

UDK 261.8(4)“16”  
262.12Dominis, M. A. de  
Prethodno priopćenje  
Primljeno: 5. lipnja 2012.  
Prihvaćeno za objavljivanje: 20. prosinca 2012.

## **CHANGING AND UNITING THE CHURCHES: ONE EPISODE OF MARCUS ANTONIUS DE DOMINIS' ENGAGEMENT CONCERNING THE IRENICISTIC MOVEMENT\***

Filip NOVOSEL, Zagreb

*In the period of the constant religious struggles in Western European history of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, various men of letters who dealt with emerging religious questions played a role on the cultural and political scene of the time. Unlike the more common intolerant standpoints characteristic of wider public, a concept called irenicism, which was connected with the idea of Church unity achieved via reason in a peaceful way, was rather accepted among scholars of all kinds. This paper brings to light one of the cases connected to the irenicistic concept initiated by the archbishop of Split, Marcus Antonius de Dominis, who was accused of heresy by the Inquisition. This particular initiative dates from the period of the archbishop's stay in exile in England where he was very active in discussing ecclesiological matters. Namely, this Dominis' activity resulted with a single letter to Cyril Loukaris, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and the response. Although quite brief and not yielding any results, the analysis of his correspondence brings some interesting notions about the intellectual efforts of these two protagonists of the irenicistic movement and contributes to the better understanding of the exchange of religious ideas among European men of letters in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century in general.*

**KEY WORDS:** *Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Cyril Loukaris, Catholicism, Anglicanism, Orthodox Church, irenicism.*

### **1. Introduction**

On 8<sup>th</sup> September 1624 one cleric, accused of heresy by the Inquisition, died in captivity within the walls of St. Angelo's Castle in Rome during the investigation of his case. More than two months later, he was proclaimed guilty. Accordingly, on 21<sup>st</sup> December of the

---

\* This text was originally written for the purposes of the course *Religious Conversion and Migration of Knowledge from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*, dr. Yossef Schwartz, at Central European University, Budapest.

same year, the public on Campo de Fiore witnessed the process of execution by burning at the stake the heretic's dead body, together with his portrait and some of his writings. The deceased was Marcus Antonius de Dominis, a priest, theologian, politician, philosopher and physicist, in other words one of the many Renaissance *homines universales*.

His intensive life, as it will be shortly presented, tells much about the early modern man of letters and his struggling with his own time, leaving vast space for historical research. Being so interesting and rich, his entire life path thus requires a long study in order to grasp all his ideas. Despite the fact that his biography was the subject of both Croatian and Western scholars, a fully comprehensive study has not yet been done.<sup>1</sup> Naturally, this paper does not have the intention to achieve this goal either, but will definitely try to give a small contribution to some crucial questions concerning Dominis' theological ideas. Therefore, the focus here will be on one single detail from Dominis' stay in London, namely his brief attempt to reunite Eastern and Western Churches.

Although rather well researched, unlike his scientific background, many aspects of Dominis' theological work are still not completely discovered. Most of the scholars have dealt with his capital work *De republica ecclesiastica* and some progress has been made on analyzing his writings about the reasons of shifting from one religion to another and back,<sup>2</sup> yet Dominis' brief correspondence with the patriarch of Alexandria, a short but also rather important moment in his religious struggles, has stayed somehow neglected. Despite the fact that the correspondence is known to modern historians interested in Dominis' case, it obviously never attracted attention and was mentioned only occasionally, rather than being considered significant for some deeper analysis.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, for the purposes of this text, the main focus will be exactly on this brief correspondence containing only two texts – Dominis' letter to Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria and latter's response to Dominis.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These more extensive studies are always focused either on Dominis' work on theology or natural philosophy, but never comprehend both. For instance, see: Žarko DADIĆ, *Povijest egzaktih znanosti u Hrvata (A History of Exact sciences among the Croats)*, vol. 1 (Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber, 1982), 130-145; Noel MALCOLM, *De Dominis (1560–1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic*. London: Strickland & Scott Academic Publications, 1984.

<sup>2</sup> Besides Noel Malcolm's work, see: Marko Antun de Dominis. *Splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar (Marcus Antonius de Dominis. The Archbishop of Split, Theologian and Physicist)*, Vesna TUDJINA GAMULIN (ed.). Split: Književni krug Split, 2006. For his major ecclesiological writings, see: Marcus Antonius de DOMINIS, *De republica ecclesiastica*. Heidelbergae; Francofurti ad Moenum; Francofurti: cura Iohannis La/n/cellotti: sumptibus Rulandiorum, typis Ioan. Friderici Weiss: sumptibus viduae Jonae Rosii, 1618-1658. For recent publication with Croatian translation, see: Marcus Antonius de DOMINIS, *De republica ecclesiastica*, 10 vols. Split: Lamaro, 2003–2006; Marcus Antonius de DOMINIS, *A Manifestation of the Motives*. Zagreb–Split: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> For instance, see: Vesna TUDJINA GAMULIN, *Ekleziološko-politološka misao Marka Antonija de Dominisa (Marcus Antonius de Dominis' Ecclesiological-Politological Thought)*. Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, 2003.

<sup>4</sup> 19<sup>th</sup> March 1622, *A Letter Sent by Antonio de Dominis to Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria*, <http://anglicanhistory.org/misc/spalato1.html> (last time checked, 4<sup>th</sup> September 2012); for the exact date of Dominis' letter, see: Vesna GAMULIN, »Regesta dokumenata iz arhiva Public Record Office u Londonu koji su vezani uz boravak Marka Antonija de Dominisa u Engleskoj (Calendar of documents from the Public Record Office in London concerning the sojourn of Marcus Antonius de Dominis in England)«, *Zbornik za povijesne znanosti istraživačkog centra JAZU (Almanach for the Historical Sciences of the Research Centre JAZU)*, vol. 13 (1983), 213; for Croatian translation of Dominis' letter, see: Marko Antonije de DOMINIS, *Izabrani radovi (Selected Works)*, vol. 1 (Split: Lamaro, 2002), 123-124; *A Letter to the celebrated Archbishop of Spalato*,

However, in order to give the broader context and explain the reasons of such an action, some secondary literature will be used as well.

## 2. Marcus Antonius de Dominis in the late 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> century religious movements and the role of the Orthodox Church

Before going to the analysis, the broader context should be presented in short. Together with Dominis' short biography presented above, there should be some discussion of his religious teachings, and some information about the whole situation concerning religion in Europe will be included as well.

### 2.1. The basis of Dominis' anti-papal ideas

Born in 1560 on the island of Rab, Dominis' good family background and firm connections in high Venetian social circles gave him all predispositions for a successful life. Being a member of the old Dalmatian nobility,<sup>5</sup> he followed the path of many other Dalmatians going from the Eastern shore of the Adriatic coast to the Italian lands in order to gain his education. Becoming a member of the Jesuit order, he finished his education and started teaching in the Jesuit Colleges firstly in Padua and then in Brescia. However, soon after the graduation he returned to Dalmatia in 1596 to take over the empty seat of the bishopric of Senj. From that moment, his anticipated scientific career finished, basically almost it before even started,<sup>6</sup> giving place to his political and theological activity.

After several years spent in Senj, last two of them being the bishop, Dominis was elected the archbishop in Split in 1602. There he started writing his »opus magnum« *De republica ecclesiastica*. Even before being published, the work was put on the *Index librorum prohibitorum* and caused him many troubles forcing him to leave Dalmatia forever. Traveling throughout Europe in order to reach England, Dominis arrived in London in 1616, where he was very well perceived. Supposedly, he converted to Anglicanism<sup>7</sup> and lived the life of one of the major anti-papal activists in England at that time. However, when his old friend got elected as the new pope, Gregory XV, Dominis decided to return to Italy as a penitent. Unluckily, the pope died soon and was followed by new one, Urban VIII. Not favouring

in: John Mason NEALE, *A History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. II (London: Joseph Masters, Aldersgate street, 1847), 391-400.

<sup>5</sup> Emperor Sigismund's charter from 1434 granting the Dominis family nobility, together with the coat of arms, see: HR-HDA-710. For the transliteration, see: Šime LJUBIĆ, »Prilozi za životopis Markantuna de Dominisa Rabljanina, spljetskog nadbiskupa (Contributions for the biography of Marcus Antonius de Dominis from Rab, archbishop of Split)«, *Starine*, book 2 (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (henceforth JAZU), 1870), 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> More about Dominis' scientific engagement, see: *Zbornik radova o Marku Antunu Dominisu i znanstvenoj prošlosti otoka Raba (Collection of papers concidering Marcus Antonius de Dominis and scientific history of Island of Rab)*, Žarko DADIĆ (ed.). Zagreb: Kućna tiskara Nacionalne i sveučilišne biblioteke Zagreb, 1976.

<sup>7</sup> There are some strong disagreements concerning Dominis' conversion to Anglicanism in Croatian historiography, for instance see: Nikola BULAT, *Crkva i sakramenti u misli M. A. de Dominisa (The Church and the Sacraments in Marcus Antonius de Dominis' thought)* (Split: Crkva u svijetu, 2002), 112-114.

Dominis, the new pope started a procedure against him, which appeared to be fatal for Dominis, at that time already old and rather ill.<sup>8</sup>

It is hard to tell when Dominis started questioning the Catholic Church. However, one detail from his student and teaching days should be pointed out. Namely, at the time when Dominis was in Padua, a struggle between the Jesuit College and the University at Padua occurred. Jesuits complained to the Council of Ten at Venice about heresy supported at the University. Apparently, some teachings there were connected to heretical religious indifferentism, which led Noel Malcolm to the notion about the possibility that some of these teachings already at that early period of his life inspired Dominis' later ecclesiological ideas.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, trying to ease the tense situation in his bishopric and archbishopric which, situated in Dalmatia, stood as a part of Triplex Confinium, led Dominis to occasional struggles with Rome bringing him personal interdict and causing his ban from entering the church. Although he explicitly supported Venice in the problem of the interdict pronounced on the Republic in 1606–1607, his attempt to get the support from Venice in the case of personal interdict only deteriorated his position, since the Republic was not ready for another possible dispute with the pope.<sup>10</sup> Naturally, all these quarrels disappointed Dominis and most probably provoked him to start his work on *De republica ecclesiastica*.<sup>11</sup>

Accordingly, Dominis' first attack was on the Papal claims to »potestas interdicta« over temporal rulers. In other words, he argued that temporal power devolves immediately onto princes by divine right, and extends to all external actions of the people, whilst the jurisdiction of the church is spiritual, internal and ministerial.<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, although conceived before his stay in England, these ideas coincide with King James I's understandings of the ruler's power. James I was one of the most influential English political writers of the early modern period. His texts, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*, *Basilicon*

<sup>8</sup> Dominis' biography, with the emphasis on his ecclesiological work, is quite well represented in numerous articles, but the most representative could still be considered Noel Malcolm's book. Moreover, although dating from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, one Croatian historian's work, pioneering in investigating the case of Dominis', still provides valuable data, see: Šime LJUBIĆ, »O Markantunu Dominisu Rabljaninu (About Marcus Antonius de Dominis from Rab)«, *Rad*, book X (Zagreb: JAZU, 1870), 1-159.

<sup>9</sup> MALCOLM, 8-9. About struggles between Jesuit College and the University at Padua, see: Paul R. GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2002), 479-483.

<sup>10</sup> More about the interdict, see: William J. BOUWSMA, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1984), 339-482; Gherardo ORTHALI, Giorgio CRACCO, Gaetano COZZI and Michael KNAPTON, *Povijest Venecije (A History of Venice)* 2. vols., vol. 2 (Zagreb: Antibarbarus, 2007), 115-119. Especially for Dominis' role in it, see: Branko JOZIĆ, »Marko Antun de Dominis u sporu između Mletačke Republike i pape Pavla V. (Marcus Antonius de Dominis and his conflict with the Republic of Venice and the Pope Paul V.)«, in: *Marko Antun de Dominis*, 119-133.

<sup>11</sup> However, it should be also stated that Dominis was just one of the many from Venetian lands troubled by the official teachings of the Church thus searching answers in the new Protestant ideas. For the question of religious movements in Venice, see: ORTHALI, CRACCO, COZZI and KNAPTON, *Povijest Venecije*, vol. 2, 47-62, 95-106, 183-205. Especially for heretics from Dalmatia, see: Lovorka ČORALIĆ, *Hrvati u procesima mletačke inkvizicije (Croats in processes of the Venetian Inquisition)*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001; Lovorka ČORALIĆ, »Dalmatinski 'protestanti' Dominisova doba – tragom procesa mletačke inkvizicije (16–17 st.) (Dalmatian 'protestants' of Dominis' times – the process of the Venetian Inquisition (16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries))«, in: *Marko Antun de Dominis*, 271-282.

<sup>12</sup> MALCOLM, *De Dominis*, 27.

*Doron* and others, bring the combination of absolutist principles with an emphasis to law and the public good; the king's political philosophy was a nuanced, moderate absolutism. Furthermore, the king also discussed the papal power, trying to prove from the Scripture that the pope is Antichrist.<sup>13</sup> It is not known whether Dominis knew about these texts partially published before his arrival to London, but this coherence of ideas was certainly an advantage for Dominis' position on the royal court.

Regardless, Dominis' major work, *De republica ecclesiastica*, most clearly shows his standpoint towards the pope. Only to summarize for the purpose of this study, some of his basic theses in this work are focused on the unity of all Christians based on equality, and denying hence the universality and primacy of Rome and the pope. Therefore, he considered that all the power in the Church belonged to the bishops as heirs of the Apostles and claimed how the power of the Church must be only spiritual and thus should not be involved in a profane rule. Yet, his most important thesis for this paper is his emphasis on tolerance between all Christians, expressing thereby an important idea of the time of reformation – irenicism.<sup>14</sup>

### 3. The idea of unifying Eastern and Western Christianity

In these turbulent times for Western Europe, primarily marked by religious struggles, the Orthodox Church also played a certain role. The most significant moment from this point was the Venetian success on the Eastern Mediterranean. Gaining many territories including islands, Venice encountered mainly Orthodox Greek populations and, naturally, met new, or maybe more correctly said forgotten, ideas.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, Venice was highly aware of the importance of the Orthodox Church for the overall religious movements of the time.

#### 3.1. The role of the Orthodox Church during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation

Although the interaction between Catholics and Orthodox was not on a high level in the case of Venice, it was definitely present. Speaking of the broader context, connections

<sup>13</sup> See: King James VI and I, »Political Writings«, *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*, Johann P. SOMMERVILLE (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), xv-xxviii. Although not in the focus of this study, this issue would be important and interesting for some future research on Dominis' thought.

<sup>14</sup> For the debates about early modern European tolerance and irenicism, for instance see: Ole Peter GRELL »Introduction«, in: *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, Ole Peter GRELL and Bob SCRIBNER (ed.) (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1-12; Henry KAMEN, *The Rise of Toleration* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 7-21; Hans J. HILLERBRAND, »Religious Dissent and Toleration: Introductory Reflections«, in: *Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe*, Béla K. KIRÁLY (ed.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), 1-8; *Conciliation and Confession*, Howard P. LOUTHAN and Randall C. ZACHMAN (eds.) Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004. The most concise summary of Dominis' ideas in *De republica ecclesiastica* can be found in: »Macus Antonius de Dominis«, in: *Hrvatski latinisti/Croatian auctores qui latine scripserunt, Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti (Five centuries of Croatian literature)*, book 3, Veljko GORTAN and Vladimir VRATOVIĆ (eds.) (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1969), 7-31.

<sup>15</sup> About the Venetian conquests, its estates in the Eastern Mediterranean during the late Middle Ages and early modern period, including immigrants to Venice, see: ORTHALI, CRACCO, COZZI and KNAPTON, *Povijest Venecije*, vol. 1, 259-356, 416-417, 443-462, 567-578; vol. 2, 237-304, 357-432.

between the Papal state and Constantinople and furthermore with the Near East Christians were reestablished in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The Catholic Church sent missionaries to the East who operated in the light of the post-Tridentine time. On the other hand, a Greek congregation was founded in Rome in 1573. Interaction between Catholics and the Orthodox were most intensive in the Balkans and in the Danube region.<sup>16</sup> However, relations differed from region to region and Catholics were not always welcomed. That can especially be said for the Jesuit activity, though the Greek congregation in Rome was not very well perceived by the Orthodox authorities either.<sup>17</sup>

Accordingly, the Protestants saw their chance there and raised an idea about unity in order to fight against the Catholics together. The key figure in these Protestant-Orthodox relations was Cyril Loukaris, the patriarch of Alexandria, born in Candia in 1572. Although choosing a path of celibate monasticism, he was influenced by Italian humanism brought by Venice and even gained an education at the University of Padua graduating in 1595,<sup>18</sup> around the same time that Dominis was there. Although this significant fact raises some questions about the possibility the two knowing each other, unfortunately there is no indication that they ever met during that time of their academic careers. Anyhow, in 1596 Cyril Loukaris participated in the synod in Constantinople about Catholic-Orthodox issues, and later on was rather active in Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, fighting against the Jesuits and sympathizing with the Protestants. Elected patriarch of Alexandria in 1601, he immediately made connections with the Protestants in order to stop the Catholic advancement to the East. Significantly, in the early stage he turned to England, exchanging ideas with two successive archbishops of Canterbury, George Abbot and William Laud. The result was the opening of a course of Alexandrine church theological training and in 1617 Matrophanses Kritopoluos, Greek theologian, was sent to England as a professor. All in all, Cyril Loukaris wanted to rearrange his church by the Anglican model of simplicity based on the authority of the scriptures and the Holy Spirit.<sup>19</sup>

In 1620 Cyril Loukaris became the patriarch of Constantinople. Strengthening the Orthodox Church, weakened after the fall of Constantinople, together with improvement of education, his whole time as the patriarch is generally marked by his fight against the Catholic influence. Relying mostly on the Orthodox-Protestant alliance, he cooperated firstly with the British ambassador in Constantinople. Even more, in 1629 a confession under his name was published, mixing Orthodox and Calvinist doctrine. Catholics were irritated by that publication and the Orthodox were not delighted either. It was at that point that problems for Cyril Loukaris started, although he had neither admitted nor rejected his authorship of the confession. In spite of all attempts to discover the authorship of that confession, this

---

<sup>16</sup> Michail V. DIMITRIEV, »Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy«, in: *The Cambridge history of Christianity*, vol. 6, R. Po-Chia HSIA (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 321-326.

<sup>17</sup> Paschalis M. KITROMILIDES, »Orthodoxy and the west: Reformation to Enlightenment«, in: *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 5, Michael ANGOLD (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 187-188.

<sup>18</sup> KITROMILIDES, 193.

<sup>19</sup> KITROMILIDES, 193-194; DIMITRIEV, »Western Christianity«, 334. Same as for Dominis' researcher, Šime Ljubić and his 19<sup>th</sup> century work, John Mason's book, although being old, still carries some valuable information, see: NEALE, *A History*, 356-405.

question stays open till today. As a consequence, a conspiracy against him was organized by both the Jesuits and some of his personal Orthodox enemies, and even the bad influence from the Calvinists played a role in Cyril Loukaris' decline. That resulted in the losing of his function of the patriarch of Constantinople three times during the 1630s. Finally, he was executed in 1638, accused of secret communication with the Russians, at that time at war with the Ottomans under which rule Cyril Loukaris had lived.<sup>20</sup>

### 3.2. Dominis' letter from London to Alexandria and the response

First of all, it should be emphasized how Dominis was not the first from Protestant lands to corresponded with the Orthodox leaders in order to discuss the unity. Joasaph II, the patriarch of Constantinople was in contact with Philip Melanchthon in 1559, but their aims gave no results. More successful correspondence was established between professors at Tübingen University and the patriarch in Constantinople. However although it started promisingly, this project also failed. Yet, these latter attempts still yielded some indirect results; the main one can be considered Martin Crusius's work *Turcograecia*.<sup>21</sup>

Speaking of Dominis' letter, this text is rather short and does not go into any details. Actually, its major significance is in the fact that it brings us the information that Dominis: »... of these my works, the *De Republica Ecclesiastica*, the first birth being lately published, I send herewith to your Lordships (most religious Father) as a pledge of my hearty desire to enter communion with your Fatherhoods.«<sup>22</sup> Therefore, we know that Cyril Loukaris received and, as it will be seen from his response, read this volume. Furthermore, Dominis does not hide his earlier background justifying hereby his attacks on the pope, rather illustratively comparing the pope and Papal state with ancient Egypt and Pharaohs: »I therefore being born and bred and promoted within the Romish verge and having of long time endured that ancient Egyptian darkness under the Western Egypt and accursed Pharaoh...«<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, he even considers the Ottomans more tolerant and as a smaller threat to Christianity.<sup>24</sup>

As it is said, Dominis does not discuss much the unity between the Churches in his letter, but refers to the book where all his ideas are explained. He only:

*...pray and beseech you on all the bowels of Christ that you will enter into serious consideration of uniting your Eastern Churches with this most noble and flourishing Church of England. For by making such a union against Pharaoh, or rather*

<sup>20</sup> KITROMILIDES, »Orthodoxy«, 195-199; NEALE, *A History*, vol. II, 411-455.

<sup>21</sup> KITROMILIDES, »Orthodoxy«, 188-190.

<sup>22</sup> *A Letter*.

<sup>23</sup> *A Letter*. This comparison of the Pope with »accursed Pharaoh« might be interesting for Dominis' self-interpretation. Hence, it might be said that if the Pope is the Pharaoh, then Dominis possibly sees himself as Moses. I am grateful to Professor Matthias Riedl from Central European University for drawing my attention to this observation.

<sup>24</sup> »But yet he [another Pharaoh, i.e. the sultan] doth not offer to take the service of God from you, nor use any such impediments of it, but that you may offer to God entire and pure sacrifice (though not with pomp and splendour to the sight of men) and enjoy peace and content in your exercises of religion which I hear of with much delight.«, *A Letter*.

*Anti-Christ, we shall more easily prevail against him and remove his tyranny far from the Church of Christ.*<sup>25</sup>

Cyril Loukaris was apparently very grateful for the book and the letter, writing many compliments on it.<sup>26</sup> However, he had some complaints and reasonably called for a better understanding of the problems and differences between the three Churches, although being throughout his letter constantly sympathetic towards Protestant teachings. For himself, he said: »...I invoked earnestly the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and for three years compared the doctrine of the Greek and the Latin Church with that of the Reformed.«<sup>27</sup> Therefore, he points out some of the major inequalities between the Orthodox and Protestant teachings, such as the question of the Holy Eucharist and idolatry, supporting the Protestant interpretation again.<sup>28</sup> Yet, he rejects any possibility of complete suppressions, but upholds the more rational methods, as can be seen in the case of idolatry: »Not that I think that Images should absolutely speaking to be condemned, since when not adored they cannot occasion any mischief; but I abhor the idolatry which they cause to these blind worshippers.«<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, he sees the main reason for idolatry in general ignorance,<sup>30</sup> which can be explained with his aims to raise the education among the people during his life and work. At the end of his letter, Cyril Loukaris asks Dominis to send him another volume of his book as soon as it is published.<sup>31</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

Evidently, nothing more came out of this correspondence and both correspondents continued their fights for unity separately, experiencing however a similar destiny at the end. It is not even known whether Dominis ever sent his other volume to the patriarch. Nevertheless, this may be possible, since Dominis was not a missionary (although was a former member of the Jesuit order), but he primarily acted through his writings. Yet, before any further discovery is made, this can only remain as a hypothesis.

Although of minor importance and not yielding any results, this interesting episode of the irenicist movement can contribute to the overall notion of irenicism itself. Furthermore, this single detail from the lives of these two rather peculiar persons says a great deal about their visions and plans in the future religious relationships. Cyril Loukaris continued working on the Orthodox-Protestant alliance, whilst Dominis was still devoted to his anti-papal ideas for some time and relatively soon returned to Rome asking for redemption. Nevertheless, although this brief correspondence did not continue, it still presents a significant guideline for better understanding Dominis' religious ideas in total.

---

<sup>25</sup> *A Letter.*

<sup>26</sup> *A Letter to the Celebrated Archbishop of Spalato*, in: NEALE, *A History*, vol. II, 397.

<sup>27</sup> *A Letter to the Celebrated*, 398.

<sup>28</sup> *A Letter to the Celebrated*, 399-400.

<sup>29</sup> *A Letter to the Celebrated*, 400.

<sup>30</sup> On the same place.

<sup>31</sup> On the same place.



Unlike Dominis, no matter how much he supported ideas of the Reformation, Cyril Loukaris definitely never officially adopted the new religion. Therefore, there cannot be word about him as a converter in any sense. On the other hand, both Dominis' text and his actions remain an interesting case for scholars dealing with the complex religious happenings from the period of the late 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> century. To conclude, although not among the greatest reformers of the time, Dominis as a (re)converter and man of letters who tried to pass his knowledge throughout the Christian world, represents a reflection of many people who, at the time of grand religious conflicts, tried to find peaceful solutions.

#### *Sažetak*

#### *MIJENJAJUĆI I UJEDINJAVAJUĆI CRKVE: MARKO ANTUN DE DOMINIS I NJEGOVO PISMO ALEKSANDRIJSKOM PATRIJARHU ĆIRILU LUKARISU*

*U razdoblju stalnih vjerskih sukoba 16. i 17. stoljeća, mnogi učeni ljudi, zagovarajući brojne nove ideje vezane uz pitanja religije, djelovali su na političkom i kulturnom planu onodobne Europe. Za razliku od raširenih stavova, čija je karakteristika ponajprije nerazumijevanje i manjak tolerancije prema drugome, mnogi su učenjaci zastupali drukčiji, pomirljiv, koncept zvan irenicizam – ideju da se u prvom redu razumnim i mirnim putem dođe do ponovnog ujedinjenja kršćanskih Crkava. Ovaj rad istražuje jedan slučaj vezan uz promoviranje irenicizma, a vezan je uz Marka Antuna de Dominisa. Poznati splitski nadbiskup i heretik, Dominis je, optužen od Inkvizicije, pobjegao u Englesku, gdje se kretao u najvišim dvorskim krugovima i bio vrlo aktivan u bavljenju vjerskim pitanjima te njegova inicijativa vezana uz irenicizam datira upravo iz tog razdoblja. Kako bi se поближе istražilo njegovo djelovanje na tom planu, u tekstu se analizira Dominisovo pismo Ćirilu Lukarisu, aleksandrijskom patrijarhu, te patrijarhov odgovor na Dominisovo pismo. Iako je sama korespondencija vrlo kratka i nije polučila nikakve rezultate, taj detalj Dominisova života svakako je važan i mnogo govori o širem kontekstu Dominisova okruženja te njegovih misaonih dometa vezanih uz probleme Crkve. Stoga se u radu donose nova zanimljiva i važna saznanja koja pridonose postojećim spoznajama o njegovim naporima u bavljenju ekleziološkim pitanjima, ali i njegovim intenzivnim vezama s mnogim učenim suvremenikima, u ovome slučaju također jednom vrlo zanimljivom vjerskom osobom onoga doba iz jednog prilično udaljenoga kršćanskog centra na istočnom Sredozemlju.*

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** *Marko Antun de Dominis, Ćiril Lukaris, katoličanstvo, anglikanizam, pravoslavlje, irenicizam.*