



# Nathanael of Leukas and the Hottinger Circle: The Wanderings of a Seventeenth-Century Greek Archbishop

Sundar Henny<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 3 December 2019  
© Springer Nature B.V. 2019

Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!  
Gospel of St John, 1:47<sup>1</sup>

## Arrival in Zurich (1650)

If the past is a foreign country, can foreigners be seen as envoys of the past? Some theologians of the Reformed city of Zurich certainly hoped so when, on a day in January 1650, a stranger named Nathanael showed up.<sup>2</sup> He claimed to be the Greek archbishop of Santa Maura on the island of Leukas, modern Lefkada. The Zurich clergy took an interest in him because they were eager to learn more about the early church and to undermine Roman Catholic claims to primacy and faithful tradition. In the midst of an epic confessional battle about the Eucharist, they hoped that their ventures into the foreign country of the past would finally prove that things were not done so differently there, and that the early church, the contemporary Greek church and Reformed doctrine were all in agreement on vital matters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some commentators of Scripture hold that Jesus said this tongue in cheek, insinuating that the Nathanael addressed here, an elusive figure of the New Testament, was in fact of dubious character. Other commentators – at odds with the notion of divine humour – disagree.

<sup>2</sup> Old Style; all specific dates in this article are reproduced as given in the sources.

---

I profited from comments by the audience present at the conference on ‘The Reception of the Church Fathers and Early Church Historians, c. 1470–1650’ (23 September 2016, Trinity College, Cambridge), as well as from feedback by Jan Loop, Margarita Voulgaropoulou and Christian Windler. Tobias Graf has generously brought the Vienna sources on Nathanael to my knowledge, while Rainer Henrich helpfully advised me on sources from Schaffhausen. Emanuel Buttigieg and Matthias Ebejer provided information on the raid on Santa Maura. I am grateful to Maria Francesca Melloni for helping me analyse Hottinger’s Latin in some opaque passages. The two editors and the two anonymous reviewers have helped to improve the text.

---

✉ Sundar Henny  
sundar.henny@hist.unibe.ch

<sup>1</sup> SNSF Ambizione fellow, Historisches Institut, Universität Bern, Länggassstrasse 49, 3012 Bern, Switzerland

Nathanael said that he was by birth a Greek nobleman from the island of Chios.<sup>3</sup> He carried with him a confirmation from patriarch Cyril Lucaris, which attested that he had been installed by the patriarch in 1624. Moreover, he presented documents to prove that he had been accepted by other Reformed communities in Greece, England, the Netherlands and Switzerland. As an archbishop, he said, he had shown great care for captured Christians on the island. Later on, he had gotten into severe difficulties with the Turks as they accused him of having assisted the Knights Hospitaller in entering the fortress of Santa Maura.<sup>4</sup> After that, he said, he had been held in custody and given the choice either to be executed by archers or to pay ten thousand ducats. Reluctant to end up a neo-martyr in the vein of St Sebastian, the archbishop tried to pay his way out.<sup>5</sup> The sum was huge, however, so that he could pay only a small portion of it and was forced to raise the outstanding amount within wider Christendom. His bad luck had been recognized by many churches and schools, the better part of them Reformed. Lutherans, on the other hand, had treated him badly, he said.

Nathanael came to Zurich from Berne, where on 7 January 1650 he had been given 30 ducats and several *Reichsthaler* to cover his travel expenses by order of the magistrates. In the Bernese records, the payment is earmarked 'as a contribution to the sum of ten thousand ducats that he [Nathanael] owes (through no fault of his own) to the Turkish emperor'.<sup>6</sup> Before Berne, Nathanael had stayed in Basel, where he was given 12 ducats on 29 December 1649.<sup>7</sup> In Zurich, the authorities decided on 14 January 1650 that a committee of the city's theologians should examine the

<sup>3</sup> The most detailed reports of Nathanael's stay in Zurich are provided by the theologians Johannes Müller and Johann Caspar Schweizer. This paragraph is based on Müller's biographical notes in his manuscript *Biographia*, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, D 192 a, pp. 19–22. For Müller and his autobiographical writings, see my book *Vom Leib geschrieben: Der Mikrokosmos Zürich und seine Selbstzeugnisse im 17. Jahrhundert*, Cologne, 2016, pp. 221–73 (open access: <http://www.boehlau-verlag.com/978-3-412-50289-8.html>).

<sup>4</sup> Nathanael was probably referring to the temporary seizure or raid of Santa Maura (Aya Mavra) by the Hospitallers in 1625, for which see *Theatrum Adriaticum, Oder Schau-Platz deß Adriatischen Meers*, Augsburg, 1685, pp. 83–5; Bartolomeo Dal Pozzo, *Historia della sacra religione militare di S. Giovanni Gerosolimitano detta di Malta*, I, Verona, 1703, pp. 729–35; G. Zampelas, *Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Λευκάδος*, I, 'Ἄπο τίς ἀρχές τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ μέχρι τὸ 1797 μ.Χ.', Lefkada, 2002, pp. 138–40. For an early print applauding the seizure, see *Avviso nuovo della presa della città, e fortezza di Santa Maura: fatta dalle cinque galere della Sacra Religione, & Illustrissima Militia di Malta, il dì 25 di Maggio 1625. Con la presa di 300. Schiavi la maggior parte da riscatto*, Rome, 1625, and for further literature, see T. Freller, "'Adversus Infideles": Some Notes on the Cavalier's Tour, the Fleet of the Order of St. John, and the Maltese Corsairs', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 4, 2000, pp. 405–30 (423 n. 76).

<sup>5</sup> On the trans-religious popularity of neo-martyrs and neo-martyrology in the Ottoman context, see T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford, 2011, pp. 121–42.

<sup>6</sup> Berne, Staatsarchiv, A II 416, p. 3: 'Dem vor Ir Gn. erschienen Hn. Nathanael Ertz Bischoven zu St. Maura und Leucados, zu steühr an die vom Türkischen Keiser Imme (zwar umb unschuld) offerlegten 10'000 ducaten, 30 ducaten, sambt 6 Reichsthaleren uff dreiß ußzurichten, auch Inne vom Wirth zelösen.'

<sup>7</sup> In the Basel records, a fine of ten thousand ducats is also mentioned, half of which still to be raised. In Basel, Nathanael asked for permission to do house-to-house fund raising. The authorities denied him this but granted him the sum mentioned above and stated that he would be free to raise additional funds at the university and the French church. Basel, Staatsarchiv, Protokolle: Kleiner Rat 37, fol. 387<sup>r</sup>.

matter. They should investigate how their co-religionists in Basel and Berne had treated the archbishop and then act accordingly.<sup>8</sup> Ultimately, the archbishop was received openly in Zurich: he was paid 18 ducats and granted free board and lodging during his onward journey until he reached the city of Schaffhausen.<sup>9</sup>

Nathanael did not travel alone, but arrived in Zurich in the company of a certain Andreas Palaiologos from Thessaloniki. According to the Zurich diarist Johannes Müller (see below), Andreas had fled from possible conscription as a janissary.<sup>10</sup> Like Nathanael, Andreas too has left archival traces at other parts of Europe, notably in Bremen, where he signed the *album amicorum* of the theologian Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669), and in Rostock where he registered at the university together with Nathanael.<sup>11</sup>

Who were these two Greeks who travelled Europe in the middle of the seventeenth century? While the question is straightforward, the answer may turn out to be more complex. As Bernard Heyberger and John-Paul Ghobrial have pointed out, the figure of the wandering, alms-collecting Eastern Christian had already become familiar to authorities throughout Europe and even in the New World by the seventeenth century.<sup>12</sup> This familiarity and the expectations that came with it – for instance about persecution and oppression by the ‘Turks’ – again had repercussions for how the temporary visitor would tell his story. Whatever the truth, the story told had to sound heart-wrenching and credible at the same time in order to be effective.

In the following article, I will approach the encounter between Nathanael and the Zurich clergy from two sides. I will reconstruct on the one hand Nathanael’s itinerary through Europe and, on the other, shed light on the ideological predisposition of theological circles in Zurich. Given the scattered nature of the sources, it is unlikely that I have succeeded in uncovering all that is relevant about Nathanael. Nevertheless, what I have identified allows us to cast more light on him than the Zurich dignitaries were able to.

<sup>8</sup> Zurich, Staatsarchiv, Manual, Stadtschreiber, B II 470, p. 11.

<sup>9</sup> There seems to be no record of Nathanael’s visit to Schaffhausen.

<sup>10</sup> *Devşirme* – the Ottoman practice of forcefully recruiting Christian peasant boys – loomed large in the Western perception of ‘the Turks’. In fact, this kind of levy was in decline from the middle of the 17th century; see M. Greene, *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks, 1453 to 1768: The Ottoman Empire*, Edinburgh, 2015, pp. 153–6; T. Graf, *The Sultan’s Renegades: Christian-European Converts to Islam and the Making of the Ottoman Elite, 1575–1610*, Oxford, 2017, pp. 44–7.

<sup>11</sup> On Andreas Palaiologos, see B. Vonderlage, *Thessaloniki: Bilder aus der Vergangenheit der Stadt; ihre Beziehungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, Hamburg, 1953, pp. 94–5. Possibly, the *album amicorum* mentioned by Vonderlage is identical with Bremen, Staats- u. Universitätsbibliothek, Brem.b.0384, which I have not yet had the chance to consult. On Rostock, see n. 18 below.

<sup>12</sup> B. Heyberger, ‘Chrétien orientaux dans l’Europe catholique, XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles’, in *Hommes de l’entre-deux: parcours individuels et portraits de groupes sur la frontière de la Méditerranée, XVIe–XXe siècle*, ed. B. Heyberger and C. Verdeil, Paris, 2009, pp. 61–93; J.-P. A. Ghobrial, ‘The Secret Life of Elias of Babylon and the Uses of Global Microhistory’, *Past & Present*, 222, 2014, pp. 51–93; J.-P. A. Ghobrial, ‘Migration from Within and Without: In the Footsteps of Eastern Christians in the Early Modern World’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 27, 2017, pp. 153–73.

## Nathanael's Itinerary Reconstructed

On his travels throughout Europe, Nathanael produced evidence of encounters with Western Christians. He has, for instance, left a considerable paper trail in Zurich. To some extent, this can be explained by the fact that local theologians had been instructed by the city council to examine the archbishop. But, as will become evident, the theologians did not just perform a duty that was bestowed on them by the secular authorities. Knowing more about the archbishop was also in their own best interest, because he could, after all, stock their armoury of polemical arguments against confessional adversaries.

What can we know about Nathanael apart from his own narrative as delivered and recorded in Zurich? There are Greek sources that speak of a Nathanael as having been installed as archbishop of Leukas, although the great Émile Legrand (1841–1903) mentions him only by way of preterition in the preface of his *Bibliographie Hellénique*. There, Legrand announces that he will discuss on another occasion the relevant bull, issued by Lucaris on 7 August 1624.<sup>13</sup> Still, there is disagreement in modern literature whether Nathanael ruled from 1624 to 1640 or from 1641 to 1653.<sup>14</sup>

Nathanael's second name, Diasorinos, has puzzled Western writers through the centuries. There are different versions attested, like 'Diasarinos', 'D'Asserinos', 'Διόσσυρινος' [sic] and 'Masarinos'. A clerk in seventeenth-century Riga – or his nineteenth-century reader – seems to have misunderstood the name as an indication of the arch bishop's origin, rendering it 'from Mount Sinai' and thereby creating a second archbishop besides the one from Leukas.<sup>15</sup>

Outside historical Greece or Constantinople, the first dated source is to be found in Vienna, where the imperial *Reichshofrat* ruled in November 1638 that Nathanael ('Nathanaellus') should be granted full freedom to collect alms for his ransom.<sup>16</sup> On that occasion, Nathanael was also described as Greek, but familiar with

<sup>13</sup> E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au XVIIe siècle*, 5 vols, Paris, 1894–1903, V, p. XXXIX. That Nathanael was elected as archbishop of Leukas in 1624 is also confirmed by other Greek manuscript sources; see Athenagoras Metropolitites, 'Ο θεσμός τῶν Συγκέλλων ἐν τῷ Οἰκουμἐνικῷ Πατριαρχείῳ', *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, 9, 1932, pp. 241–88 (257).

<sup>14</sup> For 1624 to 1640, see Zampelas, *Ιστορία* (n. 4 above), I, pp. 149–50. For 1641 to 1653, see S. Vlanthes, *Η Λευκάς υπό τους Φράγκους, τους Τούρκους και τους Ενετούς (1204–1797)*, Lefkada, 1902, p. 90; K. G. Machairas, *Ναοὶ καὶ Μοναὶ Λευκάδος*, Athens, 1957, p. 372; S. N. Avouris, 'Λευκάδος καὶ Ἰθάκης, Μητρόπολις', *Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 12 vols, Athens, 1962–68, VIII, col. 252. See also the official catalogue of the Metropolis of Leukas and Ithaka today: <http://www.imli.gr/metropolit/preoccupancy/> (accessed: 20 November 2019).

<sup>15</sup> So far, I have been able to locate the entry only in an early 19th-century digest; see 'Rigaische Kirchen-Collecten von 1647 bis 1652', *Rigaische Stadt-Blätter*, 1823, pp. 93–100 (94). An archbishop called Nathanael 'from Mount Sinai' is mentioned who travelled with a second archbishop, this one from Leukas.

<sup>16</sup> Vienna, Austrian State Archive, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Reichshofrat, Gratialis et Feudalia, Patentes, box 3. On the *Reichshofrat*, see E. Ortlieb, 'Reichshofrat', in *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit*, 16 vols, Stuttgart, 2005–2012, X, col. 914–921.

– or possibly even subscribing to – the teachings of the Roman Catholic church.<sup>17</sup> Almost a decade later, in Michaelmas term of 1647, we find Nathanael enrolled at the University of Rostock.<sup>18</sup> There, additional information is provided that he was born on the island of Chios. In November of the following year Nathanael passed through Riga, coming with recommendations from the court of Queen Christina of Sweden. According to the registers of the Riga city council, he told the magistrates roughly the same story as he had in Zurich: that he was travelling through Europe in order to raise his own ransom that he owed to the Turks.<sup>19</sup> Nathanael appears for the last time in a list of the defunct at the Hôtel-Dieu in Paris, that had been added to an older ritual.<sup>20</sup> According to this laconic entry, he died in December 1661 and was buried in situ in the chancel.

If we combine all the available direct or indirect testimonies, we get the following, evidently incomplete itinerary through western Europe: Vienna (1638), Paris (before 1647), Rome (before 1649), Rostock (1647), Venice (1648), Stockholm (1648), Riga (1648), Basel (1649), Berne (1650), Zurich (1650), Schaffhausen (1650), Paris (1661).

## Contexts: Eastern Christian Travellers and Confessionalization

In early modern times, travelling strangers were all but uncommon. Some have argued that the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are to be seen as an age of credulity, when hosts were ready to read into a stranger whatever corresponded best with their own hopes and dreams.<sup>21</sup> Such a credulous approach, while undeniable in some spectacular cases of imposture, coexisted with the fear, lurking in the back of every magistrate's mind, of being fooled by tramps. The Zurich authorities had a record of preventing fraud by vagrants.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 'Nathanaellus Archiepiscopus Sanctae Maurae natione Graecus, sacris tamen Romano-Catholicae Ecclesiae institutus initiatus.'

<sup>18</sup> Rostock, Universitätsarchiv, 1.8 Matrikelbücher (*Matrikel der Universität Rostock, 1419–1760*), p. 762. The digitized manuscript is accessible online: <http://purl.uni-rostock.de/rosdok/ppn63866263X>. The reading of the name in the published transcription is wrong; see *Die Matrikel der Universität Rostock, III: Ost. 1611–Mich. 1694*, ed. A. Hofmeister, Rostock, 1895, p. 151.

<sup>19</sup> See 'Rigaische Kirchen-Collecten' (n. 15 above), p. 94, where we also learn that in the same year, another Eastern Christian traveller passed through Riga, asking for financial support. It was Josephus Adjutus (1602–1688) 'from Nineveh' (probably Mosul), a Chaldean Catholic who had spent some time as a monk and student of theology in Italy before coming to Wittenberg where he would break with Rome. Having obtained a chair in Wittenberg, the turmoil of the Thirty Years War had forced Adjutus to leave the Lutheran stronghold. On Adjutus, see now Ghobrial, 'Migration' (n. 12 above), pp. 163–4.

<sup>20</sup> E. Coyecque, 'Un rituel de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Paris (1527–1532)', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île-de-France*, 35, 1908, pp. 189–209 (206).

<sup>21</sup> For the spectacularly successful David Reuveni, the fake Messiah and ambassador of a Jewish king in the East, see M. Eliav-Feldon, 'Invented Identities: Credulity in the Age of Prophecy and Exploration', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 3, 1999, pp. 203–32. Eliav-Feldon revisits the case in her book *Renaissance impostors and Proofs of Identity*, Basingstoke, 2012, pp. 68–96.

<sup>22</sup> V. Groebner, *Who Are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*, transl. M. Kyburz and J. Peck, New York, 2007, p. 187.

The scepticism of the authorities in Zurich and elsewhere about the identity of strangers and the autobiographical stories told by them had its reasons. By the middle of the seventeenth century, itinerant Eastern Christian prelates had become a common sight at western European churches, courts and city halls. A case in point is William Lithgow, who had travelled the Levant in the early seventeenth century.<sup>23</sup> In the first edition of his travel account printed in 1614, Lithgow – in the passage describing Greece – limited himself to highlighting the virtues of the Greeks, such as their being the first people converted to Christianity, that their priests were men of sincere piety and rigorous asceticism, their ceremonial differences with regard to the papists and their resistance (shared by Protestants) to the Gregorian calendar.<sup>24</sup> In the revised edition of 1640, however, Lithgow – who back in the day had himself been a traveler of considerable versatility – added some vitriolic lines, in stark contrast to the preceding benevolent remarks (left intact) of almost thirty years before. Whereas he had once fraternized with the Greeks as fellow Christians of sorts, he now – in a passage adorned with the marginalia “False testimonies of vagabonding *Greeks*” – presented them as frauds and sang the praises of Ottoman freedom of conscience:

In a word, they are wholly degenerate from their Ancestors in valour, vertue, and learning: Universities they have none, and civill behaviour is quite lost: formerly in derision they tearmed all other Nations *Barbarians*: A name now most fit for themselves, being the greatest dissembling lyers, inconstant, and uncivill people of all other Christians in the world. By the way, I must give the Kings Kingdomes a caveat here, concerning vagabonding *Greeks*, and their counterfeit Testimonials: True it is, there is no such matter, as these lying Rascals report unto you, concerning their Fathers, their Wives, and Children taken Captives by the *Turke*. O damnable invention! How can the *Turke* prey upon his owne Subjects, under whom, they have as great Liberiy [sic], save only the use of Bels, as we have under our Princes? the tithe of their Male children, being absolutely abrogated by *Achmet*, this *Amuraths* Father, and the halfe also of their Female Dowry at Marriges [sic]: And farre lesse for Religion, can they be banished, or deprived of their Benefices, as some false and dissembling fellowes, under the Title of Bishops make you beleieve; There being a free Liberty of Conscience, for all kinds of Religion, through all his Dominions, as well for us free borne *Frankes* as for them, and much more them, the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Syriacks*, *Amoronits*, *Copties*, *Georgians*, or any other Orientall sort of Christians: And therefore look to it, that you be no more gulled, golding them so fast as you have done, lest for your paines, you prove, greater Alies, than they do Knaves.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> On Lithgow, see C. E. Bosworth, *An Intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's Travels in the Ottoman Lands, North Africa, and Central Europe, 1609–21*, Burlington, 2006.

<sup>24</sup> William Lithgow, *A Most Delectable, and True Discourse, of an Admired and Painefull Peregrination from Scotland, to the Most Famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affricke*, London, 1614, sig. G3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> William Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse, of the Rare Adventures, and Painefull Peregrinations of Long Nineteene Yeares Travailles from Scotland, to the Most Famous Kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica*, London, 1640, p. 188.

The fraudulent travelling Greek prelate had, then, become a literary trope a decade before Nathanael arrived in Zurich. In fact, in the late sixteenth century a dedicated philhellene like the Tübingen professor Martin Crusius (1526–1607) had already become doubtful about whether all of his alms-collecting Greek visitors were driven by pure charity to ransom their captive brethren.<sup>26</sup> And Greek prelates were not alone in touring European cities, but joined by other Eastern Christians of other ethno-religious affiliation.<sup>27</sup>

Given the relative frequency of appearances of alms-seeking Eastern Christians, one can infer that more often than not their requests were met with success. This is somewhat surprising, given how hard it was to verify their credentials in light of the distances that they had travelled. This suggests that for the donors something more than charity was involved. Since the consolidation of the Reformation and the development of a quickly confessionalizing scene, Eastern Christianity promised to destabilize the either-or logic of one's confessional adversary. By the seventeenth century, accordance with the beliefs and practices of the Greek church and Eastern Christianity more broadly had become an attractive asset for any confession in the Latin West. Protestants, mostly Anglicans and Reformed, were excited when Cyril Lucaris (1572–1638), the Patriarch of Constantinople, harboured sentiments that seemed to align with their own stance. In Reformed strongholds, Lucaris's confession of faith – printed for the first time in 1629 in Geneva – was hailed like a military victory and his writings exhibited like trophies although – or rather, because – it had been written for a Western audience.<sup>28</sup> However, Lucaris fell victim to Roman Catholic intrigue and was executed by the Ottomans in 1638. Even worse: his teachings were anathematized the same year. Once supporting the Protestant cause in the West, Lucaris and his legacy were now in need of succour.

Meanwhile, the Roman church had not been idle. Leo Allatius (Allacci) (1586–1669) was the embodiment of a Reformed theologian's (and librarian's) nightmare.<sup>29</sup> Born on Chios (like Nathanael) into a family that had both Catholic

<sup>26</sup> R. Calis, 'Reconstructing the Ottoman Greek World: Early Modern Ethnography in the Household of Martin Crusius', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 72, 2019, pp. 148–93.

<sup>27</sup> See the literature cited in n. 12 above.

<sup>28</sup> G. Hering, *Oekumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik 1620–1638*, Wiesbaden, 1968, pp. 190, 203; V. Tsakiris, 'The *Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio* and the Attempted "Calvinisation" of the Orthodox Church under Patriarch Cyril Loukaris', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 63, 2012, pp. 475–87; O. Olar, 'Les confessions de foi de Kyrillos Loukaris († 1638)', in *L'Union à l'épreuve du formulaire. Professions de foi entre Églises d'Orient et d'Occident (XIIIe–XVIIIe siècle)*, ed. M.-H. Blanchet and F. Gabriel, Louvain, 2016, pp. 271–310 (Hottinger is wrongly identified there as 'Adolphe Hottinger').

<sup>29</sup> For Allatius, see T. Cerbu, 'Leone Allacci (1587–1669): The Fortunes of an Early Byzantinist', PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986; G. Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821): Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens*, Munich, 1988, pp. 213–19; K. Hartnup, 'On the Beliefs of the Greeks': *Leo Allatius and Popular Orthodoxy*, Leiden, 2004, pp. 53–64; T. I. Papadopoulos, *Λέων Ἀλλάτιος: Χίος, 1588–Ρώμη, 1669: Σύμμικτα Ἀλλατιανά*, Athens, 2007; I. Herklotz, *Die Academia Basiliana: Griechische Philologie, Kirchengeschichte und Unionsbemühungen im Rom der Barberini*, Rome, 2008, pp. 57–8; D. Surace, 'Vita e opere di Leone Allacci', in *La Vaticana nel seicento (1590–1700): Una biblioteca di bibliotece*, ed. C. Montuschi, Storia della Bibliotheca Vaticana, Vatican City, 2014, pp. 199–204.

and Orthodox members, he became a professor at the Collegium Graecum in Rome and scribe at the Vatican Library. In 1623, Allatius organized the deportation of the Palatinate Library from Heidelberg to Rome. The loss, both intellectual and material, was a sore wound in the Reformed imaginary. It initiated the founding of the *Bürgerbibliothek* in Zurich as a confessional battleship sailing under the flag of *Arte et Marte*, appropriately situated in a former church on an island in the river Limmat and equipped mainly with works on theology and military science.<sup>30</sup> Back in Rome, Allatius wrote *De ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione* (1648), a voluminous work dedicated to proving ‘the uninterrupted accord between the occidental and the oriental church.’<sup>31</sup> Allatius sought to substantiate the claim that the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches agreed overwhelmingly in all major theological issues. In making his case – and contrary to some of his contemporaries who sought to define the relation between the two churches on theological or canonical grounds – Allatius argued also by recourse to history and contemporary, actual practice.<sup>32</sup>

Challenged by Allatius, Protestant theologians and Calvinists in particular needed to demonstrate that Lucaris had not been a one-off heretic, but in fact a martyr in alignment with the true Greek tradition and backed by the consensus of the Church Fathers. The renowned church historian and oriental scholar Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620–1667) took up the task.<sup>33</sup> Hottinger was held in high esteem in his home town of Zurich. Although only in his late twenties, this *Wunderkind* had already produced a considerable output when the archbishop arrived in 1650. In order to see why Hottinger was interested in Nathanael and in then-current Eastern Christianity in general we first have to look into Hottinger as a student of the Church Fathers. After all, his interest in contemporary non-Latin Christianities evolved out of his interest in patristics, which was in itself driven by the necessities of confessional polemic.

<sup>30</sup> See M. Germann, ‘Arte et Marte: Durch Wissenschaft und Waffen. Die Gründungs-idee der Bürgerbibliothek Zürich nach Balthasar Venators Lobgedicht von 1643/1661 und Heinrich Ulrichs Programmschrift aus dem Gründungsjahr 1629’, *Zürcher Taschenbuch*, 109, 1981, pp. 25–45. For the history of the Wasserkirche, see also C. Rüttsche, *Die Kunstkammer in der Zürcher Wasserkirche: Öffentliche Sammeltätigkeit einer gelehrten Bürgerschaft im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert aus museums-geschichtlicher Sicht*, Bern, 1997.

<sup>31</sup> Leo Allatius, *De ecclesiae Occidentalis atque Orientalis perpetua consensione libri tres*, Cologne, 1648.

<sup>32</sup> See Ware, ‘Orthodox and Catholics’ (n. 35 above) pp. 271–3. For Allatius as a student of contemporary Greek religiosity, see also Hartnup, ‘On the Beliefs’ (n. 29 above).

<sup>33</sup> For Hottinger, see J. Loop, *Johann Heinrich Hottinger: Arabic and Islamic Studies in the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford, 2013. So far, the dozens of volumes of Hottinger’s papers, the so-called *Thesaurus Hottingerianus* in the Zurich Zentralbibliothek, remain largely unexplored. For a short description of the collection, see F. Büsser, ‘Johann Heinrich Hottinger und der *Thesaurus Hottingerianus*’, *Zwingliana*, 22, 1995, pp. 85–108. For the importance of private papers and archives in early modern Zurich, see my contribution ‘Archiving the Archive: Scribal and Material Culture in Seventeenth-Century Zurich’, in *Archives and Information in the Early Modern World*, ed. L. Corens et al., Oxford, 2018, pp. 209–35. For an overview of the personnel and the topics of Reformed Orthodoxy in Switzerland, see C. Moser, ‘Reformed Orthodoxy in Switzerland’, in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. H. J. Selderhuis, Leiden, 2013, pp. 95–226.



The skirmishes between Hottinger and Allatius and their respective interest in the Greek connection have to be placed against the backdrop of that epic theological war about the Eucharist which raged for decades in seventeenth-century France and which itself had been provoked by contact with Greek Christians.<sup>34</sup> In the course of that controversy, Eastern Christianity became increasingly attractive as a window through which one could look (even if just through a glass darkly) at how things were done in the early church. While highly intellectual in nature, the controversy on the Eucharist was not just a theological quarrel, but also affected the question of *communicatio in sacris*, that is the question of whether and how far Rome should acknowledge sacraments administered by Eastern churches, a matter of utmost practical relevance to its missionary endeavours in the East.<sup>35</sup> While sacramental generosity helped in making friends with Eastern Christians, it also threatened to undermine Rome's claim to orthodoxy and authority. Interest in contemporary Eastern Christianity, in other words, was high precisely because theologians were eager church historians, and much was at stake for both Catholics and Protestants.

## Hottinger on the Church Fathers and the Greek Church

By 1650 Hottinger had already taught as a professor in Zurich for eight years.<sup>36</sup> Since 1643 he had held a special chair in church history that was established in 1612 with the aim of studying the Reformed confession's enemies, such as Roman Catholicism and Islam. The study of both was intimately connected to that of the Church Fathers, who were pivotal in order to combat Roman Catholics on their own ground, that is tradition, and to reconstruct the corrupt state of the church at the time of Muhammad.

Hottinger had addressed patristics before Nathanael's arrival in three dissertations, in which he provided an introduction to patristics and elaborated on the use

<sup>34</sup> R. Snoeks, *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformés français au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Louvain, 1951; Podskalsky, *Théologie* (n. 29 above), pp. 392–6; F. Gabriel, 'Les témoins orientaux d'une querelle latine: orthodoxie et professions de foi dans *La perpétuité de la foi*', in *L'union à l'épreuve du formulaire* (n. 25 above), pp. 373–89; C. Zwierlein, *Imperial Unknowns: The French and British in the Mediterranean, 1650–1750*, Cambridge, 2016, pp. 124–34.

<sup>35</sup> On *communicatio in sacris*, see C. Windler, 'Uneindeutige Zugehörigkeiten: Katholische Missionare und die Kurie im Umgang mit "communicatio in sacris"', in *Konfessionelle Ambiguität. Uneindeutigkeit und Verstellung als religiöse Praxis in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. A. Pietsch and B. Stollberg-Rilinger, Gütersloh, 2013, pp. 314–45; and more extensively in Windler's new book *Missionare in Persien. Kulturelle Diversität und Normenkonkurrenz im globalen Katholizismus (17.–18. Jahrhundert)*, Cologne, 2018; C. Santus, 'La "communicatio in sacris" con gli scismatici orientali in età moderna', in *De l'Église aux Églises: réflexions sur le schisme aux Temps modernes*, ed. A. Girard and B. Schmitz, Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Italie-Méditerranée, 126.2, Rome, 2014, pp. 325–40, and Santus's forthcoming book *Trasgressioni necessarie: Communicatio in sacris, coesistenza e conflitti tra le comunità cristiane orientali*. Still helpful, especially for the Greek context, is K. T. Ware 'Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century: Schism or Intercommunion?' in *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, ed. D. Baker, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 259–76.

<sup>36</sup> Loop, *Hottinger* (n. 33 above), pp. 18, 34.

and abuse of the Church Fathers by scholars.<sup>37</sup> In the first dissertation, the *Isagoge ad lectionem partum* (Introduction to the Reading of the Fathers), Hottinger argued that Reformed theologians had a duty to prove ‘the papists’ wrong, who ‘slandorously and unashamedly proclaim that there is no place left for the writings of the Fathers in the Reformed churches who despise them as worse than mud’.<sup>38</sup> Hottinger proposed that the student of patristics had first of all to master the Oriental languages, the most important being Greek, followed by Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Egyptian, Ethiopian and Armenian.<sup>39</sup> Hebrew would allow the student to understand the Church Fathers’ varying uses of the Bible, while knowledge of the other languages had the potential to uncover otherwise lost patristic works and, more importantly, to reduce the student’s dependence on translations. However, even when vested with a text in the original language, Hottinger insisted that one should not assume reliability too soon: ‘the malice of heretics, Jesuits, inquisitors, and other Papists as well as the ignorance and wrong self-confidence of monks’ had brought it about that the writings of the Church Fathers were doctored and mutilated, a hotchpotch of right and wrong.<sup>40</sup> The student should therefore not only try to obtain the best text available, but also go through it sentence by sentence, ‘and distinguish the crooked from the straight, the spurious from the genuine in order to correct the text’. Hottinger outlined how one could get to the ‘true sense’ (*sensus verus*) of a patristic text. This through historicization: considering the text’s purpose, line of argument, subject matter, the specific manner of speaking of different regions and authors, and the time of the utterance in the author’s life.<sup>41</sup> Hottinger warned of the Church Fathers’

<sup>37</sup> As usual in this academic genre, it is somewhat difficult to identify the ‘actual’ author of the dissertations. In the first edition, Hottinger is only credited with having presided while two students are credited with the actual publication. Given the fact, however, that Hottinger edited two of the three dissertations in a volume printed a few years later without giving the names of the students, it is clear that he was the authority, if not the author. I will therefore refer to these tracts as his in what follows. For the first editions, see *Isagoge ad lectionem partum, quam... Ioh. Henrici Hottingeri... publicae disquisitioni subicit Christophorus Schererus*, Zurich, 1648; *Dissertatio de usu patrum, quam... sub praesidio Ioh. Henrici Hottingeri... subicit Joh. Christophorus Faesius*, Zurich, 1648; *Dissertatio de vario patrum abusu, quam... sub moderamine... Ioh. Henrici Hottingeri... συζητήσει subicit publicae Iohannes Adamus Wuscherus*, Zurich, 1649; for the two newly edited dissertations, see Johann Heinrich Hottinger, *Analecta historico-theologica*, Zurich, 1652, ‘Isagoge’ at pp. 316–76 and ‘De usu patrum’ at pp. 377–97.

<sup>38</sup> Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 321–2: ‘Patrum lectionem ministro Ecclesiae utilem esse & necessariam, inter Orthodoxos extra omnem dubii aleam positum est: ita ut calumniosè satis & protervè spargant Pontificii, nullum nos in Ecclesiis Reformatis Patrum scriptis relinquere locum, eaque, tanquam algâ viliora, contemnere.’

<sup>39</sup> *Isagoge* (n. 33 above), sig. A3<sup>r</sup>=Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 321–2. The nomenclature is Hottinger’s: ‘Egyptian’, ‘Ethiopian’, and ‘Armenian’ are missing in the first edition.

<sup>40</sup> Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), p. 340: ‘Cum partim Haeticorum, Jesuitarum & Inquisitorum, aliorumque Pontificiorum malitiâ, partim etiam Librariorum, & Monachorum inscitiâ perversiBimaque audaciâ, Patrum scripta falsata sint, mutilata, & veris falsa mixta, non tantùm de exemplari integro, & quantum licet correctiBimo sibi lector prospiciet, sed etiam omnes nervos ad curvum à recto, spurium à genuino dignoscendum, vel corrigendum intendet.’ Hottinger substantiates his verdict on the corruption of the Church Fathers texts with a reference from the Church Fathers themselves: Jerome complained about the malice and ignorance of amanuenses and librarians who would ‘copy what they understand rather than what they find’: *ibid.*, p. 343.

<sup>41</sup> *Isagoge* (n. 33 above), sig. E2<sup>v</sup>=Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 369–76. The section is substantially expanded in the re-edition in the *Analecta*.

non-classical manner of speaking (*idiotismi, quibus libri veterum pleni sunt*) and, following Martin Crusius and Johannes Meursius, their use of loanwords, especially the later Greek authors.<sup>42</sup> Hottinger especially recommended Scaliger and Casaubon as modern *critici* who could help to guide the student through the peculiar linguistic challenges posed by the Greek Church Fathers.<sup>43</sup>

In the *Dissertatio de usu patrum* (Dissertation on the use of the Fathers), Hottinger took for granted that ‘no one of a clear mind would deny that studying the Fathers, the shining lights of the early church, is worthwhile: such is the rule among those who fight for orthodoxy’.<sup>44</sup> Interest of some sort in the Church Fathers was widespread and uncontroversial in wider Reformed Orthodoxy.<sup>45</sup> Where leading theologians differed on this matter was about the use of it all. The Heidelberg professor Abraham Scultetus (1566–1624) tended to look for Reformed doctrine in Church Fathers, sometimes dismissing problematic passages and works as spurious. André Rivet (1572–1651), on the other hand, was not restricted by such a priori assumptions. He did not expect theologians of late antiquity necessarily to conform to Reformed dogma whose allegiance was to scripture alone. Therefore, Rivet could allow for a more disinterested and philological approach to patristics. Jean Daillé (1594–1670) went further and thought that the Church Fathers were of little use in present theological debates.<sup>46</sup> Daillé’s assessment was based on theological, philological and historical reasoning: as human and therefore fallible the Church Fathers cannot be considered authoritative; their surviving texts had come down often incomplete, misattributed, or corrupt; the historical context of late antiquity differed too much from that of present confessionalism.

Hottinger’s nuanced affirmative stance on patristics combined Scultetus’s sympathies for patristic theology, while considering possible objections such as those uttered by Daillé. As the above tirades against Jesuits and inquisitors suggest, Hottinger firmly believed in the apologetic potential of patristics for Reformed theology. But at the same time, he did not want advance polemic at the expense of philological and historical precision. The Church Fathers emerge from Hottinger’s dissertations as a somewhat hazy cloud of witnesses that, for different reasons, might be at odds sometimes with Reformed doctrine, but in general supported it. At the very least, the Church Fathers could be of use in confessional polemics negatively: for not supporting Catholic theological positions like the doctrines of purgatory or the questioning of scriptural authority.

How did Hottinger think that the current Greek church related to its patristic heritage? On the whole, for Hottinger the history of the Greek church had the outlook

<sup>42</sup> *Isagoge* (n. 33 above), sigs D1<sup>r</sup>–D1<sup>v</sup>=Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 354–6. While the reference to Crusius’s *Turco-Graecia* appears already in the first edition, the reference to Meursius’s *Glossarium Graeco-barbarum* is added in the *Analecta*.

<sup>43</sup> Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 351–2.

<sup>44</sup> *De usu patrum* (n. 33 above), sigs A2<sup>r-v</sup>=Hottinger, *Analecta* (n. 33 above), pp. 377–8.

<sup>45</sup> The following sketch is based on I. Backus, ‘Reformed Orthodoxy and Patristic Tradition’, in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. H. J. Selderhuis, Leiden, 2013, pp. 91–117.

<sup>46</sup> On Daillé, see also J.-L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*, Oxford, 2009, pp. 218–38.

of the letter V. In a major work called *Christenlicher, unpartheyischer Waegweyser* (The Christian Non-Partisan Signpost), published in the years just before Nathanael's arrival, Hottinger elaborated on Greek decadence that had set in after the patristic era.<sup>47</sup> This was not just an ecclesiastical or theological collapse but also a downfall of learning and linguistic competence. The once learned Greeks had become barbarian while their clergy did not bother to translate the Gospel into the vernacular. Lately, however, one could detect signs of encouragement, Hottinger said. He deemed ancient Greek Christianity to have been in accordance with 'that steadfast martyr of Christ, Cyril Lucaris', the murdered patriarch of Constantinople whose virtues had included a plan to translate the Bible into modern Greek.<sup>48</sup>

In 1652, two years after Nathanael had come to Zurich, it became evident how close Hottinger thought the connection between Lucaris and the early church was when he re-edited his dissertations on patristics. In this second edition, the dissertation *De usu patrum* was followed by an appendix of 170 pages. It presented the Confession of Faith of Lucaris, where each article was presented in Greek, followed by a Latin translation, an apparatus with supporting scriptural references, and a second apparatus, entitled 'Consensus Patrum', providing extensive quotations of (mostly Greek) Church Fathers.<sup>49</sup> Lucaris's Confession had already been printed before in Geneva (see above, n.19), but never in Greek, nor with a patristic apparatus. Nowhere in this apparatus was Nathanael of Leukas mentioned, but we can understand now why Hottinger was at first interested in him.

## Nathanael the Calvinist? The Vetting Process in Zurich

Contemporary Greek Christians were not entirely strange to Reformed theologians by Hottinger's time. While the 'discovery' of Eastern Christians by Western scholarship had begun already in the fifteenth century, the Reformation had catalysed the process.<sup>50</sup> In the sixteenth century, the Zurich scholar Theodor Bibliander – or somebody close to him – had taken notes on Greek practices based on a report by the Danish theologian Niels Hemmingsen, who had in turn got his information in Copenhagen from a certain Demetrios of Thessaloniki.<sup>51</sup> A couple of decades later,

<sup>47</sup> Johann Heinrich Hottinger, *Christenlicher, unpartheyischer Waegweyser dadurch ein jeder gottliebender seiner Saeligkeit sorgfältiger Christ versichert und vergwüssert werden mag*, 3 vols, Zurich, 1647–1649, I, pp. 110–14.

<sup>48</sup> On the project of a translation of the Bible into Modern Greek, see K. Papoulidis, *Problèmes de traduction et d'interprétation du Nouveau Testament en grec moderne: le cas de Maxime de Gallipoli (1638)*, Thessaloniki, 2004.

<sup>49</sup> On this edition of Lucaris's confession, Hottinger's apparatus and Allatius's reaction, see now Zwierlein, *Imperial Unknowns* (n. 34 above), pp. 122–3.

<sup>50</sup> A. Hamilton, 'Eastern Churches and Western Scholarship', in *Rome Reborn: The Vatican Library and Renaissance Culture*, ed. A. Grafton, Washington DC, 1993, pp. 225–49, 303.

<sup>51</sup> Hottinger mentioned and made use of these notes in Johann Heinrich Hottinger, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Novi Testamenti seculum XVI seu pars quinta*, Zurich, 1655, pp. 53–62. On the encounter of Hemmingsen with Demetrios, see H. Volz, 'Zum Briefwechsel des Luther- und Melanchthonschülers Johannes Mathesius', in *Geist und Geschichte der Reformation*, Berlin, 1966, pp. 239–54, esp. pp. 251–2.

in the 1620s, the Zurich professor Johann Jacob Ulrich (1569–1638) published a tract about the historical and actual Greek church.<sup>52</sup> Soon after the theologians in Zurich became personally acquainted with Greeks. The monk Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589–1639) had been sent to England by Lucaris, the then patriarch of Alexandria.<sup>53</sup> After several years of study at Balliol College in Oxford, Metrophanes left in 1622 for Constantinople. After he had paid his respects to just about every German city with a university, and also to a good deal of cities without one, Metrophanes arrived in Basel and registered at the university in September 1627. He assured the Basel professors, according to their own notes, that the Greek church basically agreed with the Helvetic Confession and differed merely ‘in the more abundant usage of outward ceremonies’.<sup>54</sup> From Basel, Metrophanes had moved on to Berne and Geneva, before presenting himself to the authorities of Zurich who – just as in the case of Nathanael twenty-three years later – decided to treat him ‘like Berne and Basel did’. From Zurich, Metrophanes continued travelling East, presenting himself in Schaffhausen, St. Gallen and Chur. After another long stay in Venice he finally reached Constantinople in the winter of 1630/31.

When Nathanael arrived in Zurich, more than two decades had passed since the visit of Metrophanes and more than a decade since Lucaris’s execution. Metrophanes had supported Lucaris’s condemnation.<sup>55</sup> Still, the prospect of a Protestant-Greek Orthodox joint venture entranced dignitaries in Europe. This was not altogether unreasonable or naive, even after Metrophanes’s return (in every sense of the word) to the East. Greek prelates continued to travel Europe even in the late 1640s. For instance, Hierotheos Abbatis (1599–1664), an abbot from the island of Kephania, was at that time translating liturgical and confessional texts of the Dutch Reformed church into modern Greek in Leiden.<sup>56</sup> Hierotheos had come to western Europe in order to raise money to restore the buildings of his monastery on Kephania that had been shattered by an earthquake. Other high-ranking Greek dignitaries who continued to be in close contact with Protestant churches well into the 1640s were Meletios Pantogalos, Archbishop of Ephesus and Nathanael Konopios (Nathanail

<sup>52</sup> J. J. Ulrich, *De religione ecclesiarum Graecanicarum tum vetere tum hodierna disquisitio theologica & historica*, Zurich, 1621.

<sup>53</sup> On Kritopoulos in general, see C. Davey, *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589–1639) and Relations between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches*, London, 1987. On his visit to Switzerland, see E. Staehelin, ‘Die Reise des griechischen Theologen Metrophanes Kritopoulos durch die Schweiz im Jahre 1627’, *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, 22, 1942, pp. 508–28; Hering, *Patriarchat* (n. 28 above), pp. 159–81. See also G. Podskalsky, ‘Die Deutschlandreise des Metropolitens Kritopoulos (1624–1627) im Rahmen der deutsch-griechischen Beziehungen im 17. Jahrhundert’, in *Nürnberg und das Griechentum: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. E. Konstantinou, Frankfurt a. M., 2003, pp. 93–106. On Kritopoulos’s stay in Oxford, see C. Davey, ‘Metrophanes Kritopoulos and his Studies at Balliol College from 1617 to 1622’, in *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy: 300 Years after the ‘Greek College’ in Oxford*, ed. P. M. Doll, Oxford, 2006, pp. 57–77.

<sup>54</sup> Quoted in Staehelin, ‘Reise’ (n. 49 above), p. 517.

<sup>55</sup> Hering, *Patriarchat* (n. 28 above), p. 200.

<sup>56</sup> K. Rozemond, *Archimandrite Hierotheos Abbatis, 1599–1664*, Leiden, 1966.

Canopius), archbishop of Nicaea, biographer of Lucaris, and the first documented coffee drinker in the British Isles.<sup>57</sup>

While by 1650 the theologians of Zurich could look back on a history of actual exchange with Greek Orthodox prelates, and while Lucaris, who had started out as a merely anti-Roman cleric, in his later years truly became something like a ‘Protestant Patriarch’, the actions of Metrophanes after returning to Constantinople and Alexandria also warned that such affinities could turn out to be ephemeral. Apart from the difficulties of establishing beyond doubt the confessional stance of even an honest Greek, one also had to reckon with the more mundane problem of imposture. Archbishop Abbot, the former host of Metrophanes, complained bitterly that the latter ‘fell into the company of certain Greeks, with whom we have been much troubled for collections, and otherwise; and although I knew them to be counterfeits and vagabonds’.<sup>58</sup> Accordingly, excitement was mingled with suspicion when Nathanael arrived in Zurich.

Probably the most extensive and coherent account of Nathanael’s visit to Zurich is given in the private papers of Johannes Müller (1629–1684), a trainee pastor who worked as an amanuensis to Hottinger. In Müller’s papers, the account is part of a wider book with biographical episodes that do not have much more in common than making the clerical authorities and Professor Hottinger look corrupt, irresolute and greedy. In Müller’s eyes and those of the stauncher clergy, the city state of Zurich had fallen from grace when, together with the fellow Reformed city of Berne, it forged an alliance with Venice in 1615, thus ending a period of self-prescribed abstinence from mercenary deals with foreign powers. In the middle of the seventeenth century the alliance became relevant when the Serenissima fought the Ottomans in Dalmatia and on Crete. To both theatres of war, Zurich and Berne sent a regiment. At the same time that Nathanael was arriving in Zurich, the city’s sons therefore fought (or were supposed to fight) the Ottomans on the Dalmatian shores. Such delicate Mediterranean entanglements falsify the cliché-ridden account of seventeenth-century Zurich as successfully controlled by stern, hyper-orthodox clergy.<sup>59</sup> As Jan Loop has pointed out, Hottinger profited directly from the Swiss military endeavour, as the Bernese Colonel Gabriel von Weiss (1613–1684) seized a manuscript containing miscellanea in Arabic.<sup>60</sup> Müller ranted repeatedly against those foreign military engagements in his papers.

Müller may therefore have put together raw materials in order to write a kind of *Secret History*, directed against Hottinger and other conformists, in the future. At any rate, Müller later became a driving force behind the drafting of the *Formula Consensus* (1675), a collection of canons that defined the verbal inspiration of the Bible in narrow terms, encompassing a particular Hebrew script and vowel points.

<sup>57</sup> On Meletios, see *ibid.*, pp. 23–4; on Nathanael Konopios, see K. Rozemond, ‘Nathanael Konopios – Nathanael, Bischof von Nizäa’, *Kirche im Osten: Studien zur osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte und Kirchenkunde*, 20, 1977, pp. 53–6.

<sup>58</sup> Quoted in F. H. Marshall, ‘An Eastern Patriarch’s Education in England’, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 46, 1926, pp. 185–202 (193).

<sup>59</sup> For a critique of this account, see my *Vom Leib geschrieben* (n. 3 above).

<sup>60</sup> Loop, *Hottinger* (n. 33 above), pp. 60–1.

Although Hottinger himself was already dead at that point (he drowned in the Limmat in 1667), the drafting of the *Formula* led to quarrels between Müller and friends of the late Hottinger. Müller may have envisioned such a use for his biographical materials. Although Hottinger does not look exactly foolish in Müller's account of Nathanael's arrival in Zurich, the fact that Hottinger took the archbishop to be serious and – at some point – even highly educated, as we shall see, had the potential to make him look naive.

Nathanael, however, was not Lucaris, and Hottinger was asked by Müller whether this new Greek was to be trusted. According to Müller's notes, the professor reassured his amanuensis that there could hardly be doubts about Nathanael as he had corresponded on this matter with the Basel theologian Johann Rudolf Wettstein (1614–1684).<sup>61</sup> Wettstein had assured Hottinger (again according to Müller) that this Greek was very learned, and if he were an impostor, no one could be trusted anymore. In Basel, where Nathanael dwelt before he visited Berne and Zurich, Professor Samuel Grynaeus (1595–1658) – 'not normally interested in such persons' – even introduced the itinerant archbishop to the mayor. However, Müller notes that Hottinger, despite the assurances from Basel, retained some scepticism since the archbishop's story and testimonials seemed not entirely consistent.

While the authorities at Berne seem to have dealt with Nathanael rather routinely and swiftly, the authorities at Zurich were more scrupulous. According to its records, the city council ordered that the standing committee of professors should evaluate the archbishop's request and make inquiries into how Berne and Basel, where he had been before, had treated him. They were expected to write a report to the presiding mayor, who would either follow the pastors' advice or bring the matter into consideration again.<sup>62</sup> Hottinger was an active member of that committee. We know from his correspondence and from Müller's notes that he mentioned the archbishop's visit at least to the Basel professors Johann Buxtorf (1599–1664) and Johann Rudolf Wettstein. Both professors, though also known on their own merits, were sons of famous families and of eponymous fathers, the first being the son of a Hebraist and the latter of a Basel mayor. Buxtorf, a Hebraist with no professional curiosity about Greek matters, informed Hottinger that he did not know anything about Nathanael other than what the latter's testimonies revealed.<sup>63</sup> Wettstein had a special interest in patristics and Greek literature, both classical and Christian. It has often been repeated that Wettstein even paid Greek monks to furnish him with information.<sup>64</sup> Years later he would refuse, with others, to sign the *Formula Consensus* (1675), the doctrinal statement that we have seen Johannes Müller would propagate. In his correspondence to Hottinger, Wettstein showed himself pleased that Zurich

<sup>61</sup> For Johann Rudolf Wettstein, see M. Geiger, *Die Basler Kirche und Theologie im Zeitalter der Hochorthodoxie*, Zollikon-Zurich, 1952, pp. 221–50.

<sup>62</sup> Zurich, Staatsarchiv, B II 470, p. 11 (14 January 1650).

<sup>63</sup> Buxtorf to Hottinger, 16 January 1650, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, F 51, fol. 263<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>64</sup> The earliest source for this seems to be the entry on Wettstein in Hans Jacob Leu, *Allgemeines helvetisches, eydgenössisches, oder schweizerisches Lexicon*, XIX, Zurich, 1764. The claim is repeated also in Geiger, *Basler Kirche* (n. 61 above), p. 253, but the manuscript source given as reference does not support it.

was hosting the stranger who had stayed in Basel before.<sup>65</sup> When it came to the supposed erudition of the archbishop, however, Wettstein – contrary to what we read in Müller’s papers – was not at all impressed. He wrote to Hottinger: ‘Think about it: If this is the barbarity of an archbishop, in what dire state must the common people be? *Kyrie eleison!*’<sup>66</sup>

It seems that Hottinger became less and less convinced about the archbishop’s story or his utility in confessional polemics. He must have written about the matter to the Genevan professor and former chaplain of the Dutch embassy in Constantinople, Antoine Léger (1596–1661), as Léger thanked him for a warning, probably about a possible visit of Nathanael to Geneva.<sup>67</sup> Léger told Hottinger that he had a good recollection of Lucaris’s writing and that he was in possession of several letters by him: should Nathanael indeed turn up in Geneva, Léger could therefore easily assess whether the archbishop’s letter of accreditation stemmed from the patriarch’s hand.<sup>68</sup>

Besides Hottinger, another Zurich cleric who took an interest in Nathanael was Johann Caspar Schweizer (also known as Schwyzer, Suicer, Suicerus) (1619–1688).<sup>69</sup> Schweizer was later respected, at least by his co-religionists, as one of the most thorough scholars in Greek patristics. His *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, a lexicon of Greek patristic terms, would remain in use well into the nineteenth century. It was published in 1682 in Amsterdam by Heinrich Wettstein (Henricus Wetstein) (1649–1726), an emigre son of Hottinger’s correspondent Johann Rudolf Wettstein who we’ve already met. When Nathanael arrived in Zurich in 1650, Schweizer was in his early thirties. To a friend, a bailiff by the name of Wepfer, Schweizer wrote that the archbishop

certainly is truly pious and orthodox, as I could see from speaking with him. In many controversial matters I have found him to be of the same opinion as we. If only he would stay with us longer, I could profit a lot from his presence. He speaks the Greek language, but a vernacular version, which, however, comes close to the pure Greek and is well understood by those competent in pure Greek. He too understands the pure version but does not speak it himself.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Wettstein to Hottinger, 16 January 1650, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, F 52, fol. 526<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> Wettstein to Hottinger, 23 January 1650, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, F 52, fol. 796<sup>r</sup>: ‘Iam cogita, quam plebis sit barbaries, si haec Archi-Episcopi. Κύριε ἐλεῖσον.’

<sup>67</sup> On Léger, see A. de Lange, ‘Antoine Léger (1596–1661): Das Leben eines Waldenserpfarrers zwischen Konstantinopel und Genf’, in *Von Berlin bis Konstantinopel. Eine Aufsatzsammlung zur Geschichte der Hugenotten und Waldenser*, ed. A. Flick and A. de Lange, Bad Karlshafen, 2001, pp. 119–67.

<sup>68</sup> Léger to Hottinger, 4 cal. Febr. = 29 January 1650, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, F 51, fol. 644<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>69</sup> On Schweizer, see V. Ryssel, ‘Suicerus, Johann Caspar’, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXXVII, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 141–3, and C. Moser, ‘Schweizer, Johann Caspar’, *Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz* (accessible online: <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch>).

<sup>70</sup> Schweizer to Wepfer (copy), 17 Cal. Febr. = 16 January 1650, MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, S 269, fol. 92<sup>v</sup>: ‘Vir certè est, quam ego quidem ex alloquio cum eo scire potui sincerè pius, orthodoxus: in plerisque enim controversis articulis eum nobis prorsus ὀμόψηφος expertus sum. Utinam diutius nobiscum mansisset, ejus consuetudo mihi non futura fuisset inutilis: Loquitur Græcam Linguam, sed vulgarem, quae proximè ad puram accedit, et à puræ gnaro facilè intellegibilis. Ipse certè Græcam puram optionem intelligit, at non loquitur.’ Schweizer probably addressed Hans Jakob Wepfer, a bailiff in nearby Diesenhofen; see K. Schmuki, ‘Georg Michael Wepfer’, *Schaffhauser Beiträge zur Geschichte*, 68, 1991, pp. 225–35 (225).



Schweizer then decided to profit from the situation by thoroughly interviewing the archbishop. He therefore prepared an honorary address and a questionnaire in classical Greek, both still extant.<sup>71</sup> In the questionnaire, we find questions on whether the Greeks take the communion in both kinds or whether they believe that during the Eucharist the bread transforms into the actual body and the wine into the actual blood of Christ. The fact that questions relating to the Eucharist dominate the questionnaire is related to the epic controversy on the nature of the Eucharist that has been mentioned above. Over time, the parties of this controversy referred even more to Eastern Christianity in order to buttress their positions. Unfortunately, we do not have the detailed answers of Nathanael to the questions posed by Schweizer. From the suggestive wording of those questions, one would expect the archbishop's answers to have pleased Schweizer. However, differences between Greek and Protestant or Reformed worship were not ignored by Nathanael, as we can learn from the summary report that Schweizer wrote to his friend Wepfer:

To some [questions] he answered to my content, to others he replied not at all and referred me to the Greek ritual that had been printed in Venice not that long ago. Also, he promised to send me further explanations from Venice.<sup>72</sup>

The book that Nathanael mentioned to Schweizer is without doubt Jacques Goar's *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum* where Nathanael is quoted on several occasions (see the discussion below). Though the more famous edition of this work appeared in 1647 in Paris, Goar had indeed printed another edition in Venice in 1638 which seems to exist today in only two copies.<sup>73</sup> Nathanael then did not just echo his Reformed interlocutors when he was interrogated in Zurich. While it remains unclear whether his seemingly monosyllabic answers stemmed from uncertainty or cautiousness, he revealed, in a way, his multiple allegiances by referring to the *Euchologion*, a work compiled and edited by a Dominican friar and printed in Catholic (even if republican and anti-papal) Venice.

## Nathanael the Lutheran

Despite the fact that Nathanael was understood in Zurich to have been treated badly by Lutherans, Lutherans for their part obviously considered him one of their own. In his book *Introductio generalis*, the Jena professor Johann Andreas Bose

<sup>71</sup> MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, S 269, fol. 93<sup>r-v</sup>. Together with Margarita Voulgaropoulou, I am preparing an edition and translation of Schweizer's questionnaire.

<sup>72</sup> Schweizer to Wepfer, Cal. Martii = 1 March 1650; MS Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, S 269 fol. 97<sup>r</sup>: 'Ad quasdam [quaestiones] respondit, et mihi satisfacit, ad alias verò prorsus nihil, quum id ex rituale Graecorum non ita pridem Graecè Venitiis impresso haberi possit. Promisit verò se Venitiis alias ad me daturum quas avidè expecto.'

<sup>73</sup> For details about these editions, see C. Rapp, *Brother-Making in Late-Antiquity and Byzantium: Monks, Laymen, and Christian Ritual*, Oxford, 2016, pp. 57–8. For the history of Greek printing in Venice, see E. Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy: Printers and Publishers for the Greek World*, Venice, 1994.

(1626–1674) described the Greek church. By reviewing the known contact between Protestants and Greeks in the sixteenth century, he sought to repudiate the Catholic writer Leo Allatius's claim that the Greek church – except for some ceremonial practices – was by and large identical with the Roman church.<sup>74</sup> On the other hand, Bose also advised his readers that they should not believe everything the Reformed said about the proximity of their faith and that of the Greek Orthodox. Even though Lucaris could indeed be seen as a Calvinist, Bose warned, he did and does not represent the Greek church as a whole in this:

He [Lucaris] soaked up this doctrine as he dwelt in Transylvania and Geneva. I was told so on December 24, 1649 by Nathanael, Archbishop of Leukas or Santa Maura, who was on his way from Italy to Greece to free some fellow Greeks who were held captive by the Turks.<sup>75</sup>

If Bose is correct, he met Nathanael only a couple of days before the latter arrived in Basel. Unfortunately, we do not know Bose's exact whereabouts for the date he indicates. While the statement is no direct testimony that Nathanael aligned himself with Lutheranism, he seems to have responded to some extent to the expectations of his Lutheran interlocutor. Indeed, Nathanael seems to have been a valuable informant for Bose, who quoted him again to substantiate the claim that the Greek patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria were largely diminished, both in personnel and possessions.<sup>76</sup>

As regards the confessional identity of the Greek church, the Lutheran Bose had his own views. Referring to the correspondence of Patriarch Jeremias II (1536–1595) with the Tübingen theologians, he argued that 'if the consensus of the Greeks is to be boasted about by any of the Western sects the Lutherans would be in a better position to do so'.<sup>77</sup> Whatever Nathanael did or did not say to Bose about his personal take on Lutheranism, his statements were crucial for Bose's argument that Lucaris's case was an isolated one and that the Greek church was not, in fact, in accordance with the life and doctrines of the Reformed churches.

## Nathanael the Roman Catholic

Hottinger, Schweizer and Bose were not the only Europeans to be pleased by interviews with Nathanael. As briefly mentioned above, the Paris Dominican Jacques Goar (1601–1653) had quoted Nathanael in the *Euchologion*, a comprehensive scholarly

<sup>74</sup> Johann Andreas Bose, *Introductio generalis in notitiam rerumpublicarum orbis universi*, Jena, 1676, p. 332.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 333: 'Eam autem doctrinam in Transsilvania & Geneuae, vbi aliquando substiterat, illum imbibisse, narrabat mihi anno MDCXLIX, die 24. Decembris, cum ex Italia in Graeciam, suos a Turcis detentos liberaturus, rediret Nathanaël Archiepiscopus Leucados siue sanctae Maurae.'

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 334–5.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 333: 'Quod si tamen alicui ex Occidentalibus sectis consensus Graecorum iactandus est, id aliquanto meliori iure Lutherani facient.' On that correspondence, see D. Wendebourg, *Reformation und Orthodoxie: der ökumenische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der Württembergischen Kirche und Patriarch Jeremias II. von Konstantinopel in den Jahren 1573–1581*, Göttingen, 1986.

edition of Greek liturgical texts that remains unsurpassed to this day.<sup>78</sup> Goar not only collected manuscripts for this work but also drew on his own experience of the Greek church, as he had acted seven years as a prior to the Convent of St Sebastian on Chios, the birthplace of Nathanael of Leukas. Indeed, in the *Euchologion*, Goar credited Nathanael several times as a source on liturgical particularities, for instance on the number of narthexes in Greek church buildings, the way of wearing the *phelonion* (priestly vestment), the line of sight that the priest had to observe and the number of ministries.<sup>79</sup> What is clear from these quotes is that Nathanael had a considerable understanding of the liturgical acts discussed, as he would not only provide information on orthopraxy but also deduce it from theological foundations. Moreover, Goar also credited Nathanael with the quote that ‘the number of ministries is the same in both churches’.<sup>80</sup> Thus, in Goar’s rendering, Nathanael in this instance argued for the similarity of the Greek Orthodox church and the Roman Catholic church.

Given the technical nature of the *Euchologion*, we cannot extract a lot of personal information from Goar’s citations of his informant Nathanael. From the last of them it at least becomes clear that Goar had discussed liturgical matters with Nathanael in Paris at some point.<sup>81</sup> This is not the only trace that we have of Nathanael in the Catholic world. We also find him mentioned in the writings of Allatius.

In his famous *De perpetua consensione* (1648), Allatius attacked Calvinists who claimed to have found allies in the Orthodox church:

Those who mumble the contrary shall know that there are many more Greeks ... who venerate the Roman Pontifex, his words, and especially his sacred statements. And if they were not inhibited by the fear of a completely mad tyrant as well as by defamations and accusations of many unreliable men, even more worthy Greeks would prostrate themselves daily at the feet of the highest pontifex. In order to prove this, I will add the names of those who come to my mind. These have come to Rome in the last few years and, having reconciled with the Church of Rome, have returned to their own lands. Some also have settled in Italy itself in order to stay in peace.<sup>82</sup>

Allatius then gives a list of about a dozen Greeks with sympathies for Rome. Among them, he mentions an archbishop called Nathanael from the island of Leukas.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>78</sup> On Goar, see Snoeks, *L’argument* (n. 34 above), pp. 169–70; Herklotz, *Academia* (n. 29 above), pp. 201–2, and the literature cited there.

<sup>79</sup> Jacques Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον [Euchologion] sive Rituale Graecorum*, Paris, 1647, pp. 23, 31, 47, 239.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 239: ‘Parisiis [mihi] interroganti Nathanael Leucados siue S. Mauræ Archiepiscopus assignavit, æqualem nempe esse vtraque in Ecclesia numerum Ordinum.’

<sup>81</sup> See the quotation in n. 80 above.

<sup>82</sup> Allatius, *De perpetua consensione* (n. 31 above), I, col. 1091: ‘Sciant ergo, qui contraria mussitant, multo plures esse, quam ipsi opinantur, Graecos, qui Romanum Pontificem venerantur, illiusque dicta, perinde atque sacra eloquia, excipiunt. Et, si timor tyranni insensissimi, & non nullorum improborum hominum calumniae & criminationes, non retarderent, plurimi singulis diebus ad pedes summi Pontificis se prosternerent ex iis, qui dignitatibus apud Graecos praeferunt. Idque ut magis videas, eorum, quos memoria suggerit, nomina attexam. Hi à paucis annis Romam venere, & cum Romana Ecclesia reconciliati, ad propria reversi sunt, vel, ut liceret illis quieta mente consistere, in Italia ipsa sedem fixerunt.’

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, I, col. 1092.

Allatius's contact with Nathanael becomes more significant when we consider the Calvinist responses to his work. An author of one such response was none other than Hottinger, whose *Historia Ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti* (1651–67) deals extensively with the Eastern churches. In volume five of this work, Hottinger praised the preservation of doctrine among some Eastern churches and ridiculed Catholic attempts to construe consensus between Rome and them.<sup>84</sup> One of his targets was Allatius, who Hottinger dubbed Alastor (evil spirit), an insignificant Greekling and a producer of hot air.<sup>85</sup>

Allatius responded to Hottinger – who had accused him of proceeding ‘far too rashly’<sup>86</sup> – with a book of no less than 600 pages.<sup>87</sup> He denied Protestantism the support of the Greek church in past and present, referred to the harsh words of early Reformers like Luther, Zwingli and Calvin against the Church Fathers, and stressed his own native understanding of the Greek tradition. Hottinger's short reply (a mere 40 pages) renewed the accusation of Allatius's ‘extreme rashness’,<sup>88</sup> and was responded to once again by Allatius, who supported his counterattack with a long letter from the Maronite scholar Abraham Ecchellensis who, *mutatis mutandis*, made the same claim about the consensus of the Roman and Eastern churches as Allatius had done.<sup>89</sup> This drew forth another counter-blast from Hottinger.<sup>90</sup> But amongst the arguments on the Greek church in these hundreds of pages of text, one point is notable: neither author attempted to claim Nathanael from his adversary or referred to his opponent's knowledge of him. The archbishop of Leukas is, except for the brief mentioning in Allatius's *De perpetua consensione*, absent in the writings published either in Rome or in Zurich. Nathanael, however, would not get away with it indefinitely.

<sup>84</sup> Hottinger, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae... pars quinta* (n. 51 above), pp. 45–6.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45: ‘Et Graeci quidem (quos idem Allatius temerè nimis... cum Latina conglutinare, & sub idem Papismi regimen revocare studet).’

<sup>87</sup> Leo Allatius, *Ioannes Henricus Hottingerus fraudis et imposturae manifestae convictus*, Rome, 1661.

<sup>88</sup> Johann Heinrich Hottinger, *Leo Allatius nimiae temeritatis convictus sive dispositio de evidenti ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis tam in dogmatibus quam ritibus dissensu*, Heidelberg, 1661; reprinted in *id.*, *Enneae Dissertationum philologico-theologicarum Heidelbergensium*, Zurich, 1662, pp. 179–212.

<sup>89</sup> Leo Allatius, *De octava Synodo Photiana. Annexa est, Ioannis Henrici Hottingeri Disputationis apologeticae de ecclesiae Orientalis atque Occidentalis dissensu, et Iuvenis Ulmensis Exercitationis historico-theologicae de Ecclesia Graecanica hodierna refutatio*, Rome, 1662, pp. 244–679. Allatius combined the refutation of Hottinger with a refutation of Elias Veielius (‘Iuvenis Ulmensis’); see Podskalsky, *Theologie* (n. 29 above), p. 217.

<sup>90</sup> Johann Heinrich Hottinger, *Topographia ecclesiastica*, pp. 5–10, which is the second part (with separate pagination) of *id.*, *Αρχαιολογία Orientalis*, Heidelberg, 1662.

## Nathanael the Impostor

At the very end of the seventeenth century, the Reformed theologian Samuel Andreae (1640–1699) began to investigate the matter of Nathanael.<sup>91</sup> Andreae was a former student of Hottinger and a professor at the University of Marburg. When he did research on writings his father (Ernst Andreae) had copied from a certain archbishop Nathanael several decades ago (in 1648), he became suspicious because he could not find any other proofs of a synod mentioned in the writings.<sup>92</sup> Finally, he thought that he had been able to put the pieces together and concluded that the Nathanael who had met with his father and of whose physical appearance Andreae the younger still had some childhood memories ('he had a white, long beard'), was

the same as the one mentioned by Allatius to have been among those who have come to Rome a few years ago and have been reconciled with the Church of Rome.<sup>93</sup>

A decade or so after Andreae's observation, Nathanael had become an iconic trickster traveller.<sup>94</sup> When the theologian and polymath Johann Michael Heineccius (1674–1722) wrote his *Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche* (Description of the ancient and present Greek church) in 1711, he mentioned Nathanael as a case in point that the confessional utterances of vagrant Greeks should not be taken at face value.<sup>95</sup> After all, Heineccius said, juxtaposing the reference to Allatius with the one to Andreae, Nathanael of Leukas had been a Protestant in Marburg and a papist in Rome in the same year of 1648.

As revealing as Heineccius's verdict sounds, its zest comes from his own sloppy reading: it is not at all clear that Nathanael met with Andreae's father in Marburg (it was just the city where Andreae was professor later on) nor did Allatius claim that Nathanael appeared in Rome in the year 1648 (it was just the year when Allatius published the assertion that Nathanael had appeared in Rome). But one can see why Heineccius did not care too much about the details: it allowed him to substantiate his point that itinerant Greek prelates were if not engaged in outright confessional prostitution – confessing allegiance to any given creed as long as it proved remunerative – at least caught in some kind of faith odyssey, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine. However, the data that Heineccius had at his disposal

<sup>91</sup> On Samuel Andreae's biography and his correspondence (which included many of the Basel and Zurich professors mentioned above in this article), see U. Winter, *Die europäischen Handschriften der Bibliothek Diez in der Deutschen Staatsbibliothek Berlin*, 3 vols, Wiesbaden, 1986–94, III, pp. 109–11.

<sup>92</sup> On Ernst Andreae, see G. Biundo, *Die evangelischen Geistlichen der Pfalz seit der Reformation (Pfälzisches Pfarrerbuch)*, Neustadt an der Aisch, 1968, p. 7.

<sup>93</sup> Andreae's letter is quoted in *Monatliche Unterredungen einiger guten Freunde von allerhand Büchern und andern annehmlchen Geschichten*, ed. Wilhelm Ernst Tentzel, Leipzig, 1697, p. 485.

<sup>94</sup> A reference, of course, to N. Z. Davis, *Trickster Travels: A Sixteenth-Century Muslim between Worlds*, New York, 2006.

<sup>95</sup> Johann Michael Heineccius, *Eigentliche und warhafftige Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer Historie Glaubens-Lehren und Kirchen Gebräuchen in III Theilen*, Leipzig, 1711, I, p. 226.

could also have been used to describe an alternative story of a long and complicated life of a wandering outsider, met in almost every city with other, highly codified expectations.

## Conclusion

What should we make of Nathanael? Were people justified in trusting him or not? For sure, the details of his story vary: the exact sum that he owed to the sultan is not the same in all the records, nor is it clear whether the funds he was trying to raise were to help free him or his fellow Greeks on Leukas. These, however, are minor differences in an overall coherent testimony. The testimony must have looked plausible to his interlocutors, as strategically minded Western theologians had become more and more aware that nothing could be achieved at the confessional front in Constantinople without considerable sums of money.<sup>96</sup> Even the proverbial ‘Turkish yoke’ under which Eastern Christians suffered had been defined in relevant literature as consisting largely in innumerable and potentially infinite financial obligations to the powers that be.<sup>97</sup>

What looks more incoherent is the assessment of Nathanael’s erudition by different interlocutors. This may be due to prejudice and ignorance. The badly educated Greek cleric was a trope – as we saw above – in seventeenth-century occidental writings, co-existing with the trope of the fraudulent vagrant Greek.<sup>98</sup> Classically educated Western scholars could not help but to be disappointed by dignitaries whose vernacular did not correspond either to Plato’s Attic Greek or to New Testament *koine*. However, the negative assessment of Nathanael by Wettstein does not sit well with the erudite information on the Greek liturgy that Goar claims to have received from his interlocutor. This may also have to do with the kind of questions that Nathanael was asked: while Wettstein was interested in patristics, classical erudition and confessional argument, Goar was interested in the way contemporary Greeks celebrated and understood their own liturgy.

The case of Nathanael can also tell us something about ignorance within the Republic of Letters. The simple fact that Allatius and Hottinger attacked each other directly with breath-taking speed could blind us to the fact that they didn’t always have all the relevant information, even if it was ‘out there’. When Nathanael arrived in 1650, Hottinger seems not have had Allatius’s *De perpetua consensione* (1648) ready to hand, nor to have had detailed knowledge of it. Otherwise, he would

<sup>96</sup> How much Western clerics and ambassadors could achieve at the Porte and the Patriarchate through orchestrated pay-offs is carefully documented throughout Hering, *Patriarchat* (n. 28 above).

<sup>97</sup> In *Historiae Ecclesiasticae... pars quinta* (n. 51 above), pp. 39–40, Hottinger specifies – following Martin Crusius and Sethus Calvisius – that the yoke consists in specific payments (*pişkeş*) in ducats to the sultan that are due when a new patriarch is elected. On *pişkeş*, see T. Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan: Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries*, Oxford, 2015, pp. 150–3.

<sup>98</sup> In dealing with Armenians in Persia, Catholic clerics would also often refer to ignorance in both the laity and the clergy; see Windler, *Missionare in Persien*, (n. 35 above), pp. 294–9.

probably have doublechecked the passage where Allatius addressed his Calvinist opponents and mentioned all itinerant Greeks who had come to Rome. By contrast, Allatius boldly mentions that he had not been able to consult two of Hottinger's references, insinuating that they had been too obscure (or irrelevant) to be found: Johann Jacob Ulrich's admittedly little-known *De religione ecclesiarum Graecanicarum* (1621) and David Chytraeus's much more famous *Oratio de statu ecclesiarum hoc tempore in Graecia, Asia, Austria, Vngaria, Böhemia etc.* (first edition 1569) which had seen numerous re-editions and a translation into German even in the sixteenth century.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, in 1650 Schweizer in Zurich did not have the chance to consult any edition of Goar's *Euchologion*, which had been printed in 1638 and 1647. Schweizer also seemed surprised about the linguistic difference between classical and early modern Greek, even though Johannes Meursius's *Glossarium graecobarbarum* (1614) had been published several decades before.<sup>100</sup> To this might be added some of Schweizer's questions addressed to Nathanael, which at the same time continued and disregarded the time-honoured tradition of questioning Greek clerics. Schweizer's take on the archbishop may have been specific to seventeenth-century Zurich where, as Jan Loop has shown for Hottinger, small libraries and dilettantism coexisted with thorough Biblical scholarship and innovative methods. When coming to terms with the 'discovery of the Greeks' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries we also have to reckon, as it were, with a patchy circulation of knowledge that left apparently obvious books unknown to many contemporaries.

What about Nathanael? Was he a kind of confessional chameleon who adapted to any given environment, be it Roman Catholic, Reformed, or Lutheran, only to be exposed posthumously as an impostor by stern German scholars? The juxtaposition of the printed seventeenth-century testimonies certainly gives that impression. However, by looking into Schweizer's papers we have encountered a thoughtful interlocutor who approved of some Reformed doctrines, refused to comment on others and referred to his previous utterances printed in Goar's *Euchologion*. Such behaviour may result from shrewd political reasoning. It may also have been the best possible answer for a convinced Greek Orthodox confronted with the question of whether he was more Catholic or Protestant, a question arising from and provoking misunderstandings and to which, some argue today, there could not have been a satisfactory answer, presupposing as it did among Eastern Christians some confessional stance in the Western European sense.<sup>101</sup> The theologians in Zurich and elsewhere who had

<sup>99</sup> Allatius, *Hottingerus* (n. 87 above), p. 572. On Chytraeus and his *Oratio*, see E. Benz, *Die Ostkirche im Lichte der protestantischen Geschichtsschreibung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, Freiburg, 1952, pp. 21–4, 391, 399; D. Benga, 'David Chytraeus (1530–1600) als Erforscher und Wiederentdecker der Ostkirchen: Seine Beziehungen zu orthodoxen Theologen, seine Erforschungen der Ostkirchen und seine ostkirchlichen Kenntnisse', PhD diss., University of Erlangen, 2001, pp. 101–284; A. Ben-Tov, *Lutheran Humanists and Greek Antiquity: Melanchthonian Scholarship between Universal History and Pedagogy*, Leiden, 2009, pp. 109–13.

<sup>100</sup> On Meursius and the *Glossarium*, see J. Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage*, Cambridge, 2008, pp. 253–6.

<sup>101</sup> For innumerable occurrences of misunderstanding, see B. Heyberger, *Les chrétiens du Proche-Orient au temps de la Réforme catholique (Syrie, Liban, Palestine, XVIIe–XVIIIe siècle)*, Rome, 2014. For confessionalism as foreign to Greek Orthodox religion, see C. Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*, transl. P. Chamberas and N. Russell, Brookline MA, 2006.

hoped to access a remote patristic past through Greek travellers were bound to be disappointed. Nathanael and his answers were of little use in the Reformed project of aligning the Church Fathers, the contemporary Greek church and Reformed doctrine. The heavily annotated Confession of Lucaris, therefore, that Hottinger edited in 1652 nowhere mentioned the Greek archbishop who had visited Zurich just two years before.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.