *Ristretta notizia presa dall’ autentiche carte...*, fol. 29v : “morti molti ricchi mercanti tutti testarono lasciando pingui legati alle chiese di Gerusalemme di Monte Santo, di Giannina et altre, posta in dimenticanza la chiesa di San Giorgio di Venezia...”

<sup>69</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 90.

<sup>70</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 91.

events such as those in Dalmatia involving Orthodox and Catholics. Due to that they allowed the election of a new Bishop on 31 December 1761 after they had previously set a clear condition that the new Bishop must accept the decisions of the Council of Florence. This development annoyed the Orthodox Greeks in Venice, but now they were not in a position to impose their own terms. So on 18 January 1761 they elected a new local leader, Georgios Fatseas, from the island of Kythira<sup>71</sup>. However, not all Orthodox Greeks agreed with this decision. Some of them preferred the return of Millias who was removed after intervention of the Pope. These people sent a letter to the Patriarch in Constantinople, Ioannicius III, protesting that the leader of their Church was a person who agreed with the Catholic dogma<sup>72</sup>. At the same time they sent a letter to the Pope stating that Fatseas was a Schismatic. The Venetians insisted on their choice and sent Fatseas to Corfu. After pressure of the “Proveditor General” in Corfu the bishops of Lefkada and Cephalonia who were present, were forced to ordain Fatseas as the new Archbishop of Philadelphia, on 11 July 1762, after a six months period of dispute<sup>73</sup>. In the meantime the Ecumenical Patriarch, Ioannicius III, had reached a decision and in September 1762 he issued a decision to dethrone Fatseas and the Bishops of Lefkada and Cephalonia as well, because they ordained him (Fatseas)<sup>74</sup>. The Venetians found themselves in the middle of two opposing parties, because apart from the Patriarch’s decision they had to deal with the letter of the Pope, sent to the Senate on 22 January, and his accusation against the Senate on 30 April 1763, because it allowed a Schismatic to take the Bishop’s throne of the church of St. George<sup>75</sup>.

It is evident that Fatseas was a victim of continuous false allegations from all sides in his attempt to restore his name within the Orthodox Confraternity. But a third influence, rather unforeseeable, the Sultan’s doctor, Karos (from Neapolis), told the Sultan that those seeking the restoration of Fatseas did it because of his intention to try and convert the Ottoman subjects living in Venice<sup>76</sup>. Thus, the Grand Vizier gave an order to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Samuel, who was now occupying this

<sup>71</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*; Georgios Ploumidis, “Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Φιλαδελφείας Γρηγόριος Φατσέας, 1762-1768”, *Θησαυρίσματα*, 4 (1967), 85-113; Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*.

<sup>72</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 92.

<sup>73</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 94-95.

<sup>74</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 95.

<sup>75</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 95.

<sup>76</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 97.

position, to not agree with the restoration of Fatseas. The Grand Interpreter, Rallis, exerted pressure on the Patriarch of Constantinople, as did other High Priests as well, such as the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who believed that Fatseas was a victim of slander. The Patriarch of Constantinople believed in the innocence of Fatseas, but was not able to disobey the order of the Vizier<sup>77</sup>. But he made the mistake of confiding to some priests around him that he thought Fatseas to be innocent of the accusations. This information reached Venice. The Senate, without the formal approval of the Ecumenical Patriarch, issued a decision on 14 September 1765 to restore Fatseas to the archiepiscopal throne of Philadelphia<sup>78</sup>. But because there was no official act issued by the Ecumenical Patriarch the Orthodox Greeks again divided. This division led to some very dramatic scenes happening inside the church of St. George. There is a particularly vivid description of what followed in the few months that Fatseas kept the position of Archbishop. According to Vendotis<sup>79</sup> whenever Fatseas showed up some people approached him to kiss his hand or receive the communion and others turned their eyes away and left the church. And Vendotis writes that twice he witnessed that they spat on him. Because of this reason the Orthodox Greeks continued to leave Venice, seeking for a more peaceful life in Trieste. The Patriarch of Constantinople dethroned Fatseas once again<sup>80</sup>. Eventually, after a long ailment, he died on 9 July 1768.

As the Venetian Government saw that the tensions within the Greek Confraternity continued to increase, it permitted the free election of a new Archbishop on 31 July 1768. After a vote this position was taken by the Bishop of Kythira, Nikiforos Mormoris<sup>81</sup>. This time the Venetian Government had to deal with comments from the Catholic Legate. And the ambassador of Rome merely received the announcement about the election of Mormoris<sup>82</sup>.

<sup>77</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 97.

<sup>78</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 98.

<sup>79</sup> Georgios Vendotis (ed.), *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία Μελετίου Μητροπολίτου Αθηνών, μετενεχθείσα εκ της ελληνικής εις την ημετέρα απλοελληνικήν φράσιν, εις τόμους τρεις διαιρεθείσα και πλουτισθείσα με πολλάς χρήσιμους και αναγκαίας υποσημειώσεις και ακριβείς πίνακας παρά Γεωργίου Βενδότη εκ Ζακύνθου και παρ' αυτού διορθωθείσα – προσφωνηθείσα τω υψηλοτάτω, ευσεβεστάτω, και γαληνοτάτω αυθέντη και ηγεμόνι πάσης Ουγγροβλαχίας κυρίω κυρίω Ιωάννη Νικολάου Καραντζά, V.4* (Vienna: Bauermeister, 1783-1795), 270; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 176.

<sup>80</sup> Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*, 556.

<sup>81</sup> A.E.I.B, Α'. Οργάνωση - λειτουργία, 4. Γραμματεία, Κατάστιχο 2, ff. 3r-9v; Spyros Evangelatos, "Γεώργιος Μορμόρης", *Ελληνικά*, 22/1 (1969), 173-182.

<sup>82</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 99.

But the Bishop of Kythira, aware of the events with Fatseas, refused to take up his duties before the approval of the Patriarch of Constantinople. On the other side the Patriarch did not issue a decision, because the Sultan still suspected that the Archbishop of Philadelphia would try to convert the Ottoman subjects of Venice. These suspicions were also grown by the Catholic “Vicarios” in Constantinople<sup>83</sup>. The Bishop of Kythira, Mormoris, died two years later. Then, on 21 January 1772, the Confraternity elected a new Bishop, Theotokis from Corfu<sup>84</sup>. He immediately demanded from the Venetian Government to annul the decree of 31 December 1761, according to which the Bishop of Philadelphia had to declare his acceptance of the decisions of the Council of Florence. He also asked the Venetian Government to recognize publicly that the Archbishop of Philadelphia is directly dependant on the Patriarch of Constantinople<sup>85</sup>. Another four years passed and none of his requests were fulfilled, and on 8 November 1775, in a letter sent from Iasi, he informed the Confraternity that he stepped down from the office<sup>86</sup> of High Priest.

Another five years went by. The Venetian Government was aware that for seven decades the Greek Orthodox Confraternity of St. George was left without a leader and suffered conflict and it decided to once again proceed with the election of an Archbishop of Philadelphia. This time however it acted in favour of the Greek Confraternity in the best way. It annulled a previous decree which obliged the Orthodox Greeks to uphold the decisions of the Council of Florence<sup>87</sup> and permitted them to follow the dogma of the Orthodox Church. The conditions were ripe for the election of a new Archbishop.

On 31 August 1780 a new Archbishop of Philadelphia was elected, Sofronios Koutouvalis (1780-1790)<sup>88</sup>. On 15 January 1782 the Patriarch of Constantinople issued a decision for the appointment of Koutouvalis on the Throne of Philadelphia<sup>89</sup>. Previously the Bailo of Constantinople assured the Patriarch of Constantinople that the election of Bishop Sofronios “was definitely right beyond any doubt for the

---

<sup>83</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 100.

<sup>84</sup> A.E.I.B., Α΄. Οργάνωση - λειτουργία, 3. Πρακτικά Συνεδριάσεων, Κατάστιχο 11, ff. 168v-169v; Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 101.

<sup>85</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*.

<sup>86</sup> A.E.I.B. Οργάνωση 1, Θ 1 και A.E.I.B. Εκκλησία 3, Θ 5.

<sup>87</sup> See section 2.2.

<sup>88</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 103.

A.E.I.B., Α΄. Οργάνωση - λειτουργία, 4. Γραμματεία, Κατάστιχο 2, ff. 26v-36v.

<sup>89</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 103.

customs of the Greek Confraternity, as he has been presiding for many years and he is free and independent from the Roman Court”<sup>90</sup>. Previously Koutouvalis was the Bishop of Cephalonia and Zakynthos. It should be noted that Meletios, who was the cause of the absence of leadership for seventy years, also originated from Cephalonia.

Sofronios lived until 1790. After him Gerasimos Zygouras, from Lefkada, was elected Archbishop of Philadelphia<sup>91</sup>. The confirmation Act of the Patriarchate arrived on September 1795. He did not have the chance to be ordained because in May 1797 the Venetian State was dismantled. Napoleon’s army confiscated the ecclesiastical property of the Orthodox Greeks in Venice, which at the time amounted to 1.667.800 francs<sup>92</sup>. At the same time the Flanghinian School was closed.

---

<sup>90</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 103.

<sup>91</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 103-104.

<sup>92</sup> Veloudis, *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία*, 104.





## EPILOGUE: THE CAUSES OF THE FAILURE

-----

The condemnation of Typaldos continued after his death. By transferring the past to the current situation it could be argued that he fell into the error to draw up policies but underestimated the culture of a nation and especially the underground powers which may be activated by their actions. Typaldos underestimated the reactions, first, of the Greeks of Venice, and second, of the Patriarchate.

Regarding the reaction of the Greek Confraternity, it could be argued that this could well be a part of a number of conflicts related to the orientation of the Greek “genos” towards the culture of the West or that of the East. These conflicts began to show up at the end of the Byzantine Empire, when emperor John VIII Paleologos and Patriarch Josef II wanted to negotiate with the West for the union of the two Churches, taking part in the Council of Florence<sup>1</sup>. Such conflicts go on within Greek society even today<sup>2</sup>. The supporters of the Western orientation do not deny that the West has inherited ancient Greek culture, the principles of democracy and freedom; that is why they argue that the position of Greece stands *ipso jure* within the orchestrated group of Western European states<sup>3</sup>. However, the interruption of its cultural continuity -brought about by Ottoman occupation- causes them have an unfavourable stance towards modern cultural situation in Greece. Thus they claim that political and cultural reasons advocate in favour of the enhancement of the country’s links to the West and, therefore, the establishment of an ethnic or national

<sup>1</sup> Podskalsky, *Η Ελληνική θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*, 60; Gill, *The Council of Florence*; Patrinelis, *Βιβλιοκρισία*, 494-499.

<sup>2</sup> Vakalopoulos, *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία*, 12; Svoronos, *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος*; Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*; Hélène Ahrweiler- Glykatzi, *Γιατί το Βυζάντιο* (Athens: Μεταίχμιο, 2012); Christos Giannaras, *Ορθοδοξία και Δύση στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα* (Athens: Δομός, 2006); Papanoutsos E. “Εισαγωγή”, in *Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, V. I (Athens: Αετός, 1950), 7-8; Zisimos Lorentzatos, *Μελέτες* (Athens: Γαλαξίας, 1967), 17, 160; Maltezou, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*; Anna Fragoudaki and Thalia Dragona, *Τι είναι η πατρίδα μας* (Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 1997); and many others.

<sup>3</sup> This view has been supported by Greek scholars long before the Fall of Constantinople. A letter sent by cardinal Bessarion to the Bishop of Moreas and later emperor Constantine XI Paleologos is typically mentioned. Bessarion asserts that the fact that Greeks who will study in the West will then transfer their knowledge to their homeland -is not actually a “shame”- since this will be equivalent to the Latins giving back what the West owes to Greece. See Chassiotis, *Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως*, 144.

identity that is sympathetic to Western European states<sup>4</sup>. On the contrary, the supporters of the Eastern orientation are for the uninterrupted cultural continuity of the Greek nation, whereas they separate the Byzantine-Orthodox tradition as dominant in the creation of the ethnic or national identity in Greece; that is why they confront the West and its religious dogmas in terms of disbelief<sup>5</sup>.

Throughout such historically long-lasting controversies, one could assert that Typaldos was a carrier and continuator of the Western orientation of that identity, which would allow it to join or to be integrated into Western civilization; the Greek Confraternity could be then seen as a supporter of the Eastern orientation, which focused on Orthodox faith and Byzantine oral and written tradition. The members of the Greek Confraternity in Venice, and mainly of its presidency, the major part of whom came to the tolerant state of Venice from Greek regions under Turkish occupation, could maintain, on the one hand their love for their fatherland, and on the other their religious faith, rituals and customs which united them with the Greek “genos”. As we have seen in the “Lettera” that fact made them see Catholics with contempt and hostility.

The Schismatics believe that all Catholic Latins are truly heretics [...] the most sweet adjective given to the Catholic Latins is “dog” and they prefer to marry their daughters with a Muslim rather than with a Catholic [...] this “hate” is not based in political reasons or in other human affairs, but based in religious sentiments stubbornly maintained [...] This passes from generation to generation and is fueled by the fathers who nurture children and their descendants with it<sup>6</sup>.

Even though the Orthodox rituals would remain the same after the transformation of their Church into a Uniate structure, the reaction of the Confraternity towards the “Unia” was generally intense. In order to understand this, three reasons for the Confraternity’s fear should be taken into account: one reason was their experience with Catholic clergymen and the oppression they suffered before

---

<sup>4</sup> Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφοτισμός*; Fragoudaki and Dragona, *Τι είναι η πατρίδα μας*; Pantelis Lekkas, *Η εθνικιστική ιδεολογία* (Athens: Παπαζήσης, 2011); Thanos Veremis, *Ελλάδα, Ευρώπη* (Athens: Πλέθρον, 1999); Antonis Liakos, *Πώς το παρελθόν γίνεται ιστορία* (Athens: Πόλις, 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Vakalopoulos, *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία*, 12; Svoronos, *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος*; Ahrweiler- Glykatzi, *Γιατί το Βυζάντιο*; Giannaras, *Ορθοδοξία και Δύση*; Theodoros Ziakas, *Έθνος και Παράδοση* (Athens: Εναλλακτικές Εκδόσεις, 1993); Giorgos Karabelias, *Το 1204 και η Διαμόρφωση του Νεώτερου Ελληνισμού* (Athens: Εναλλακτικές Εκδόσεις, 2007); Maltezou, *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση*.

<sup>6</sup> See subsection 4.3.1, subnote 88.

Leo X granted them special privileges<sup>7</sup>. Another one was related with the prospect of their subjection to the Pope. They were afraid that the freedom and neutrality that they enjoyed from their commercial activities would be lost if they were tightly connected with Vatican. As detailed earlier<sup>8</sup>, Greeks did not like to be attached to the one or the other part, but they preferred to keep their autonomy and trading across the Mediterranean according to their own interest. For example, they collaborated with the English since the latter preferred to have their commerce with Venice's Greeks "as co-owners provided also a convenient cover to avoid the payment of the duties reserved to foreign ships"<sup>9</sup>. Also, after the rise of piracy in Mediterranean Greeks tried to keep their privilege to operate as ideal mediators in the transactions between the Ottomans and the Venetians. Therefore their strict connection with Vatican would deprive them of the autonomy they enjoyed in their trading activities around the Mediterranean<sup>10</sup>. Finally the last reason, as it is analytically commented, is the endangering of their ethnic identity.

One might wonder just how strong the ethnic consciousness of the Greeks living in Venice during the seventeenth century was, when there were Greek emigrants in the whole of the Italian peninsula who converted to Catholicism during that period. The answer to these question depended on the policies of the cities where Greeks were living, either as refugees or as settlers. In cities with a strong Catholic regime it was difficult for a minority to maintain its religious and cultural tradition. On the contrary, in cities more tolerant towards minorities the preservation of culture and tradition was much easier. Venice provided the foundation for a foreign tradition to maintain itself in a vibrant way.

Greek identity in Venice was permitted to be preserved due to the economic and social power of the Greek community, which was managed and represented by its two main institutions, the Archbishop of Philadelphia and the Confraternity of St. Nicolas. Until the time of Typaldos the reason the Confraternity had not raised any concerns about persons converting to Catholicism was due to the fact that the Confraternity was able to differentiate between individual and collective identity. The individual cases of converting into another faith did not endanger the traditions and the cultural-religious

<sup>7</sup> See subsection 2.4.1.

<sup>8</sup> See subsection 2.1.3.

<sup>9</sup> Fusaro, "Commercial Networks", 134.

<sup>10</sup> Fusaro, "Coping with Transition".

stereotypes of the “genos”. Persons or families turning Catholic were not condemned, because their reasons of personal or family survival were well respected. Therefore it was natural to accept people who converted to another doctrine in the ceremonies and celebrations of the Greek community.

Even when the conversion to Catholicism was not based on economic reasons, it was possible to respect a religious doctrine with familiar ceremonies that was established in the great Western empires for centuries. But the collective conversion of the religious doctrine and the subjection of the whole Greek community to the regime of “Unia” would probably lead to the denial of the identity of the “genos” and the submission of what was considered sacred and holy by the Orthodox dogma to the authority of the Pope.

In addition, the dual nature of “Unia” caused an aversion. It was seen as a false mantle, a masquerade, a Trojan horse aiming at a complete assimilation into Catholicism, which would slowly but securely lead to the final religious and also political assimilation by the foreign powers. A Uniate was not a mere Catholic but a monstrous hybrid that tried to blur any line of separation between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, thus deceiving the Orthodox Greeks.

The above suggest that when conditions are favourable, the preservation of the collective identity of an ethnicity acts subconsciously and comes to the surface when such an ethnicity or its beliefs are endangered. Which means that the common sense of ethnic identity of the Greeks in Venice was not subjugated in the favourable conditions provided by the Venetian Republic; on the contrary it remained unharmed and emerged when the times called for it.

It has already been described how ethnic identity is formed during the long phases of an individual’s socialization, through the shared representations of the individual with others in social practices<sup>11</sup>. Because of this fact, representations are not simply imagined<sup>12</sup>, but they create a social imaginary able to conduct collective behaviour and action<sup>13</sup>. Also, it has been demonstrated how its activation comes about in fields of social interactions, through symbolic stereotypes and rituals, which are

---

<sup>11</sup> See section 3.1.

<sup>12</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>13</sup> Castoriadis, *The Imaginary Institution of Society*.

tangible objects<sup>14</sup>, demanding the physical presence of a person and not just his or her mental awareness. Thanks to this tangibility, ethnic identity is embedded in the felt experience of the members of a social group, which then explains why it is difficult to erase it from the group's memory<sup>15</sup>. It is also argued that it includes a structure of legitimate authority as well as social relationships, which adds to the identity the capability of changeability during the passage of time<sup>16</sup>. In sum, this kind of mutability is different to the one described by the instrumental approach<sup>17</sup>, according to which ethnic identity is a product of state, capitalist or ideological mechanisms of power. It is more appropriate here for ethnic identity to be viewed as culturally constructed, in a continuous flow of mutability<sup>18</sup>, which, nevertheless, takes place on a substratum of interlinking between social macro-variables, such as of the regime of authority and the structure of social relations.

As long as the Greeks of the European Diaspora of the seventeenth century continued to live within communities, as it happened during the period of Ottoman occupation<sup>19</sup>, in other words, provided that they maintained the same kind of political regime and social structures (that is, the communal ones), their ethnic identity remained unchanged. It was forged by their religion, their language, and an unchangeable rituality that kept the history of the ancestors vivid in their collective memory. Many members of the Confraternity were first generation settlers; but also those who were second generation settlers had internalized the rituality of their faith, the longing for the enslaved country, the myths and songs of their birthplace. A number of them were born in regions of Greece under Venetian rule, such as those coming from Crete. The latter were also the most poor among the community, and thus their opinion did not have a major influence in the Confraternity's decisions<sup>20</sup>. It

<sup>14</sup> Turner, *Ritual Process*.

<sup>15</sup> Gendlin, *Experiencing and the creation of meaning*.

<sup>16</sup> Friedman, *Cultural Identity*.

<sup>17</sup> Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism*; Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

<sup>18</sup> Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism*; Cohen, *Self Consciousness*.

<sup>19</sup> The issue of Greek communities, from ancient Greece and Byzantium to the establishment of the Hellenic national state, has been extensively researched and is not dealt with in this Thesis. For analysis, see Constantine Karavidas, *Αγροτικά: μελέτη συγκριτική* (Athens: Αγροτική Τράπεζα Ελλάδος, 1990); Constantine Karavidas, *Σοσιαλισμός και Κοινότητα* (Athens: Παπαζήσης, 1981); Nicolaos Pantazopoulos, *Νεοελληνικό Κράτος και Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινότητα, ο καταλυτικός ρόλος των Βαυαρών* (Athens: Παρουσία, 1998); Ioannis Giannopoulos, "Κοινότητες", in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11 (Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975), 134-143.

<sup>20</sup> Sotirios Koutmanis, "Όψεις της Εγκατάστασης των Ελλήνων στη Βενετία τον 17<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα", *Θησαυρίσματα*, 35 (2005), 309-339.

is certain that the economic power of the Confraternity permitted it to claim its “genos” rights aggressively<sup>21</sup> in facing the Venetian authorities during the conflict with Typaldos, which meant promoting its ethnic identity. This fact confirms the powerful social position of the members of the Greek Confraternity, and also the position suggested by this thesis, that ethnic identity was particularly vivid in the consciousness of the members of the Greek Confraternity. Every member of the Confraternity had on the one hand, during their socialization process, internalized the social representations responsible for the creation of an ethnic identity; and, on the other hand, had an active feeling of it, reproduced by his or her physical participation in religious rituals.

In summary, the Greek Confraternity of Venice functioned as a wide social group, the members of which were tied through their religion and shared representations regarding their common origin and culture; also through their participation in symbolic forms of religious rituality transmitted from generation to generation. Their respect for their ethnic institutions -Confraternity and Church- was inspired by the idea of holiness by which their grandfathers, and the grandfathers of their grandfathers, had invested them. Also, this respect reflected on them, because Venetian society recognized their economic success and seemed to esteem them greatly. But, as soon as the Venetian authorities became fearful of the spirit of independence of the members of the Greek Confraternity and tried to control it, by recognizing the old pontifical Decrees, then these Greeks reacted strongly. This is because what was at stake now did not only affect their religion, but also their political status, as an autonomous ethnic entity.

Reacting against Typaldos’ initiatives, the Confraternity actually resisted the loss of its ethnic self-determination. However, this denial, despite the victory of the Confraternity against Typaldos, resulted in losing the favourable conditions for an unconstrained maintenance of its ethnic identity. The conflict for the appointment of an Orthodox or a Catholic Archbishop lasted for almost seventy years. During this period many prominent Greeks abandoned Venice and moved to other centres of commerce and culture, where -along with their other activities- they were permitted to

---

<sup>21</sup> Koutmanis, “Το τρίτο είδος”.

perform their religious duties freely. The Venetian community would never be the same again.

By investigating the reaction of the Patriarchate it could be argued that they were rather weak, even its existence was in danger. However, at the time the Patriarchate had the ultimate power against Typaldos; it could dethrone him, which it finally did, although late, by divesting him of all the powers coming from his office. Without power, Typaldos could influence fewer Orthodox Greeks and he was certainly rendered a less important negotiator in his dealings with the pontifical court. For the Patriarchate it would be a great defeat to lose the religious community of Venice for several reasons. Firstly, in Venice the Patriarchate maintained the only Exarchate in the West. The transformation of the Archdiocese from Orthodox to Uniate would bring significant harm to Orthodoxy and also close its gate to the West. Secondly, a possible conversion of the Greek Orthodox community of Venice to Catholicism would certainly affect the rest of the regions under Venetian rule, such as the Dalmatian coasts and mainly the Ionian Islands. The spreading of Catholic influence with the consent of the Archbishop of Philadelphia might also affect other religious leaders in regions controlled by the Patriarchate, which would then restrict Orthodox influence only to the areas in Greece under Ottoman rule. As it was faced with such a dangerous situation, the Patriarchate's reaction was to dethrone Typaldos and remove his ability to appear as the spiritual leader of Orthodox believers in Venice.

It is true that the Patriarchate's reaction was delayed, which gave Typaldos the time needed to unfold his plans. This delay was caused partly by the constant assurances offered by Typaldos in writing about his faith in the Eastern Orthodox Church, and partly by the instability which the Patriarchate suffered because of the immense control exerted by the Sultan<sup>22</sup>, which resulted in continuous changes and internal disputes between the hierarchs. At the same time the Holy See, after the Thirty Years war, despite the fact that it remained as a very powerful institution, was remarkably weakened due to the independence of the French Church, the reduction of the German Princes, as well as the rise of Protestantism<sup>23</sup>. As the German regions were no longer under his influence and with the defeat of Spain in the years following the

<sup>22</sup> Runciman, *Great Church in Captivity*.

<sup>23</sup> Ravitch, *The Catholic Church and the French Nation*; Carlson and Owens, *The Sacred and the Sovereign*. For details see subsection 2.1.1.



war, the Catholic Church turned its attention towards the Orthodox regions and attempted to enforce the “Unia”. Its plan was met with success in many countries, and it was also very close to success in the Venetian Greek regions, thanks to the assistance offered by Typaldos.

Venice, on the other side, perhaps due to its own weaknesses due to the emergence of new dominant powers in the Mediterranean Sea<sup>24</sup>, or even the tendency of its principal representatives towards a more conservative ideology chose to support the Pope’s position. Despite the strong reactions of the Greek Orthodox living in Venice, the most Serene Republic finally confirmed the attempts of the Catholic Church by re-enforcing the decrees which demanded the confession of faith. This action of the Venetian authorities shows their political shift towards Papal authority in comparison with the stance they held in 1671, when they rejected the plan of enforcing a Catholic Patriarch<sup>25</sup>.

Based on the above we conclude that Typaldos’ personality, as highlighted through the pages of this thesis, is that of a competent and multifarious person who, although the political framework of that period was favourable to his plans, he did not estimate properly the reactions of the Greek Confraternity. The refusal of the latter to submit to the Catholic Church, its insistence to fight any suspicious attempt on behalf of the Archbishop for years and its constant reminders towards the Patriarchate -until the point that the latter became aware of the danger and moved into action- show that the Confraternity’s will for the preservation of its religious faith and its ethnic consciousness was higher than its social interests.

Typaldos was born and lived always under the authority of Venice and Catholicism. If he had been a simple layman, his wish to get along with both of them would not necessarily have been opposed. To a certain extent it would be a necessity for him in order to survive. But he had a leading role in his community and its Church. From this standpoint he should not be judged as a common mortal, but in the light of his commitments and vows; undoubtedly he did not fulfil their requirements. However there is the question whether he was able to rise to the needs of his clerical position; in other words, to what extent the cultural and political environment of Venice and

---

<sup>24</sup> See subsection 2.1.2.

<sup>25</sup> See chapter 4.

Roman Catholicism influenced his choices. The answer of the thesis to these questions is that his choices were burdened by both the satisfaction of his personal ambitions and by his concern for the future of the Greek community of which he was the undisputed leader<sup>26</sup>.

If events and results usually give an objective answer regarding the actions of an individual, they do not reveal the attribution of motives. And in the case of Typaldos' rise and spectacular fall, the research is necessarily connected to motives. Most likely both, his beliefs and his plans to make a career in the Catholic Church, were present in the mind of a man of his own culture and ethos. Referring particularly to the ethos of the Archbishop, two judgments could be developed. The one is bound to take into account the culture of the time. And this particular culture showed us that to move from one denomination to another was not something unethical, but usual, despite the objections of the official Churches. However, the confession of faith given secretly in 1690 in the Catholic Church<sup>27</sup>, and shortly after, in 1699, the letter sent to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople<sup>28</sup>, reassuring him of his faith in Orthodoxy, lead to a second judgment; they reveal an unethical and opportunist personality, ready to follow two opposing positions in order to achieve his objectives without jeopardizing the gains of his position.

In a preceding chapter<sup>29</sup>, it was commented upon that many eminent priests and monks of Orthodox doctrine supported Catholicism or Protestantism, first because they did not see significant differences between different denominations of Christianity, and, second, because they believed that such a union would turn the Orthodox Church from restrictions which had been imposed by the Ottomans, and would allow the Orthodox population, if not a political, at least a spiritual rebirth.

This situation proves that such a concern for change or reconciliation of Orthodoxy and Catholicism since it was limited in the context of philosophical and religious debates within the Orthodox Church, and concerned only the preferences of an individual, could be viewed negatively, but not as criminal and condemnable. In

---

<sup>26</sup> In section 4.3, certain extracts from Typaldos' letters towards the Venetian authorities have been commented upon, whereby he expressed his interest in Greeks.

<sup>27</sup> See section 4.1 and 4.2.

<sup>28</sup> See subsection 4.3.2.

<sup>29</sup> See section 2.2.

contrast, it was considered a crime if it was aimed at changing the religious orientation of an entire community, without the consent of the ecclesiastical authorities and more importantly, without the consent of the community itself. And this was Typaldos' case.

It is obvious that Typaldos, classifying himself and other Greek Orthodox people as second-class citizens, decided to convert. The turn to Catholicism could be viewed as motivated by his thirst for recognition, fame and power. However, the fact that he was not alone in this shift but rather a link in a long chain of eminent figures of the Orthodox clergy and scholarship -who had adopted Catholic or Protestant doctrine-, does not allow the analysis to render a verdict that his aspirations were only to gain personal benefit. Instead, it reinforces the view that the social advancement of the Greeks of Venice was a serious motive for him.

It cannot be denied that his thought and teaching were inspired by the Greek Humanists and also by his effort to introduce students to ancient Greek literature, especially of Aristotle. His teachings during the period of the Flanghinian School, according to his few texts that have survived<sup>30</sup>, reveal that he was a distinguished Aristotelian but not an enthusiastic supporter of modernist ideas. Although initiated into the Neo-Aristotelianism of Korydaleus, he preferred to remain loyal to connecting new ideas with religious faith, thus forming together with other circle of Neo-Aristotelianism the circle of "religious" Neo-Aristotelianism<sup>31</sup>.

Nevertheless all the members of this circle listened carefully to the new ideas current in Europe at the end of the seventeenth century and these were talked over among Greek pre-Enlightenment figures; they held a conservative attitude which did not alienate them from the great theologians of Aristotelian scholastic philosophy, like

---

<sup>30</sup>In subsection 2.3.2., it has been mentioned that his views coincided with the ones of Kottounios, and mainly with those of Koursoulas, who insisted on the cosmological interpretation offered by Aristotle since, according to his opinion, this was aligned with the description given by the Bible. In his writings, *Theses Philosophicae* and *Synthesis*, he deals with Aristotle's Physics (Περὶ Φυσικῆς Ακροάσεως), copying actually the respective chapter of Koursoulas. See subsection 2.3.2.

<sup>31</sup>In section 2.3., it has been noted that the trend of religious Neo-Aristotelianism, eminently based on the principles of the Hellenist Humanists, mostly of Margounios, separated physics -where things (social and natural phenomena) could be explained based on physical operations, and with the tools provided by natural science - from the spiritual world, where the interpretation of phenomena is based on catholic concepts that only theology can supply. It is also noted that George Koressios, Nikolaos (Nikiforos) Klarontzanos, Meletios Syrigos, Nikolaos Koursoulas, Nikolaos Kerameus, Gerasimos Vlachos and George Sougdouris belonged to this circle.

Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus<sup>32</sup>. From this circle came also those priests and scholars who are considered today as precursors of Greek Enlightenment, because they introduced in the Greek schools the demotic Greek language as well as the thought of modern European thinkers such as Descartes and Locke<sup>33</sup>. Most important however is that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, as they became leading figures in the schools and churches of the main land in Greece, they had the opportunity to form groups of national awakening in the occupied land, a turn towards the demotic language and a revival and liberation of philosophical thought from the bonds of theology<sup>34</sup>.

Being a supporter of religious Neo-Aristotelianism, Typaldos did not have to conflict with the Church, particularly the Catholic one, which mostly interested him, as proved by the life he led. There is not enough evidence to ground whether his obsession with scholastic philosophy was due to his high sense of responsibility as a priest and his spiritual beliefs, or to purposefulness that could help him maintain and, if possible, improve his social and religious position. However, one must have due regard to the fact that the Archbishop was aware of the Patriarchate's internal situation and its spiritual rigidity. He did not believe that it would be possible for the Orthodoxy to find bridges with the new sciences and philosophy. Nowadays, since we have the theological Orthodox Renaissance of the eighteenth century<sup>35</sup> and also the dialogue between the Churches expressed in various significant writings<sup>36</sup>, it is not easy to condemn the Archbishop of Philadelphia as a traitor.

As a religious Neo-Aristotelian, Typaldos seemed to believe that natural and social phenomena were a result of material powers, without any intervention of God's will. Therefore he did not have any religious hesitation to select the Christian camp that was more equipped to fulfil his personal ambitions as well as the social needs of the community he represented. A man like him, was easily influenced by the Pope's

<sup>32</sup> See section 2.3 and subsection 2.3.2.

<sup>33</sup> The most important of them related to the state of Venice are: Methodios Anthracites, Antonios Katiforos, Vincentios Damodos and Meletios Mitrou (see Aggelou, "Πώς η νεοελληνική σκέψη ε γνώρισε το 'Δοκίμιο' του John Locke", 128; Kitromilides, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 21-53; Henderson, *Η αναβίωση του ελληνικού στοχασμού 1620-1830*, 23-63; Petsios, *Η περί φύσεως συζήτηση στην νεοελληνική σκέψη*, 170-229. Some others came from Danube region, as Alexander and Nikolaos Mavrokordatos (Kitromiledes, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 33-37, 37-42). For more details, see subsection 2.3.1.

<sup>34</sup> See analysis in the section 2.3.

<sup>35</sup> See analysis in the section 2.3.

<sup>36</sup> Loudovikos, *Ορθοδοξία και Εκσυγχρονισμός*.

promises and the temptations offered by the Church of “Unia”. Besides, the fact that other great Orthodox Churches, such as the Polish, had converted to “Unia”, tended to take away the mantle of sin, which was put upon “Unia” by the Greek Orthodox believers.

The contradictory positions of Typaldos, as they were expressed to the Pope<sup>37</sup>, to the Venetian authorities<sup>38</sup> and to the Patriarch<sup>39</sup>, were built into the religious conflicts between Catholicism and Orthodoxy. The indispensable clues about the causes behind the risky moves made by the Archbishop of Philadelphia during those turbulent times are provided mainly, if not only, in some key details of his biography. Nevertheless, it is certain that the Archbishop contributed to the break-up of the Greek community in Venice. This community was doing very well for centuries, and because of Typaldos its eminent persons left it, and its Church and its main educational institute were left without leadership for many decades.

However, it is worth noting that despite the negative result of dissolving the Greek community in Venice, the social unrest due to the “Typaldos” issue brought about some other social changes, positive to the population of the Greek mainland. One of them was that many wealthy Greeks, coming from central Greece, who financially supported the Venetian-Greek community with their donations<sup>40</sup>, after the disorder caused in the Greek schools in Venice in eighteenth century lost their interest in supporting them any further. This fact, combined with their own personal choices, led them to move to other locations and eventually to turn their attention towards assisting the awakening of the nation, by financing projects, mainly schools, in their own places of origin. This then resulted in an increase in education and the introduction of the new ideas to the population living in all those areas. Some of these examples are the brothers Labros and Simon Maroutsis, who founded a school in Ioannina, Spyridon Rizos who founded a school in Delvino and Ioannis Dekas who also founded a school in Athens<sup>41</sup>.

---

<sup>37</sup> See subsection 4.3.6.

<sup>38</sup> See subsection 4.3.1.

<sup>39</sup> See subsection 4.3.2.

<sup>40</sup> See analysis in subsection 2.4.4; Ploumidis, “Σχολεία στην Ελλάδα”.

<sup>41</sup> See subsections 2.4.3 and 3.4.4. Also, see Papakostas, “Ηπειρώτες έμποροι στη Βενετία”, 445; Mertzios, “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχείον”, 65-83, 100-110, 181-187; Mertzios, “Ανέκδοτα

Typaldos was always attracted to power. Before the age of thirty, he had decided to put himself forward for the powerful office of Archbishop of Philadelphia. He grasped the opportunity to take on the direction of Flanghinian School. He liked to have his own people around him as a court. The power he felt, as he described it in a letter to his brother, in 1686, on the day he was consecrated as Archbishop of Philadelphia<sup>42</sup>, characteristically indicates his need of being influential and authoritative. The fame he had been seeking for is compatible with such power. He wanted to play a more active role in order to achieve more recognition than the one he had already achieved. It is also typical of him to refer to the appreciation that the Catholics would show to Greeks if they –the Catholics– commence to attend services in their churches and to “honour” them by being there. This reference of Typaldos indicates the kind of man that avidly desires recognition and glory. Obviously the grandeur of his office was not enough for him. He discerned that the leader of the Orthodox Greeks, which he had decided to call Schismatic, could not earn anything more than what he had already had, but it was not enough for him. He desired to climb another rung of the hierarchy ladder, both the ecclesiastic and the social.

Typaldos apparently did not want –as many of his contemporaries and later people have blamed him– to become just another Cardinal falling under the Pope. This would not have been enough for him, as one can deduce from his letters and actions<sup>43</sup>. Surely, he would like to play a greater role. He considered himself as the link between East and West; between the two Churches that at that time had almost no direct contact. During these years, there was no longer any debate for reunion. Patriarch and Pope maintained their own opinions, their own questions or priorities. This interruption of the religious dialogue between the Vatican and Constantinople was one of the reasons<sup>44</sup> that led the Pope to invent “Unia”, which maintained the Orthodox ritual, and yet enforced His authority and the Westernization of the non-Latin east.

---

Ηπειρωτικά Μνημεία”, 110-113; Ploumidis, “Σχολεία στην Ελλάδα”; Maltezos, *Οδηγός του Αρχαίου*, 210-263.

<sup>42</sup> See section 1.2.

<sup>43</sup> This issue is extensively discussed in section 4.1.

<sup>44</sup> Another one is the weakening of Vatican after the Thirty Years War, as it is already commented above in this chapter and in section 2.2.

During that period, the Patriarch appeared to be weak for two reasons: first, because he was in a difficult situation due to internal disputes in the Patriarchate of Constantinople; second, due to his subjection to the Ottoman rule. Also the fact that Typaldos for almost twenty years succeeded in misleading the Patriarch proves the administration's weakness in the Eastern Church. So it appears that Typaldos either wanted to become Patriarch in his office, as Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos claimed in one of his letters<sup>45</sup>, or to become the Head of "Unia". We doubt whether the claim of Nikolaos Komninos-Papadopoulos has any real foundation. If Typaldos had such a project in mind, he would have attempted to find out the contacts that could assist him. Such contacts are considered to be the influential individuals of the Sublime Porte, Greeks or Turks and the current Bailo of Constantinople. However, as we have ascertained by studying his biography, he pursued neither. When his friend Lorenzo Soranzo, a Venetian Official, visited Constantinople as ambassador of Venice, he did nothing more than sending a letter to the Patriarch in order to inform him. Besides, he had never travelled to Constantinople in order to acquire good relationships and make contacts, which would exalt him in the office of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Most likely is that Typaldos would not intend to become the Patriarch of Constantinople. He wished to become the Head of "Unia", possibly considering that in the future he might succeed in incorporating or absorbing the Orthodox Greeks residing under Ottoman rule in the East. The "Unia" would definitely follow the dictates of the Pope. So it was truthful that he became a Catholic but it would probably not have been enough for him to wear the Cardinal's biretta, as has often been claimed.

---

<sup>45</sup> See subsection 4.3.4.

## WORKS CITED

### A. Archival sources

- A.S.V. (Archivio di Stato di Venezia) 1.1.
- A.S.V., Rif (Riformatori dello studio di Padova) b.3, fol. 412r.
- A.S.V., Rif, b. 3, fol. 512r.
- A.S.V., Rif, 370 [(1/1/1684) Venetian year 1685].
- A.S.V., Rif, 293 fasc. (1707-1709).
- A.S.V., Rif, b.179.
- A.S.V., Rif, b. 125, filza of the year 1678.
- A.S.V., Rif, b. 129, filza of the year 1680.
- A.S.V., Rif, b.179.
- A.S.V., Rif, 287.
- A.S.V., Rif, Filza 369.
- A.S.V., Rif, Filza 501.
- A.S.V., Rif, Filza 547.
- A.S.V., Rif, B.547.
- ASV, Rif, Filza 548.
- A.S.V., Rif. 579, fasc. "Scritture relative a devieti di stampa... 1622-1798".
- A.S.V., *Notarile, Testamenti*, notaio Nicola Arduini, b. 24, doc. 380.
- A.S.V., *Notarile, Testamenti*, b.1051, fols. 263v-264v (27 November 1709).
- A.S.V., *Senato Mar*, reg. 151, fols. 140v-141r, olim 102v-103r.
- A.S.V., *Provveditori di Comun, Atti*, b. 9, fols. 116v-117r.
- A.S.V., *Provveditori di Comun*, b. 10, doc. 9.
- A.S.V., *Provveditori di Comun*, b. 14, reg. 21, fol. 171v.



- A.S.V., Consiglio dei Dieci, Parti miste, filza 28, doc. 51.
- A.S.V., Consiglio dei Dieci, Parti Miste, filza 28, doc.51.
- A.S.V., Senato Terra, Reg. 90, fols. 1v-2r.
- A.S.V., *Compilazione leggi*, b. 228, 345r.
- A.E.I.B. [Αρχείο Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας (Archive of the Hellenic Institute of Venice)], Οργάνωση 1, Κ 3, fol. 110v.
- A.E.I.B., Α'. Οργάνωση – Λειτουργία, 3.Πρακτικά, Κατάστιχο 8 (Capitolare VIII), φύλλο 179 r-v (181 r-v new numbering).
- A.E.I.B., Α'. Οργάνωση - λειτουργία, 3. Πρακτικά Συνεδριάσεων, Κατάστιχο 11, φφ. 168v-169v.
- A.E.I.B. Οργάνωση 1, Θ 1 και ΑΕΙΒ Εκκλησία 3, Θ 5.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ. 4.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδέλφειας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 27, ff 2r-3r.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 1.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 24/6.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφο 4β, 18 Αυγούστου 1699, φφ 1-3.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 7.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3.Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, έγγραφα 10 και 11.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 13/A.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 12.
- A.E.I.B., Β'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5, doc. 13.

A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 27, ff 2r-3r.

A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Θ.9 doc. 633, 6v.

A.E.I.B., B'. Εκκλησία, 3. Μητρόπολη Φιλαδελφείας, Θήκη 3 Μελέτιος Τυπάλδος, φακ.5 έγγραφο 29.

A.E.I.B. Εκκλησία, B'. Η Apologia του Abate Fardella, 3, Θ9. 191-207.

A.E.I.B. Οικονομική Διαχείριση 2, Κ 1, fols. 26r, 32v.

A.E.I.B. Εκπαιδευτική ... δραστηριότητα, 1.1, Θ1.

B.M.C.C. (Biblioteca del Museo Civico Correr di Venezia ), Cod. Cicogna. 2764, fol. 93r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XI della controversia tra l' arcivescovo Greco di Filadelfia et il popolo Greco in Venetia dal 1707 sino all' anno 1709.*

B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol. 37r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore.*

B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol.74r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore.*

B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol. 37r: *Relazione a Nostro Signore.*

B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2764, fol.23: *Relazione a Nostro Signore.*

B.M.C.C., cod. Cic. 2585, p. 147.

A.U.P. (Archivio Antico dell' Universita di Padua), B. 605, fol. 25r.

A.P.F. (Archivio Storico della Congregazione 'de Propaganda Fide'), Congregazioni Particolari, vol.31, arch. 216r-216v, the same, Acta, vol.56, arch. 52v-53r, the same, Miscellanee Diverse, vol.35, arch. 80v.

A.P.F. Scritture riferite nei Congressi (SC), Greci, vol.1, p. 393r, 17 November 1691.

A.P.F. Sacra Congregazione Greci vol 1, fol 422r-v (more recent numbering 279 r-v).

A.P.F.. Sacra Congregazione Greci vol 1, fol. 423r.

A.P.F. Acta, vol.62, arch.120r-122v.

Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali , vol. 512, arch. 198r-202v, 205r, 206r, 208r-209v, 211r.

Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916), "Lettera" [Meletios Typaldos], fols. 93r-98r.

Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, ms. Cl. IV, cod. 289 (916) 134r-135r.

Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, It. 2257 (9919) *Ristretta notizia presa dall' autentiche carte*, fol. 29v.

## B. Non-archival sources

### B.1. Published primary sources

*Annuario pontificio per l'anno 2010*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria editrice Vaticana; 2010.

Anthracites (Ανθρακίτης), Methodius. *Θεωρίαι Χριστιανικαί και Ψυχωφελείς Νουθεσίαι*. Venice, 1699.

Aristotle. *Περί Ψυχής*, translated by Ioannis S. Christodoulou. Thessaloniki: Ζήτρος, 2003.

Aristotle. *De Anima*, edited by David Walter Hamlyn and Christofer John Shields. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Gendlin, Eugene T. *Line by Line Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*, V.1 New York: Focusing Institute, 2012.

Athnasiou (Αθανασίου), Dimitrios (ed.). *Άπαντα Αγίου Μάξιμου Γραικού V.1: "Λόγοι"*. Holy Mountain: Ιερά Μεγίστη Μονή Βατοπαιδίου, 2011.

Avdali (Αβδάλη), Athanasia. *Η "Εγκυκλοπαίδεια Φιλολογική" του Ιωάννη Πατούσα: Συμβολή στην Ιστορία της Παιδείας του Νέου Ελληνισμού, 1710-1839*. Athens: Αναστατικές Εκδόσεις, 1984.

Barozzi, Nicolò N., and Berchet, Guglielmo (eds). *Le relazioni degli stati europei lette al Senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo decimosettimo*, vol. 5. Venice: Naratovich, 1866.

Bobou-Stamati (Μπόμπου-Σταμάτη), Vassiliki. "Αναφορά Ελλήνων της Βενετίας στον Οικουμενικό Πατριάρχη Καλλίνικο Β΄ για το Μελέτιο Τυπάλδο, 1700". *Θησαυρίσματα*, 15 (1978): 98-105.

Bobou-Stamati (Μπόμπου-Σταμάτη), Vassiliki. "Ανέκδοτα κείμενα του Μελετίου Τυπάλδου: Η 'Lettera' και η Informazione. Η Apologia του Abate Fardella". *Εώα και Εσπερία*, 2 (1994-1996): 135-227.

Bobou-Stamati (Μπόμπου-Σταμάτη), Vassiliki. "Ο Μεθόδιος Ανθρακίτης και τα Τετράδια". *Ελληνικά*, 45 (1995): 111-127.

Bobou-Stamati (Μπόμπου-Σταμάτη), Vassiliki. *Τα Καταστατικά του Σωματείου (Nazione) των Ελλήνων φοιτητών του Πανεπιστημίου της Πάδοβας, 17ος-18ος αι.* Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών E.I.E, 1995.

Bobou-Stamati (Μπόμπου-Σταμάτη), Vassiliki. *Ο Βικέντιος Δαμοδός, Βιογραφία – Εργογραφία: 1700-1754*. Athens: M.I.E.T, 1998.

Bosisio, Achille. “La legislazione marittima veneziana e la Scuola di S. Nicolò dei Marinieri”. *Ateneo Veneto*, 131 (1944-1945): 43-47.

Cappelletti, Giuseppe. *Jesuiti e la Repubblica di Venezia: documenti diplomatici relativi alla Società Gesuitica*. Venice: Grimaldo, 1873.

Caraffa, Filippo, and Guiseppa Morelli (eds). *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, 12 volumes. Rome: Istituto Giovanni XXIII nella Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1961-1969.

Chiotis (Χιώτης) Panagiotis. “Relatione dell’ eccel<sup>mo</sup> signor Domenico Gritti, ritornato dalla carica di Sindaco e catasticator del regno di Morea letta nel eccel<sup>mo</sup> Senato l’anno 1692”. *Φιλίστωρ*, 2 (1861).

Comnenus-Papadopulus (Komninos-Papadopoulos), Nicolaus. *Historia Gymnasii Patavini post ea, quae hactenus de illo scripta sunt, ad haec nostra tempora plenius, et emendatius deducta. Cum actuario de claris professoribus tum alumnis eiusdem*, V. 1. Venice: Sebastianus Coletis, 1726.

Damodos, Vincentios. *Επίτομος Λογική κατ’ Αριστοτέλην*. Βενετία, 1759.

Darvaris (Δάρβαρης), Dimitrios. *Μικρή Κατήχησις, ήτοι Σύντομος Ορθόδοξος Ομολογία της Ανατολικής Εκκλησίας των Γραικών ή Ρωμαίων*. Vienna: 1791.

Decartes, René. *Στοχασμοί περί της πρώτης φιλοσοφίας*, Athens: Εκκρεμές, 2003.

Dieten, Jan L. van (ed.) *Χρονική Διήγησις του Χωνιάτου Κυρ Νικήτα, Αρχόμενη από της Βασιλείας Ιωάννου του Κομνηνού και Λήγουσα Μέχρι της Αλώσεως της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*. *Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae* 11.1, Series Berolinensis. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975.

Fedalto, Giorgio. “Appunti inediti sulla comunità dei Greci Veneziani nella corrispondenza dell’oratoriano, padre Giambattista Bedetti (1623-1697)”. In *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume, 329-335. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1974.

Gedeon (Γεδεών), Manouil. *Κανονικαί Διατάξεις*, V.1. Constantinople: Πατριαρχικό Τυπογραφείο, 1888.

Lambros (Λάμπρος), Spyridon. “Η περί Πελοποννήσου έκθεσις του Βενετού Προνοητού Κορνέρ”. *Δελτίον της Ιστορικής και Εθνολογικής Εταιρίας της Ελλάδος*, 2 (1885): 282-317.

Germanos (Γερμανός), Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. *Η Θεία Λειτουργία ερμηνευμένη Ενετίησιν*, 1672.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1936.

Kantiotis (Καντιώτης), Avgoustinos. *Διδαχαί Αγ. Κοσμά του Αιτωλού*. Athens: Ορθόδοξη Ιεραποστολική Αδελφότητα “Ο Σταυρός”, 2008.

Karathanasis (Καραθανάσης), Athanasios E. *Άνθη Ευλαβείας*. Athens: Ερμής 1978.

Koukkou (Κούκκου), Eleni. “Η ανέκδοτος διαθήκη του αρχιεπισκόπου Φιλαδελφείας Μελετίου Τυπάλδου”. In *Πρακτικά Τρίτου Πανιωνίου Συνεδρίου 23-29 Σεπτεμβρίου 1965*, V. 1, collective volume, 137-153. Athens, 1967.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. “Αρσενίου Μονεμβασίας του Αποστόλη επιστολαί ανέκδοται, 1521-1534: Προς Κάρολον τον Ε’, Κλήμεντα τον Ζ’, τον Έρασμον, τους Καρδινάλιους Niccolo Ridolfi και Egidio Canisio, τον Ιανόν Λάσκαριν και τον Ιουστίνον Δεκάδυν”. *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου*, 8/9 [1961 (1958/9)]: 5-59.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. *Εκκλήσεις των Ελλήνων λογίων της Αναγεννήσεως προς τους ηγεμόνες της Ευρώπης για την απελευθέρωση της Ελλάδος*. Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1965.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. “Συλλογή ανεκδότων εγγράφων (1578-1685) αναφερομένων εις τους εν Βενετία μητροπολίτας Φιλαδελφείας”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 6 (1969): 7-112.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. “Η εν Βενετία Ελληνική Κοινότης και οι Μητροπολίται Φιλαδελφείας”. *Επετηρίς Εταιρίας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 37 (1969-1970): 170-210.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. *Λεονάρδου Ντελλαπόρτα Ποιήματα, 1403-1411*. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 1995.

Meniates, (Μηνιάτης), Elias. *Διδαχαί και Λόγοι*. Thessaloni: Rigopoulos, 1991.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Η οικογένεια των Γλυκέων ή Γλυκήδων”. *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 10 (1935): 1-185.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Το εν Βενετία Ηπειρωτικόν Αρχειον”. *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 11 (1936): 1-341.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Ανέκδοτα ηπειρωτικά μνημεία”. *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 13 (1938): 91-116.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Πατριαρχικά, ήτοι ανέκδοτοι πληροφορίαί σχετικάί προς τους Πατριάρχας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως από του 1556-1702”. *Πραγματεΐαι της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 15/4 (1951): 1-83.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Οι Αθηναίοι Περούληδες εν Βενετία”. *Αθηναϊκά*, 41 (1968): 1-8.

Meschini, Anna (ed.). *Giano Laskaris: Epigrammi Greci*. Padova: Liviana, 1976.

Michailaris (Μηχαηλάρης), Panagiotis. “Ανέκδοτες Επιστολές (1695-1696) του Μιχ. Ν. Γλυκού στον Μιχ. Σταμ. Περούλη”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 13 (1976): 244-257.

Mosto, Andrea da. *Archivio di Stato di Venezia: Indice generale, storico, descrittivo ed analitico*, V.1. Rome: Biblioteca D' Arte, 1937.

Nicodimos (st) of the Holy Mountain and Makarios (st) of Corinth. *Φιλοκαλία, λόγος περί νήψεως και προσευχής*. Athens: Πουρνάρας, 2002 (originally published in Venice, in 1782).

Papadopoulos-Vrettos (Παπαδόπουλος-Βρεττός), Andreas. *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία, ήτοι κατάλογος των από πτώσεως της βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι εγκαθιδρύσεως της εν Ελλάδι βασιλείας τυπωθέντων βιβλίων. Βιογραφία των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων*. Athens: Βιδαράς και Λιούμης, 1851.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus (Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς), Athanasios. “Συμβολαί εις την ιστορίαν της νεοελληνικής φιλολογίας: περιλαμβάνον επιστολάς λογίων ανδρών της ιστ' και ιζ' εκατονταετηρίδος”. *Ο εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος*, 17 (1882-1883).

Papadopoulos Theodore H. *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*. Brussels: Scaldis Publishers, 1952.

Parios (Πάριος), Athanasios. “Λόγος εις την εορτήν του θείου Γρηγορίου του Παλαμά εν Θεσσαλονίκη”. In *Λόγοι πανηγυρικοί ιδ' του πανιερωτάτου αρχιεπισκόπου Φιλαδελφείας Μακαρίου του Χρυσοκεφάλου*, 459-472. Vienna, 1797.

Paton, James M. (ed.). *The Venetians in Athens 1687-1688: from the Istorica of Cristoforo Ivanovich*. Gennadeion Monographs I. Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940.

Paton, Lucy A. *Selected Bindings from the Gennadius Librar. Thirty eight plates in colour, with Introduction and Descriptions*. Athens: Cambridge American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1924.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. *Γεώργιος Σουγδουρής (1645/7-1725): Άγνωστα στοιχεία για τη ζωή, τη διδασκαλία και το φιλοσοφικό του έργο*. Part 1. Ioannina: Δωδώνη, 2002.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. “Theses Philosophicae, Venetiis, 1681. Ένα τεκμήριο φιλοσοφικής διδασκαλίας κατά τον 17ο αιώνα”. *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Βελλάς* V. 2 (2003): 233-251.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. “Ο μεσαιωνικός – σχολαστικός άριστοτελισμός ως πλαίσιο της φιλοσοφικής διδασκαλίας στη Βενετία κατά τον 17ο αιώνα: τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ Ματθαίου (Μελετίου) Τυπάλδου. Μία (ἀνα) σύνθεση τοῦ Ὑπομνήματος τοῦ Νικολάου Κούρσουλα στοῦ Περί Φυσικῆς Ἀκροάσεως τοῦ Ἀριστο-

τέλους”. In *Πρακτικά του Συνεδρίου Βυζάντιο-Βενετία-Νεότερος Ελληνισμός. Μια περιπλάνηση στον Κόσμο της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Σκέψης*, edited by Georgios N. Vlachakis and Thymios Nikolaidis, 245-281. Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2004.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. (ed.). *Η Λογική εκ παλαιών τε και νεωτέρων συνεργανισθείσα, υπό Ευγενίου διακόνου του Βουλγάρεως. Ης προτέτακται Αφήγησις προεισοδιώδης Περί Αρχής και Προόδου της κατά την Φιλοσοφίαν Ενστάσεως, και Προδιατριβαί τέτταρες εισαγωγικά Εις άπασαν εν γένει την Φιλοσοφίαν Προτελεστικά*. Ioannina: Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων, 2010.

Plato. *Πολιτεία*: Athens, Πόλις 2002.

Ploumidis (Πλουμίδης), Georgios. “Αι Βούλαι των Πατριαρχών περί των Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων της Βενετίας, 1445-1782”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 7 (1970): 234-258.

Ploumidis (Πλουμίδης), Georgios. “La Confraternita Greco-Cattolica di Santo Spiridione a Venezia-1708”. *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, 1 (1972): 51-70.

Rouqueville, François Charles-Hughes-Laurent. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής επαναστάσεως, ήτοι, Η αναγέννησις της Ελλάδος* (translated by Ξενοφών Ζυγούρας). Κατερίνη: Μάτι, 2006.

Rigas (Ρήγας) Velestinlis. *Τα Επαναστατικά*. Athens: Επιστημονική Εταιρεία Μελέτης Φερών-Βελεστίνου-Ρήγα, 2005 (πέμπτη έκδοση).

Tselikas (Τσελίκας), Agamemnon. “Μεταφράσεις βενετικών εκθέσεων περί Πελοποννήσου”. *Πελοποννησιακά*, 15 (1984): 127 – 152.

Tselikas (Τσελίκας), Agamemnon. “Μεταφράσεις βενετικών εκθέσεων περί Πελοποννήσου, Β”. *Πελοποννησιακά*, 17 (1989): 141 – 171.

Tsirpanlis (Τσιρπανλής), Zacharias N. *Οι Μακεδόνες σπουδαστές του Ελληνικού Κολλεγίου Ρώμης και η δράση τους στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία*. Thessaloniki: Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών, 1971.

Tsirpanlis (Τσιρπανλής), Zacharias N. “I libri greci pubblicati dalla ‘Sacra Congregatio de propaganda fide’, XVIII sec”. *Balkan Studies*, 15 (1974): 204-224.

Typaldos Matteo (Archbishop of Philadelphia Meletios). *Εις τα οκτώ περί Αριστοτέλους βιβλία περί Φυσικής Ακροάσεως. Διαλέξεις, Ζητήματα και Θεωρήματα*. Holy Mountain: Docheiarion Monastery.

Vafeidis (Βαφειδης), Philaretos. “Κώδιξ της Ιεράς Μητροπόλεως Καστοριάς και τινά εκκλησιαστικά βιβλία αποκείμενα εν τισι των εκκλησιών αυτής”. *Εκκλησιαστική Αλήθεια*, 20 (1900) .

Veloudis (Βελούδης), Ioannis. *Χρυσόβουλα και γράμματα των Οικουμενικών Πατριαρχών: ανήκοντα εις τους Φιλαδελφείας Μητροπολίτας υπερτίμους και εξάρχους*



Πατριαρχικούς και Προέδρους Πνευματικούς της ενετησί των Ορθοδόξων Κοινότητος. Venice: Φοίνιξ, 1893.

Veloudis (Βελούδης), Ioannis. *Το ελληνικό τυπογραφείο των Γλυκίδων στη Βενετία (1670-1854). Συμβολή στη μελέτη του ελληνικού βιβλίου κατά την εποχή της Τουρκοκρατίας*. Athens: Χρήστος Μπούρας, 1987. First published as *Georg Veloudis, Das griechische Druck- und Verlaghaus "Glykis" in Venedig 1670-1854. Das griechische Buch zur Zeit der Turkenherrschaft*. Edited by Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden: 1974.

Vendotis (Βενδότης), Georgios, and Meletios, Archbishop of Athens. *Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία Μελετίου Μητροπολίτου Αθηνών, μετενεχθείσα εκ της ελληνικής εις την ημετέρα απλοελληνικήν φράσιν, εις τόμους τρεις διαιρεθείσα και πλουτισθείσα με πολλές χρήσιμους και αναγκαίας υποσημειώσεις και ακριβείς πίνακας παρά Γεωργίου Βενδότη εκ Ζακύνθου και παρ' αυτού διορθωθείσα*, Vol. 4. Vienna: Bauermeister, 1783-1795.

Vlassi, (Βλάσση) Despoina. "Δύο διαθήκες των αρχών του 17<sup>ου</sup> αιώνα από το παλαιό αρχείο του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας". *Θησαυρίσματα*, 31 (2001): 181-209.

Vlassi, (Βλάσση) Despoina. "Στα ίχνη του Σπυρίδωνα και του Λεονάρδου Καπετανάκη. Αρχαιικά σταχυολογήματα". *Θησαυρίσματα*, 41/42 (2011/2012): 172-232.

Vlassi, (Βλάσση) Despoina. "Ο Ηλίας Μηνιάτης στη Βενετία. Σπουδαστής και διευθυντής του Φλαγγινιανού, δάσκαλος της ελληνικής σχολής και ιεροκήρυκας στο ναό του Αγίου Γεωργίου των Ελλήνων, 1681-1699". *Κυμοθόη*, V. 22-23 (2012-3).

Zerlentis (Ζερλέντης), Pericles. "Ιωάννης Στάης, Εξαρχος Μελετίου του Φιλαδελφείας". *Νησιωτική Επετηρίς* (1918).

## **B.2. Published secondary sources**

Ahrweiler- Glykatzi (Αρβελέρ Γλύκατζη), Hélène. *Εισαγωγή στον Βυζαντινό Πολιτισμό*. Athens: Ψυχογιός, 1992.

Ahrweiler- Glykatzi Hélène. *Η Πολιτική Ιδεολογία της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας*. Athens: Ψυχογιός, 1992.

Ahrweiler- Glykatzi, Hélène. *Γιατί το Βυζάντιο*. Athens: Μεταίχμιο, 2012.

Aggelou (Αγγέλου), Alkis. "Πώς η νεοελληνική σκέψη εγνώρισε το 'Δοκίμιο' του John Locke". *Αγγλοελληνική Επιθεώρηση*, 6 (1954): 128-149.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.

Apostolopoulos (Αποστολόπουλος), Dimitrios G. "Gavriil Seviros, arcivescovo di Filadelfia a Venezia, e la sua epoca". In *Atti della giornata di studio dedicata alla*

*memoria di Manussos Manussacas (Venezia, 26 settembre 2003)*. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 2004.

Appleby, R. Scott. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. New York: Rowan and Littlefield, 2000.

Araujo, Ana Maria. “Η διαπλοκή του κοινωνικού και ψυχικού στη συγκρότηση των ταυτοτήτων μας”. In *Ταυτότητες: Ψυχοκοινωνική Συγκρότηση*, edited by Klimis Navridis and Nicolas Christakis, 91-110. Athens: Καστανιώτης, 1997.

Arbel, Benjamin. “Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox in the Early Modern Venetian State”. In *The Three Religions*, edited by Nili Cohen and Andreas Heldrich, 73-86. Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2002:

Argyriou, (Αργυρίου), Asterios. “Η Απελευθέρωση των Ελλήνων και ο Εσχατολογικός Ρόλος της Ρωσίας και της Γαλλίας μέσα στο Ερμηνευτικό Έργο του Θεοδώρητου Ιωαννίνων (1740-1823)”. In *Καιρός, Τιμητικός τόμος στον ομότιμο καθηγητή Αθ. Δόϊκο*, V.4, 11-24. Thessaloniki: Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Θεολογικής Σχολής - Τμήμα Θεολογίας, 1994.

Armstrong, John A. *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Retrieving the Tradition: The Fathers, the Scholastics, and Ourselves*. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.

Banton, Michael. *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*. Oxon: Tavistock, 1969.

Barker, Nicolas. *Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script & Type in the Fifteenth Century*. Sandy Hook: Chiswick, 1985.

Barkey Karen. *Empire of Difference. The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Baroutsos (Μπαρούτσος), Fotis. “Οι Έλληνες έμποροι της Βενετίας”. In *Δημοσία Ιλαρία*, edited by Chryssa Maltezu, 144-165. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1999.

Barth, Fredrik. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969.

Battaglia, Salvatore (ed.). *Grande dizionario della lingua Italiana*, V.13. Torino: UTET, 1986.

Bauman, Gerd. *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking National Ethnic and Religious Identities*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Baynes, Norman H., and H. St. L. B. Moss. *Βυζάντιο: Εισαγωγή στον Βυζαντινό Πολιτισμό*, translated to Greek by Dimitrios N. Sakkas. Athens: Papadimas, 1986.

Beltrami Daniele. *La composizione economica e professionale della popolazione di Venezia nei secoli XVII e XVIII*. Padova: CEDAM, 1951 (from *Giornale di Economisti e Annali di Economia*, 10/3-4, 1951).

Beltrami, Daniele. *Storia della popolazione di Venezia dalla fine del secolo XVI alla caduta della Repubblica*. Padova: A. Milani, 1954.

Bentley, Jerry H. *Humanists and the Holy Writ*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Benz, Ernst. “Melanchton et l’ Église orthodoxe”. *Irenikon*, 29 (1956): 165-176.

Berghahn, Volker R., and Simone Lässig (eds). *Biography Between Structure and Agency: Central European Lives in International Historiography*. New York – Boston: Berghahn Books, 2008.

Berglund, Bruce R. and Brian Porter-Szűcs. *Christianity and Modernity in Eastern Europe*. Budapest: Central European Press, 2010.

Berlin, Isaiah. *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*. London: Knopf, 1991.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bhabha, Homi K. (ed.). *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Birtachas (Μπίρταχας), Efstathios. “Στα χνάρια ενός ‘υποψήφιου Βησσαρίωνα’ ή Θρησκευτικές και πολιτικές ζυμώσεις στη Ρώμη και στη Βενετία στα χρόνια του Μελέτιου Τυπάλδου”. *Περί Ιστορίας*, 4 (2003): 167-182.

Birtachas (Μπίρταχας), Efstathios . “Un ‘secondo’ vescovo a Venezia: Il Metropolita di Filadelfia (secoli XVI-XVIII)”. In *I Greci a Venecia: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Venezia, 5-7 novembre 1998*, 103-121. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2002.

Bloor, Kevin. *The Definitive Guide to Political Ideologies*, Milton Keynes: Authorhouse, 2010.

Bouwsma Wiliam .J. *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation*. California: University of California Press, 1968.

Braudel, Ferdinand. “The Mediterranean Economy in the Sixteenth Century”. In *Essays in European Economic History 1500-1800*, edited by Peter Earle, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Braudel, Ferdinand. *Η Μεσόγειος και ο Μεσογειακός Κόσμος την Εποχή του Φιλίππου της Ισπανίας*. Athens: M.I.E.T., 1997.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997.

Cândeia, Virgil. “Une politique culturelle commune Roumano-Arabe dans la première moitié du XVIIIe siècle”. *Association Internationale d’Etudes du Sud-Est Européen. Bulletin*, 3 (1965): 51-56.

Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-worship, and the Heroic in History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Carlson, John D, and Erik C. Owens. *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

Castoriadis, Cornelius. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Chandra, Kanchan. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Chandra, Kanchan. “What is Ethnic Identity?” In *Constructivist Theories of Ethnic Politics*, edited by Kanchan Chandra, 51-96. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Chassiotis (Χασιώτης), Ioannis. “Η κάμψη της Οθωμανικής δυνάμεως”. In *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11, 8-51. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975.

Chassiotis (Χασιώτης), Ioannis. *Μεταξύ Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας και Ευρωπαϊκής Πρόκλησης: Ο ελληνικός κόσμος στα χρόνια της τουρκοκρατίας*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2001.

Chassiotis (Χασιώτης), Ioannis, Olga Katsiardi-Hering, Evridiki A. Abatzi (eds). *Οι Έλληνες στη Διασπορά, 15<sup>ος</sup> – 21<sup>ος</sup> αι.* Athens: Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2006.

Christianidis (Χριστιανίδης) Giannis, Dimitris Dialetis, Georgios Papadopoulos, and Costas Gavroglu. *Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία και Επιστήμη: από την αρχαιότητα έως τον 20ό αιώνα*, V.2. Patra: Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο, 2000.

Cohen, Anthony. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Cohen, Anthony. *Self Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Coser, Lewis. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: The Free Press, 1956.

Coser, Lewis. *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in historical and social context*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Coser, Lewis. "Introduction", in Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press, 1993.

Davey, Colin. "Metrophanes Kritopoulos, Pioneer for Unity". *Θεολογία*, 38 (1967): 459-486.

Deutsch, Karl. *Nationalism and Social Communication*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1966.

Dewey, John. *A Common Faith*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

Dialetis, Dimitris, Costas Gavroglu, and Manolis Patiniotis. "The Sciences in the Greek speaking regions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: The process of Appropriation and the Dynamics of Reception and Resistance", *Archimedes*, 2 (1997).

Dick, Ignatios (Archimandrite). *Melkites: Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholics of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem*. Boston: Sophia Press, 2004.

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*. Athens: Ίκαρος, 1949.

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. "Αντώνιος Στρατηγός. Βιβλιογραφικές έρευνες". *Ο Έρανιστή*, 5 (1967).

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. "Εισαγωγικά στη μελέτη της συλλογής 'Άνθη Ευλαβείας'". In *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume, 336-349. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο: 1974.

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. "Έλληνομακεδόνες λόγιοι 15ου και 16ου αιώνα: Ιωάννης Κωττούνης". In *Μακεδονία. 4000 χρόνια Ελληνικής Ιστορίας και πολιτισμού*, edited by Michael Sakelariou, 398-399. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1982.

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*. Athens: Ερμής, 1983.

Dimaras (Δημαράς), Constantine T. *Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος*. Athens: Μ.Ι.Ε.Τ., 2006.

Dimitrakopoulos (Δημητρακόπουλος), Andronikos K. *Δοκίμιον περί του βίου και των συγγραμμάτων Μητροφάνους του Κριτοπούλου Πατριάρχου Αλεξανδρείας*. Leipzig: Metzger and Vitting, 1870.

Dimitrakopoulos (Δημητρακόπουλος), Andronikos K. *Ορθόδοξος Ελλάς, ήτοι, Περί των Ελλήνων των Γραψάντων κατά Λατίνων και περί των Συγγραμμάτων Αυτών*. Leipzig: Metzger and Vitting, 1872.

- Dumont, Louis. *Essays on Individualism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press, 1993.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Dursteler, Eric. *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Eickhoff, Ekkehard. *Venezia, Vienna e i Turchi. Bufera nel sud-est europeo, 1645-1700*. Milano: Rusconi, 1997.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, 1987.
- Eriksen, Thomas H. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto, 1993.
- Eriksen, Thomas H. "Ethnic Identity, National Identity and Intergroup Conflict". In *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, edited by Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, David Wilder, 42-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Evangelidou Trifonos E. *Η Παιδεία επί Τουρκοκρατίας*. Athens: Α.Π. Χαλκιάπουλου, 1936.
- Evangelatos (Ευαγγελάτος), Spyros. "Γεώργιος Μορμόρης". *Ελληνικά*, 22/1 (1969): 173-182.
- Falangas, Andronikos. "Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants of the fifteenth – seventeenth centuries". *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, 33/1-2 (2007): 7-21.
- Fedalto, Giorgio. "Le minoranze straniere". In *Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente*, V.1, edited by Hans-Georg Beck, Manoussos Manoussakas, and Agostino Petrusi, 143-163. Florence: Leo S. Olschiki, 1977.
- Fedalto, Giorgio. "Stranieri a Venezia e Padova, 1550-1700". In *Storia della Cultura Veneta: Dalla controriforma alla fine della Repubblica V.4/ii: Il Seicento*, edited by Girolamo Arnaldi and Manlio Pastore Stocchi, 499-501. Vicenza: Pozza, 1980.
- Finlay George. *The History of Greece under Ottoman and Venetian Domination*. London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1856.
- Fragoudaki (Φραγκουδάκη) Anna and Thalia Dragona (Δραγώνα). *Τι Είναι η Πατρίδα Μας*. Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 1997.
- Freedman, James O. *Crisis and Legitimacy: The Administrative Process and the American Government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Friedman, Jonathan. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage, 1995.

Fryde, Edmund. *The Early Palaiologean Renaissance, 1261-c.1360*. Boston: Brill, 2000.

Furnivall, John S. *Colonial Policy and Practice*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1948.

Fusaro, Maria. “Commercial Networks of Cooperation in the Venetian Mediterranean: The English and the Greeks, a case study”. In *Italy, Commercial Networks in the Early Modern World*, edited by Diego Ramada Curto and Antony Molho, 121-147. Florence: European University Institute, 2002.

Fusaro, Maria. “Coping with Transition: Greek Merchants and Ship-owners between Venice and England in the late sixteenth century”. In *Diaspora Entrepreneurial Networks: Four Centuries of History*, edited by Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, Gelina Harlaftis and Ioanna Pepelasis – Minoglou, 95-123. Oxford: Berg, 2005.

Fusaro, Maria, Colin Heywood, and Mohamed-Salah Omri (eds). *Trade and Cultural Exchange in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. London: Macmillan, 2010.

Fyrigos, Antonis. “Accezioni del termine ‘Greco’ nei secoli XVI-XVIII”, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, 44 (1990): 201-216.

Garitsis (Γαρίτσης), Constantine. *Μυσταγωγική προθεωρία ἐκ τοῦ κανονικοῦ δικαίου*. Athens: Γαρίτσης, 2012.

Geanakoplos, Deno J. *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to West Europe*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Gedeon (Γεδεών), Manouil. *Τυπάλδου-Στάη Συμμορία: Σημείωμα περί των εν Βενετία θρησκευτικών ταραχών 1686-1712*. Constantinople: Πατριαρχικό Τυπογραφείο, 1913.

Gedeon (Γεδεών), Manouil. *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*. Athens: Αλφειος, 1996.

Gencarelli, Elvira. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, V.3. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

Geertz, Clifford. *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Africa and Asia*. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Geertz, Clifford. *Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gelder, Maartje van. *Trading Places, The Netherlandish Merchants in Early Modern Venice*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gellner, Ernest. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Gellner, Ernest. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil society and its rituals*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1994.

Gemert, Arnold F. van. *Constructions of Greek Past Identity and Historical Consciousness from Antiquity to the Present*. Groningen: Hero Hokwerda, 2003.

Gendlin, Eugene T. *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning*. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1962.

Gerth, Hans H., and Charles Wright Mills (eds). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University, 1946.

Giannaras, (Γιανναράς) Christos. *Ορθοδοξία και Δύση στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα*. Athens: Δομός, 2006.

Giannopoulos (Γιαννόπουλος), Ioannis. "Κοινότητες". In *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11, 134-143. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975.

Gill, Joseph. *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Gonis (Γόνης), Dimitrios. "Ιστορική ανασκόπηση του προβλήματος της Ουνίας". In *Η Ουνία Χθες και Σήμερα*, edited by Georgios D. Metallinos, 51-74. Athens: Αρμός, 1992.

Gopin, Marc. *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Goudas (Γούδας), Anastasios N. *Βίοι Παράλληλοι των επί της Αναγεννήσεως της Ελλάδος Διαπρεψάντων Ανδρών*, V.2. Athens: Παιδεία, 1874.

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

Greene, Molly. "Trading Identities: The sixteenth-century Greek moment". In *A Faithful Sea: The Religious Cultures of the Mediterranean, 1200-1700*, edited by Adnan A. Jusain, and Katherine Elizabeth Fleming, 121-148. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

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

Greyerz, Kasper von. *Religion and Culture in Early modern Europe, 1500-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Grinin, Leonid E. "The role of an Individual in History: A Reconsideration". *Social Evolution and History*, 9/2 (2010): 95-136.



Guibernau, Montserrat. "Anthony D. Smith on nations and national identity: a critical assessment". *Nations and Nationalism*, 10/1-2 (2004): 125-141.

Gurevich, Aaron. *The Origins of European Individualism*. Oxford: Blackwell 1995.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, V. 2. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Handelman, Don. *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Harrison, Peter. *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.

Hatzopoulos (Χατζόπουλος) Constantine K. *Ελληνικά Σχολεία στην περίοδο της Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας, 1453-1821*. Thessaloniki: Βάνιας, 1991.

Hauptmann, Peter. "Petrus Mogilas". In *Klassiker der Theologie*, Vol. 1: von Tertullian bis Calvin, edited by Friedrich W. Graf, 378-391. Berlin: Beck, 2005.

Henderson, George P. *Η Αναβίωση του Ελληνικού Στοχασμού 1620-1830: Η Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία στα Χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας*. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 1994.

Hering, Gunnar. *Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και Ευρωπαϊκή Πολιτική 1620-1638*. Athens: M.I.E.T., 1992.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hofstede, Geert. *Cultures and Organizations*. London: McGraw-Hill, 1991.

Horowitz, Donald L. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Hroch, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Hughes, Lindsey. *Η Ρωσία την Εποχή του Μεγάλου Πέτρου*. Athens: Λιβάνης, 2007.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

İnalçık, Halil and Cemal Kafadar (eds). *Süleymân the Second and His Time*. Istanbul: Gorgias Press & The Isis Press, 2010.

Isaacs, Harold. *Idols of the Tribe*. N.Y.: Harper, 1975.

- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Modern Library, 1902.
- Jedin, Hubert. *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: An Historical Survey*. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- Jelavich, Barbara. *History of the Balkans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and explorations*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Joireman, Sandra F. *Nationality and Political Identity*. N.Y: Continuum, 2003.
- Just R. "Triumph of the Ethnos". In *History and Ethnicity*, edited by Elisabeth Tonkin, Malcolm Kenneth McDonald, and Maryon Chapman, 71-88. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Kaldellis, Anthony. *Hellenism in Byzantium: The transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Karabelias (Καραμπελιάς), Giorgos. *To 1204 και η Διαμόρφωση του Νεώτερου Ελληνισμού*. Athens: Εναλλακτικές Εκδόσεις, 1993.
- Karagiannopoulos (Καραγιαννόπουλος) Ioannis. *Το Βυζαντινό Κράτος*. Athens: Ερμής, 1988.
- Karamanolis (Καραμανώλης), Georgios. "Was there a Stream of Greek Humanists in the Late Renaissance?", *Ελληνικά*, 53 (2003): 19-46.
- Karathanasis (Καραθανάσης), Athanasios E. *Η Φλαγγίνειος Σχολή της Βενετίας*. Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 1986.
- Karathanasis (Καραθανάσης), Athanasios E. *Πραγματεία περί Μακεδονίας. Μελέτες και άρθρα για την πνευματική κίνηση και ζωή της Νεότερης Μακεδονίας*. Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 1990.
- Karathanasis Athanasios, *Οι Έλληνες Λόγιοι στη Βλαχία (1670-1714)*. Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2000.
- Karathanasis (Καραθανάσης), Athanasios E. *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος στα Βαλκάνια και την Ρωσία*. Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2003.
- Karathanasis (Καραθανάσης), Athanasios E. *Η Βενετία των Ελλήνων*. Thessaloniki: Κυριακίδης, 2010.

Karavidas (Καραβίδας) Constantine. *Σοσιαλισμός και Κοινότητα*. Athens: Παπαζήσης, 1981.

Karavidas (Καραβίδας) Constantine. *Αγροτικά: Μελέτη Συγκριτική*. Athens: Αγροτική Τράπεζα Ελλάδος, 1990.

Karmiris (Καρμίρης), Ioannis. “Ο Ορθοδοξο-προτεσταντικός διάλογος”. *Θεολογία*, 58 (1987): 657-690; Also, *Θεολογία*, 59 (1988), 7-47, 209-229, 409-437.

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson, 1985.

Keren, Michael. “Biography and Historiography: The Case of David Ben-Gurion”. *Biography*, 23/2 (2000): 332-351.

Kidd, Colin. *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kitromilides (Κιτρομηλίδης), Paschalis. “The idea of science in the modern Greek Enlightenment”. In *Greek Studies in the Philosophy and History of Sciences*, edited by Pantelis Nicolakopoulos, 187-200. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1990.

Kitromilides (Κιτρομηλίδης), Paschalis. *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*. Athens: M.I.E.T., 2000.

Kitromilides (Κιτρομηλίδης), Paschalis. *Ιώσηπος Μοισιόδαξ*. Athens: M.I.E.T., 2004.

Kitsikis (Κιτσίκης), Dimitris. *Ιστορία της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας, 1280-1924*. Athens: Εστία, 1988.

Kolyva (Κολυβά), Marianna. “Θεόδωρος Παλαιολόγος, αρχηγός μισθοφόρων ‘στρατιωτών’ και διερμηνέας στην υπηρεσία της Βενετίας, 1452c.-1532”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 10 (1973): 138-162.

Koumariou (Κουμαριανού) Aikaterini. “Ο νεοελληνικός διαφωτισμός: μια ιστορική πραγματικότητα”. In *Πενήντα χρόνια Νεοελληνικής παιδείας. Η Παρουσία του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά στην Επιστήμη των Νεοελληνικών Γραμμάτων*, collective volume, 17-26. Athens: Εκδοτική Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας -Σχολή Μωραΐτη, 1985.

Koutmanis (Κουτμάνης) Sotirios. “Το τρίτο είδος. Θρησκευτική υβριδικότητα και κοινωνική αλλαγή στην ορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Βενετίας, τέλη 17ου-αρχές 18ου αιώνα”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 37 (2007): 389-420.

Koutmanis (Κουτμάνης) Sotirios. “Όψεις της εγκατάστασης των Ελλήνων στη Βενετία το 17ο αιώνα”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 35 (2005): 309-339.

Koutmanis (Κουτμάνης) Sotirios. “Χρονικά για την ιστορία της Ελληνικής Κοινότητας Βενετίας, 18<sup>ος</sup> αι.”. *Εώα και Εσπερία 7* (2007): 311-334.

Kraye, Jill. "Philologists and Philosophers". In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, edited by Jill Kraye, 142-160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lambros (Λάμπρος), Spyridon. *Ιστορικά Μελετήματα*. Athens: Παλαμήδης, 1884.

Lambros (Λάμπρος), Spyridon. *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Holy Mountain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.

Lambros (Λάμπρος), Spyridon. "Σημειώσεις περί της εν Πελοποννήσω βενετοκρατίας". *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 20 (1926); 21 (1927).

Lane, Frederic C. *Venice: A Maritime Republic*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Lässig, Simone. "Toward a biographical turn? Biography in Modern History – Modern Historiography in Biography". *GHI Bulletin*, 35 (2004): 147-155.

Layton, Evro. "The first printed Greek books". *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, 4/4 (1979): 63-79.

Le Goff, Jacques. *Saint Louis*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Le Goff, Jacques. *Saint Francis of Assisi*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Legrand Émile. *Recueil de poèmes historiques en grec vulgaire relatifs à la Turquie et aux principautés danubiennes*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1877.

Legrand Émile. *Bibliographie Hellénique, XVIe siècle, V.1*. Paris: Garnier, 1918.

Lekkas (Λέκκας), Pantelis. *Η Εθνικιστική Ιδεολογία*. Athens: Παπαζήσης, 2011.

Leonard, Emile G. *A History of Protestantism*, 2 vols. London: Nelson, 1965-7.

Liakos (Λιάκος), Antonis. *Πώς το Παρελθόν Γίνεται Ιστορία*. Athens: Πόλις, 2007.

Liata (Λιάτα), Eftychia. "Ένας Έλληνας έμπορος στη Δύση. Πορεία μιας ζωής από τον 17<sup>ο</sup> στον 18<sup>ο</sup> αι.". In *Ροδωνιά: Τιμή στον Μ.Ι. Μανούσακα*, V.1, 280-287. Rethymno: Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, 1994.

Llobera, Josep. R. *The God of Modernity: The development of nationalism in Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1994.

Longworth, Philip. "Russian-Venetian Relations in the Reign of Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich". *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 64/3 (1986): 380-400.

Lorentzatos (Λορεντζάτος), Zisimos. *Μελέτες*. Athens: Γαλαξίας, 1967.

Losacco, Margherita. *Antonio Catiforo e Giovanni Veludo interpreti di Fozio*. Bari: Dedalo, 2003.

Lossky, Vladimir. *Η Μυστική Θεολογία της Ανατολικής Εκκλησίας*. Thessaloniki: Ευαγγελιστής Μάρκος, 1991.

Loudonikos (Λουδοβίκος), Nikolaos, Fr. *Ορθοδοξία και Εκσυγχρονισμός: Βυζαντινή Εξατομίκευση, Κράτος και Ιστορία, στην Προοπτική του Ευρωπαϊκού Μέλλοντος*. Athens: Αρμός, 2006.

Lowry, Martin J.C. *The World of Aldus Manutius: Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.

Luckmann, Thomas. *The Invisible Religion*. London: MacMillan, 1967.

Luhmann, Niklas. *The Differentiation of Society*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1982.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*. N.Y.: Doubleday, 1948.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. *Η Βενετία των Ελλήνων*. Athens: Μίλητος 1990.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. “Η Κρήτη στη διάρκεια της περιόδου της Βενετοκρατίας”. In *Κρήτη, Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός*, V.2, edited by Nicolaos Panayotakis, 142-153. Irakleion: Πανεπιστημιακές εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 1998.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. “Βενετία, η άλλη πατρίδα των Ελλήνων”. In *Δημοσία Ιλαρία*, edited by Chryssa Maltezu, 11-22. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών της Βενετίας, 1999.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. “Ελληνες Μέτοικοι στη Βενετία μετά την Άλωση, Ταυτότητα και Εθνική Συνείδηση”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 35 (2005): 175-184.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. Οδηγός του Αρχείου. In *Series Βιβλιοθήκη του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας*, 26. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 2008.

Manousakas (Μανούσακας), Manoussos. “Επισκόπηση της ιστορίας της Ελληνικής Ορθοδόξου Αδελφότητας της Βενετίας”. *Τα Ιστορικά*, 11 (1989): 243-264.

Mantzariadis (Μαντζαρίδης), Georgios. *Ο Άγιος Γρηγόριος ο Παλαμάς στην Ιστορία και το Παρόν (Πρακτικά Διεθνών Επιστημονικών Συνεδρίων Αθηνών & Λεμεσού)*. Holy Mountain: Ιερά Μεγίστη Μονή Βατοπαιδίου, 2000.

Marzo Magno, Alessandro. *Atene 1687: Venezia, I Turchi e la Distruzione del Partenone*. Milan: Il Saggiatore, 2011.

Maturana, Humberto R., and Francisco J. Varela. *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980.

Mavroidi (Μαυροειδή), Fani. *Συμβολή στην ιστορία της Ελληνικής Αδελφότητας Βενετίας στο ΙΣΤ΄ αιώνα*. Athens: Καραβίας, 1976.

McNeill, William H. *Venice: The Hinge of Europe, 1081-1797*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Melisseidis (Μελισσειδης), Ioannis. *Η Επιβίωση. Οδοιπορικό σε χρόνους μετά την Αλωση της Βασιλεύουσας, 1453-1605 περίπου*. Athens: Vergina, 2010.

Mertzios (Μέρτζιος), Constantine D. “Θωμάς Φλαγγίνης και ο μικρός Ελληνομνήμων”. *Πραγματεία της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 9 (1939).

Metallinos (Μεταλληνός), Georgios D, and Dimitrios Gonis, Elias Fratseas, Evgenios Morarou and bishop Yevtits, *Η Ουνία Χθες και Σήμερα*. Athens: Αρμός, 1992.

Michaelides, George P. “The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris”. *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 12/2 (June 1943): 118-129.

Michalaga (Μιχάλαγα), Despoina. “Η ζωή και το έργο ‘Νικολάου Κούρσουλα του Ζακυνθίου, διδασκάλου, φιλοσόφου και θεολόγου’”. In *Διεθνές Συνέδριο “Άγιοι και Εκκλησιαστικές Προσωπικότητες στη Ζάκυνθο”*, 327-362. Athens: 1999.

Michalaga (Μιχάλαγα), Despoina. *Συμβολή στην Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία της Πελοποννήσου κατά τη Β’ Βενετοκρατία, 1685-1715*. Athens: Θεολογική Σχολή Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών, 2008.

Michalaga (Μιχάλαγα), Despoina. “Η Ζάκυνθος στην εκκλησιαστική ιστορία της βενετοκρατούμενης Πελοποννήσου”. In *Φιόρα τιμής για τον Μητροπολίτη Ζακύνθου Χρυσόστομο Συνετό*, 625-641. Ζάκυνθος: 2009.

Miller, David. *On Nationality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Mills, John. “The Ontology of Religiosity: The oceanic feeling and the value of the lived experience”. *Religious Humanism*, 33/3-4 (1999): 20-41.

Minniti-Gonia (Γκόνια), Domenica. *Ο Ελληνισμός της Διασποράς*, V.2. Patra: Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο, 2001.

Mitchell, Claire. “The religious content of ethnic identities”. *Sociology*, 40/6 (2006): 1135-1152.

Mommsen, Theodor E. “The Venetians in Athens and the Destruction of the Parthenon in 1687”. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 45/4 (Oct.-Dec. 1941): 544-556.

Monfasani, John. *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and other émigrés. Selected Essays*. Brookfield, Vermont: Variorum, 1995.

Moschonas (Μοσχονάς), Nicolaos G. “La Comunità Greca di Venezia; aspetti sociali ed economici”. In *I Greci a Venezia*, edited by Maria Francesca Tiepolo and Eurigio Tonetti, 221-242. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2002.

Murdock, Graeme. *Calvinism on the Frontier, 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Nagel, Joane. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture". *Social Problems*, 41/1 (1994): 152-172.

Nicol, Donald M. *The Immortal Emperor: The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last Emperor of the Romans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Norwich, John J., and Peter Dimock (eds). *A History of Venice*. New York: Knopf, 1989.

Ntokos (Ντόκος), Constantine. *Η Στερεά Ελλάδα κατά τον Ενετοτουρκικόν Πόλεμον 1684-1699 και ο Σαλώνων Φιλόθεος*. Athens: 1975.

Noutsos (Νούτσος), Panagiotis. *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός: Τα Όρια της Διακινδύνευσης*. Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, 2005.

Overbeck Julius Joseph (ed.). *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church from the Version of Peter Mogila*. London: Thomas Baker, 1898.

Palmer, Alan. *The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire*. London: Faber Finds, 1992.

Pantazopoulos (Πανταζόπουλος), Nicolaos. *Νεοελληνικό Κράτος και Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινότητα. Ο καταλυτικός ρόλος των Βαυαρών*. Athens: Παρουσία, 1998.

Papadopoulos (Παπαδόπουλος), Chrysostomos. "Ο Χρυσανθος Νοταράς προ της αναρρήσεως αυτού εις τον Πατριαρχικόν Θρόνον Ιεροσολύμων". *Νέα Σιών*, 26/3 (1931): 81-105.

Papadopoulos (Παπαδόπουλος), Thanasis. *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία από τον 16<sup>ο</sup> έως τον 18<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα*. Athens: Ζαχαρόπουλος, 1988.

Papadopoulos (Παπαδόπουλος), Thanasis. "Αγνωστα έργα Ελλήνων υπό έκδοση". In *Το Έντυπο Ελληνικό Βιβλίο 15<sup>ος</sup>-19<sup>ος</sup> αιώνας, Minutes of international convention, collective volume. (Delphoi, 16-20 May 2001)*. Athens: Κότινος, 2004.

Papaiouannou (Παπαϊωάννου), Dimitrios K. *Η Πολιτική των Επισκόπων στην Τουρκοκρατία*. Athens: privately printed, 1991.

Parakosta (Παπακώστα), Christina. "Ηπειρώτες έμποροι στη Βενετία, 16<sup>ος</sup>-19<sup>ος</sup> αι.". *Θησαυρίσματα*, 37 (2007): 435-448.

Papanoutsos (Παπανούτσος) Evangelos. *Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, V.1. Athens: Αετός, 1950.

Paparrigopoulos (Παπαρρηγόπουλος), Constantine. *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, Vol. 6. Athens: Νίκας, 1925.

Papoulidis (Παπουλίδης) Constantine. *Το Κίνημα των Κολλυβάδων*. Athens: Αποστολική Διακονία της Ελλάδος, 1991.

Pardos (Πάρδος), Antonis. *Οι Άξονες της Ιδεολογίας του Νέου Ελληνισμού στην άλλη Κωνσταντινούπολη. Η παρακαταθήκη του Βησσαρίωνα: Λάσκαρης και Μουσούρος ανάμεσα στους Έλληνες της Βενετίας*. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1998.

Parry, Ken, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith, and John F. Healey (eds). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*. Malden MA: Blackwell, 1999.

Patiniotis (Πατηνιώτης), Emmanouil. “Οι Pestiferae Questiones του Κυρίλλου Λουκάρεως και η ανάδυση του κορυθαλικού προγράμματος”. In *Πρακτικά του Συνεδρίου Βυζάντιο-Βενετία-Νεότερος Ελληνισμός. Μια περιπλάνηση στον Κόσμο της Ελληνικής Επιστημονικής Σκέψης*, edited by Georgios N. Vlachakis and Thymios Nikolaidis, 211-244. Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2004.

Patrinelis (Πατρινέλης) Christos. “Βιβλιοκρισία του Βιβλίου του Joseph Gill *The Council of Florence*”. *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 29 (1959): 494-499.

Patrinelis (Πατρινέλης), Christos. “Η Εκκλησία και η Ορθοδοξία”. In *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.10, 92-113. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1974.

Patrinelis (Πατρινέλης), Christos. “Εκκλησία”. In *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11, 123-134. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975.

Pelidis (Πηλείδης) Georgios. “Morire per honor di la Signoria”. In *Δημοσία Ιλαρία, 500 χρόνια από την ίδρυση της ελληνορθόδοξης κοινότητας Βενετίας (1498-1998)*, edited by Chrysa Maltezu, 26-46. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1999.

Petrucci, Armando. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, V.2. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. “Ανθρωπολογία και Γνωσιοθεωρία στις Απαρχές του 18<sup>ου</sup> αιώνας: Descartes και Νεοελληνική Σκέψη”. *Εραμιστής*, 22 (1999): 44-79.

Petsios (Πέτσιος), Constantine T. *Η Περί Φύσεως Συζήτηση στη Νεοελληνική Σκέψη: Όψεις της φιλοσοφικής διερεύνησης από τον 15<sup>ο</sup> ως τον 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα*. Ioannina: Κ. Πέτσιος, 2003.

Pettas, William A. “Nikolaos Sophianós and Greek Printing in Rome”. *Library*, 5/29 (1974): 206-213.



Pignatorre Marino and Nicoló Pignatorre. *Memorie storiche e critiche dell' isola di Cefalonia: Dai tempi eroici alla caduta della repubblica Veneta*, V.2. Corfu: Nacamuli, 1899.

Ploumidis (Πλουμίδης), Georgios. “Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Φιλαδελφείας Γρηγόριος Φατσέας, 1762-1768”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 4 (1967): 85-113.

Ploumidis (Πλουμίδης), Georgios. *Το Βενετικόν Τυπογραφείο του Δημητρίου και του Πάνου Θεοδοσίου, 1775-1824*. Athens (unknown publisher), 1969.

Ploumidis (Πλουμίδης), Georgios. “Σχολεία στην Ελλάδα συντηρούμενα από κληροδοτήματα Ελλήνων της Βενετίας, 1603 – 1797”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 9 (1972): 236-249.

Podskalsky, Gerhard. *Η Ελληνική Θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας 1453-1821*. Translated to Greek by Georgios D. Metallinos. Athens: M.I.E.T, 2005.

Politis (Πολίτης), Linos. “Βιβλιοκρισία στην έκδοση Α.Παπακώστα”. *Ελληνικά*, 12 (1952): 198-213.

Posner, Daniel N. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Prokopiou (Προκοπίου), Helen. *Το Πρόσωπο ως Υποκείμενο Δικαίου στο Έργο του Θωμά Ακινάτη*. Athens: Ηρόδοτος, 2013.

Psimenos (Ψημένος) Nikolaos K. (ed.). *Η Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία από το 1453 ως το 1821: Η κυριαρχία του Αριστοτελισμού*, V.1. Athens: Γνώση, 1988.

Ramfos (Ράμφος) Stelios. *Το Αδιανόητο Τίποτα: Φιλοκαλικά Ριζώματα του Νεοελληνικού Μηδενισμού*. Athens: Αρμός, 2010.

Ravitch, Norman. *The Catholic Church and the French Nation 1589-1989*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Reicher, Stephen, and Nick Hopkins. *Self and Nation*. London: Sage, 2001.

Ristelhueber, René. *A History of the Balkan Peoples*. New York: Ardent Media Inc, 1971.

Ritchey, P. Neal. “Explanations of migration”. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2 (1976): 363-404.

Ritzer, George. *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classical Roots: The Basics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009.

Roberson, Ronald. *The Eastern Christian Churches: A Brief Survey*. Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1988.

Runciman, Steven. *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Runciman, Steven. *Η Τελευταία Βυζαντινή Αναγέννηση*. Athens: Δόμος, 1991.

Russell, Jesse, and Ronald Cohn (eds). *Synod of Jerusalem*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University, 2012.

Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile and other Essays*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Sathas (Σάθας), Constantine. *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία: Βιογραφία των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων, από της καταλύσεως της βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι της ελληνικής εθνεγερσίας 1453-1821*. Athens: Κορομηλάς, 1868.

Sathas (Σάθας), Constantine. *Τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα, V.2*. Athens: Νέα Σύνορα – Λιβάνης, 2010.

Schäfer, Heinrich W. “The Janus Face of Religion: on the religious factor in new wars”. *Numen*, 51/4 (2004): 407-431.

Schwartz, Theodore. “Cultural Totemism: Ethnic Identity Primitive and Modern”. In *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuity and Change*, edited by Lola Romanucci-Ross and George de Vos, 106-131. Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975.

Setton, Kenneth M. *Venice, Austria, and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: Diane, 1991.

Shennan Joseph Hugh. *Louis XIV, 1643-1715*. London: Methuen & Co, 1986.

Shennan, Joseph Hugh. *The Bourbons: The history of a dynasty*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.

Shils Edward, “Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties”. *British Journal of Sociology*, 8/2 (1957): 13-45.

Shuger, Debora K. *The Renaissance Bible, Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*. Waco TX: Baylor University Press, 2010.

Sicker, Martin. *The Islamic World in Decline: from the treaty of Karlowitz to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2001.

Siecienski, A. Edward. *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Simmel, Georg. *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliation*. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Simonopetritis (Σιμωνοπετρίτης), Aimilianos. “Αντιμνήσια”. In *Σιμωνόπετρα: Άγιο Όρος*, edited by Aimilianos Simonopetritis, Vasilis Dimitriadis, Theochari Maria, 248-250. Athens: Ελληνική Τράπεζα Βιομηχανικής Αναπτύξεως, 1991.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. Nevada: University of Nevada, 1991.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism and Modernism*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis, 2003.

Staikos, Constantine and Sklavenitis, Triantafyllos (eds), Πεντακόσια Χρόνια Εντυπης Παράδοσης του Νέου Ελληνισμού (1499-1999)-Οδηγός της έκθεσης, Η εδραίωση της παραγωγής και της αγοράς του ελληνικού βιβλίου στον διάσπαρτο Ελληνισμό της δύσης και της ανατολής. Αθήνα: Βουλή των Ελλήνων, 2000.

Stavrianos, Lefteris S. *The Balkans since 1453*. N.Y.: New York Press, 2000.

Stergellis (Στεργέλλης), Aristeidis. “Νέα βιογραφικά στοιχεία για τον Ιωάννη Κωττούνιο”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 5 (1968): 249-254.

Stoye, John. *The Siege of Vienna*. Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2000.

Subtenly, Orest. *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Summer, Benedict. *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949.

Svoronos (Σβορώνος) Nikos G. *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος: Γένεση και διαμόρφωση του Νέου Ελληνισμού*. Athens: Πόλις, 2004.

Tajfel, Henri. “Individuals and groups in social psychology”. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18 (1979): 183–190.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. “An integrative theory of intergroup conflict”. In *The social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, 33–47. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

Tinniswood, Adrian. *Pirates of Barbary: Corsairs, Conquests and Captivity in the seventeenth century Mediterranean*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2010.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Society*. Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1957. First published as *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1887.

Topping, Peter. “Domenico Griitti’s Relation on the Organization of Venetian Morea 1688- 1691”. In *Μνημόσυνον Σοφίας Αντωνιάδη*, collective volume, 310-328. Venice: Ελληνικό Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Σπουδών Βενετίας, 1974.

Tsakonas (Τσάκωνας) Dimitrios. *Κοινωνιολογία του Ελληνικού Πνεύματος*. Athens: unknown publisher, 1969.

Tsakonas (Τσάκωνας) Dimitrios. *Εισαγωγή εις τον Νέον Ελληνισμόν*. Athens: unknown publisher, 1971.

Tselikas (Τσελίκας), Agamemnon. “Κατάλογος των Πατριαρχικών γραμμάτων (1546-1806) του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου Βενετίας μετά συμπληρώσεων και διορθώσεων της εκδόσεως Ι.Βελούδου”. *Θησαυρίσματα*, 10 (1973): 229-232.

Tsirpanlis (Τσιρπανλής), Zacharias N. *Το Ελληνικό Κολλέγιο της Ρώμης και οι Μαθητές του, 1576-1700: Συμβολή στη μελέτη της μορφωτικής πολιτικής του Βατικανού*. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1980.

Tsitselis (Τσιτσελής), Elias A. *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα: Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορίαν και Λαογραφίαν της Νήσου Κεφαλληνίας*. Vol.1. Athens: Π. Λεωνής, 1904.

Tsitselis (Τσιτσελής), Elias A. *Κεφαλληνιακά Σύμμικτα: Συμβολαί εις την Ιστορίαν και Λαογραφίαν της Νήσου Κεφαλληνίας*. Vol.2. Athens: Μ. Μυρτίδη, 1960.

Tsourkas, Cléobule. *Les débuts de renseignement philosophique et de la libre pensée dans les Balkans. La vie et l' œuvre philosophique de Théodore Corydalée (1570-1646)*. Bucuresti: Institut d'Études et de Recherches Balkaniques, 1948.

Tucker, Spencer C. *Battles that Changed History: An Encyclopaedia of World Conflict*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2010.

Turner, Victor. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1967.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1995.

Vakalopoulos (Βακαλόπουλος), Apostolos. *Πηγές Ιστορίας του Νέου Ελληνισμού*. V.1. Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1965.

Vakalopoulos (Βακαλόπουλος), Apostolos. *Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, V.3. Thessaloniki: Ηρόδοτος, 1968.

Vakalopoulos (Βακαλόπουλος), Apostolos. *Ιστορία του νέου ελληνισμού*, V.4. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1973.

Vakalopoulos (Βακαλόπουλος), Apostolos. “Στροφή των Ελλήνων προς τους Ρώσους”. In *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, V.11, 51-58. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1975.

Vakalopoulos (Βακαλόπουλος), Apostolos. *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία 1204-1985*. Thessaloniki: Βάνιας, 1993.

Valensi, Lucette. *Βενετία και Υψηλή Πύλη: Η Γένεση του Δεσπότη*. Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 2000.

Valetas (Βαλέτας), Georgios. “Τα Άνθη Ευλαβείας’: Μια πνιγμένη αναγεννητική αναλαμπή του Νέου Ελληνισμού”. *Νέα Εστία*, 64/755 (1958): 98-119.

Van den Berghe, Pierre L. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier, 1981.

Varshney, Ashutosh. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Veloudis (Βελούδης), Ioannis. *Ελλήνων Ορθοδόξων Αποικία εν Βενετία*. Venice: Φοίνιξ, 1893.

Veremis (Βερέμης), Thanos. *Ελλάδα, Ευρώπη*. Athens: Πλέθρον, 1999.

Viller, Marcel. “Une infiltration latine dans la théologie orthodoxe; La Confession orthodoxe attribuée à Pierre Mogila et le catechism de Canisius”. *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, 2 (1912): 159-168.

Virvidakis, (Βιρβιδάκης) Stelios. “Η Φιλοσοφική σκέψη στην Ελλάδα από τον 16<sup>ο</sup> ως τον 20<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα”. In *Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία και Επιστήμη: από την Αρχαιότητα έως τον 20<sup>ο</sup> Αιώνα*, collective volume, vol. A, 385-436. Patras: EAP (Ελληνικό Ανοιχτό Πανεπιστήμιο), , 2000.

Walby, Sylvia. “Woman and Nation”. In *Mapping the Nation*, edited by Gopal Balakrishnan, 235-254. London: Verso, 1996.

Weber, Eugen J. *Peasants into Frenchmen: the modernization of rural France, 1870-1914*. London: Stanford University Press, 1979.

Weber, Max. *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Dover, 2003.

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*. Washington DC: Fontana Press, 1985.

Wooton, David. *Paolo Sarpi: Between Renaissance and Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. New York: Putnam, 1995.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage, 1997.

Zakythinis (Ζακυθινός), Dionysios A. *Μεταβυζαντινά και Νέα Ελληνικά*, Athens: Δωδώνη, 1978.

Zaviras (Ζαβίρας), Georgios. *Νέα Ελλάς ή Ελληνικόν Θέατρον*. Thessaloniki: Εταιρία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών, 1972.

Zerlentis (Ζερλέντης), Pericles. *Η εν Πελοποννήσω ελληνική Εκκλησία επί Ενετών: Έτεσι 1685-1715*. Athens: Καραβίας, 1921.

Ziakas (Ζιάκας), Theodoros. *Έθνος και Παράδοση*. Athens: Εναλλακτικές Εκδόσεις, 1993.

**B3. Unpublished secondary sources**

Burke, Ersie. *The Greek Neighborhoods of Sixteenth-century Venice, 1498-1600: Daily Life of an Immigrant Community*. PhD Dissertation, Monash University, 2004.

Chatziaslani, Kornilia. “Morosini in Athens”. Digital edition. [http://www.eie.gr/archaeologia/En/chapter\\_more\\_8.aspx](http://www.eie.gr/archaeologia/En/chapter_more_8.aspx) last accessed 20/11/2013.

Chrysoloras, Nikos. “Religion and Nationalism in Greece”. Paper presented at the Second Pan-European Conference, Bologna, 24-26 June 2004, <http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-bologna>.

Kyriakopoulos (Κυριακόπουλος), Constantine T. *Μελέτιος (Μήτρος) Αθηνών, ο Γεωγράφος, 1661-1714*. Phd Thesis, Athens: National Kapodistrian University of Athens, 1990.

Maltezu (Μαλτέζου), Chryssa. *Ταυτότητα και Συνείδηση Ιστορικής Συνέχειας μετά την Άλωση: Η ιδεολογική συμπεριφορά των Ελλήνων της Βενετίας*. Introductory speech on her election as a member of the Academy of Athens. Public session on 27<sup>th</sup> of September, 2012.

Palabiyik, Mustafa S. “Contributions of the Ottoman Empire to the Construction of Modern Europe”. Phd Thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University, 2005 (<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr>).

Ricaut, Paul. *The present state of the Greek and Armenian Churches, anno Christi 1678 written at the command of His Majesty by Paul Ricaut, 1679*. Ann Arbor: Digital Library Production Service, 2003.

Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou (Ξανθοπούλου-Κυριακού), Artemis. *Η Ελληνική Κοινότητα της Βενετίας, 1797-1866*. PhD Thesis, Aristoteleion University of Thessaloniki, 1978.

Zoras (Ζώρας), Georgios T. *Γεώργιος ο Τραπεζούντιος και αι προς ελληνοτουρκικήν συνεννόησιν προσπάθειαι αυτού: Η “περί της των χριστιανών πίστεως” ανέκδοτος πραγματεία*. Athens: Σπουδαστήριο Βυζαντινής και Νεοελληνικής φιλολογίας Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών, 1954.