

# New Europe College Yearbook 2009-2010



---

CRISTIAN CIOCAN  
CRISTIAN DANIEL  
MIRCEA GRAȚIAN DULUȘ  
CLAUDIU GAIU  
DIANA GEORGESCU  
DAN LAZEA  
VERA MARIN  
DANIEL NIȚU  
TOADER POPESCU  
SAMUEL PAKUCS WILLCOCKS

---

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College  
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College  
Str. Plantelor 21  
023971 Bucharest  
Romania

[www.nec.ro](http://www.nec.ro); e-mail: [nec@nec.ro](mailto:nec@nec.ro)  
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



## **CRISTIAN DANIEL**

Born in 1982, in Târgu Mureş

Ph.D. Candidate, Central European University (CEU), Budapest, Hungary  
Academic Coordinator, Center for Late Antique, Byzantine and Ottoman  
Studies, CEU, Budapest

Project Coordinator, *The Caucasus and Byzantium from Late Antiquity through  
the Middle Ages*, CEU, Budapest

Open Society Foundation Scholarship, Central European University, Budapest  
(2004-2008)

Erasmus Doctoral Student, Department of History and Archaeology,  
University of Crete, Greece (2007)

Marie Curie European Doctorate Fellow, Ca' Foscari University, Venice, Italy  
(2007-2008)

Associated Doctoral Student, University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany (2008)

Participation in conferences and symposia in Armenia, the Czech Republic,  
Georgia, Greece, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Romania, Spain,  
the United Kingdom

Articles and studies on the religious history of Transylvania and Moldavia  
during the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern times

Archaeologist in the Progetto Classe: International Archaeological Excavation of  
St. Severo, Ravenna, Italy (2006)

# BRIDGING THE GAP: THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE OF TRANSYLVANIA SEEN THROUGH THE COMPARATIVE LENS

Unlike lands where the rite or pattern of jurisdiction were uniform, the regions between Eastern and Western Christianities, such as Southern Italy, the former possessions of the Byzantine Empire after 1204, the Crusader States, Poland, and Hungary, all experienced an intermingling of rites and theological traditions.<sup>1</sup>

The timeframe marked by the first conquest of Constantinople (1204),<sup>2</sup> the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–9)<sup>3</sup> and the Tridentine Council (1545–63)<sup>4</sup> saw the structural development of the Eastern Rite/Orthodox confession in Transylvania, which I analyse as a transitional region. Understanding the place of the Eastern Rite/Orthodoxy in medieval Hungary requires assessing the impact of high church politics, the way local ecclesiastical and aristocratic elites reacted to changes in church policy, and the manner in which the “Orthodox” themselves were perceived when living in a “Catholic” environment, before the time of *Konfessionalismus* (see the excellent study of Adrian Rusu on the situation of the Eastern rite churches in Transylvania before the Reformation).<sup>5</sup>

Both the papacy and the Eastern Church underwent several transformations during the High Middle Ages.<sup>6</sup> The picture at the beginning of the thirteenth century differed sharply from that at the end of the sixteenth century, when new political entities were shaping the map of Europe, national kingdoms started to have a more important say in international affairs (see France), while the Eastern Roman Empire had forever passed into the history books. The last Crusades, abortive military expeditions, also showed that the religious ethos that had supported papal appeals in the eleventh and twelfth centuries no longer functioned.

The papacy itself changed from the all-powerful pontificate of Innocent III to that of Leo X, who failed to perceive the power of the reforming message announced by Luther.<sup>7</sup> At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the papal curia was one of the best maintained and most impressive central administrations in medieval Europe. A result of constant adjustment and accommodation, the curia was animated by the idea of the rule of canon law and church justice. This is how it dealt with the inclusion within the Roman ecclesia of several territories formerly under the rule of Eastern rite elites. Behind the appropriation of those regions lay the spirit of canon law and universal sovereignty of the papacy. The curia was irritated by the Byzantine church's continuous demands for an ecumenical council which, in their view, was supposed to reestablish the communion ruptured by the mutual excommunication of 1054. The turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries showed that the papacy could not deal as swiftly as before with the problems posed by rising national kingdoms. This also brought about the Great Schism, finally settled at the Council of Constance (1414-1418). The aftermath of the Council of Constance was, in the words of Walter Ullmann, a period of transition "in which the old was not yet old enough to be replaced by the new which was yet too new to gain a firm footing".<sup>8</sup>

The Council of Ferrara-Florence (in 1439) which finally seemed to bring together the two churches, was not a fully fledged success. Nevertheless, it was applied in areas with Orthodox/Eastern rite populations under the control of Catholic states. This process was paralleled by new developments in Orthodox ecclesiology. Though outside the framework canonically established dispositions, the Orthodox Church had been slowly learning how to survive under non-Orthodox, and even more, non-Christian rule. The two centuries that followed the Fourth Crusade forced the Eastern Church to confront a continuous stream of political and ecclesiastical changes such as unionist discussions and councils, the loss of ecclesiastical patrimony, survival in exile, doctrinal disputes (hesychasm), missionary work, and the coming of the Ottomans. I believe all of this proved essential for the development of strategies of survival for Eastern Rite/Orthodox communities in non-Orthodox ruled regions.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, the Council of Trent gave the definitive *coup* to the politics of church union promoted until then by the Roman Church. Sacred rites and specific usages of the Orthodox Churches, recognized and guaranteed by the Western Church at the Council of Ferrara-Florence became errors

and abuses which the Catholics had to correct and eradicate, especially among those Orthodox dwelling in lands ruled by the Latins.<sup>10</sup>

Focusing on these particular aspects one can argue that such circumstances, which set the Eastern Rite community in Transylvania on a path that raised its self-awareness, are actually worth exploring, rather than assuming from the start a sharp confessional delineation. The situation following the Council of Ferrara-Florence, when more documents are available for two decades than for the whole of the previous century, represents a good example of how applied high church policies contributed to the increasing visibility of Eastern Rite communities.<sup>11</sup> This historical process ended with the establishment of the Orthodox bishop (metropolitan) of Transylvania at Alba Iulia, at the end of the sixteenth century: a natural option, since in ecclesiology sacred geography follows political geography. Then again, the presence of two bishops in the same seat shows the uncomfortable and non-canonical situation (judged according to the canons of the first-millennium councils) that had started to perpetuate itself in the Christian *oikumena* with the Crusades.

The ecclesiastical landscape in transitional regions becomes even more colorful as two or more communities of rite live, preach, serve, and build in the same region. This is all the more true since the term confession has been wrongly used to discuss realities to which it does not apply, realities outside the temporal coverage of this notion. Confessionalism is a historical trademark that applies much better to an ecclesiological situation starting with the sixteenth century.

Many differences accumulated between East and West over the centuries, ranging from dogmas, canon law, cult and ritual, to recourse to tradition, political discourse, and mentalities. The two communities of faith had their particularities, and were individualized at the social level by these particularities. Political power, which was also affiliated at the religious level, counterbalanced or led to the supremacy of one or the other group. The strong relationship between state and church is a familiar feature of society in the Middle Ages, with diverse paradigms in both the East and the West. Thus, a church held temporal supremacy in a region if the lord of that region embraced it, a '*cuius regio, eius religio*' *avant la lettre*<sup>12</sup> but without all the intricacies the term acquired during the Reformation period. This political situation did not necessarily lead immediately to the forceful conversion of inhabitants of the same region to a different rite; still the "state"-backed religious tradition obviously had the upper hand over the others.

Nevertheless, it would be short-sighted to consider the situation of a church in a territory, or the inter-confessional milieu in the same geographical framework, as phenomena that can be interpreted by themselves or simply by placing them in their local context. Such an approach can only lead to partial results and misunderstandings. Churches are highly hierarchical structures, and the transmission of filtered information is one of their specialties. Phenomena such as great councils and their decisions were reflected quite rapidly down to the level of the suffragan bishops, or even lower down the church hierarchy.<sup>13</sup> Thus, researching a region of inter-ecclesiological contacts reveals a deeper understanding of what inter- and multi-confessional/ritual meant. This could give some answers, if not possible solutions, for today's Christian world which experiences three ecclesiological models, revolving in a grotesque mosaic of confessional, schismatic and heretical counterattacks.

The topic in question suffers chronically from sheer lack of terminology. "Conviventia," "living together" and "rough tolerance" are just steps (though important ones) in the endeavour to provide a framework more easily understandable and closer to the documented events, buildings and human actors. With this in mind, I add a further terminological construction to the discussion, namely the notion of transitional region. I have often been asked about the implications of this term. I have to agree that it has both advantages and inconsistencies. It makes it much easier, to my mind at least, to identify geographically the regions which it covers, and helps both the scholar and the reader to map the research. At the same time, it does not say everything about what happens there, and, like the subject it covers, still leaves room for interpretations and later refinement.

Furthermore, related to the use and background of the notion, one could wonder what it means to label Transylvania a "transitional" region. Transitional regions are to be understood as territories where rites interact. Such regions had characteristics that differentiate them from more homogenous regions. Furthermore, it is necessary to point out that such a typology functions only if one takes into consideration the resemblances, as well as the differences, among what I have labelled transitional regions. Transylvania was part of a state that accumulated Eastern Rite Christianity as it expanded eastwards. So did Venice or Poland. This makes the case rather different from what happened in the Crusader States or in Byzantine



Romania. It is important to clarify this difference in order to see if there was a special condition for the Eastern Rite in Hungary.

Transitional regions are to be understood not as locked customs points, but as territories where communities of faith interact. A similar situation, though involving groups motivated by a different religious ethos, has been described through the concept of *conviventia*, connected mostly to Medieval Spain<sup>14</sup> but also reflected in studies referring to the Eastern Mediterranean<sup>15</sup> and the Crusades.<sup>16</sup> More recently, in his latest book,<sup>17</sup> Christopher MacEvitt introduces the syntagm of “rough tolerance.” I am following the way such patterns worked in the region, setting the phenomena in a broader framework of models.

Another important related question is how the transitional region fitted into the ecclesiology of the period. We must ask how practical was the ecclesiology of the day, and who helped apply it at the regional level. In Transylvania, as may be expected, the Catholic monarchy and the local hierarchy played an important role, but so too did the Mendicant mission in the area (such as shown by the conflict between John of Capistrano and a so-called Eastern Rite pseudo-bishop, John of Caffa<sup>18</sup>).

The reciprocal rupture of ecclesial communion in 1054 involved only two of the Patriarchates in the Pentarchy (the Patriarchate of Rome and the Patriarchate of Constantinople).<sup>19</sup> This rupture extended to the other patriarchates once the Crusaders took over Antioch and Jerusalem, at which time the rupture was qualified as schism.<sup>20</sup> Such a canonical understanding legitimized the foundation of homonym churches in the territories previously belonging to the Eastern patriarchates. This would never have been possible where there was only a simple rupture in communion. The Crusades brought a new solution and a new problem: co-territoriality. Territory was shared not only with the Eastern rite, but also with other rites under Roman jurisdiction. In the Holy Land for example, Patriarchates of the Latin Rite and Oriental Catholic Churches existed side by side. They were placed under the transborder jurisdiction of the Pope, meaning that the Patriarchates were created on the jurisdictional territory of a Patriarchate other than that of Rome. Furthermore, though the Patriarchs in the region were equals among themselves, they were in a situation of common dependence on the Patriarchate of Rome.

This made the Pope *primus inter inferiores*, a huge canonical change from first-millennium ecclesiology when he was *primus inter pares*. Here the papacy was inconsistent with its own ecclesiastical usages; from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, it promoted two models

of jurisdictions, one valid on the territory of the Patriarchate of Rome in Western Europe, a model of mono-territoriality and mono-jurisdiction, and another which was valid in the territories of the Eastern Patriarchates, which meant co-territoriality and transborder (multi)jurisdiction. In turn, this co-territoriality was both exterior (extra-communion) and interior (inter-communion). This model was also applied in Transylvania proper in the aftermath of the Council in 1439, with a "Uniate" bishop for the Eastern rite probably residing in Feleac, modern Cluj county.

Therefore I chose to compare information gathered about Transylvania to other regions where similar ecclesiastic issues were at stake. Much historical writing is about comparison. However while some comparison is guided by common sense, without being integrated into a conscious, methodological operation, comparative history is more demanding and self-reflective, being based on the logic of comparison and a reflection about goals and the entities compared.<sup>21</sup>

The method is a relative newcomer in historiography, if compared to other disciplines such as literature, religious studies or law. After the Second World War, historians became more interested in overcoming the national boundaries of their discipline, seen as responsible for such catastrophes. The reception of the comparative method in European historiographies, which reached its peak in the 1980s, was influenced by appetites for either a more analytical (Germany, Austria, the Netherlands) or more narrative (France, England, Italy) tradition of research, with the former at the forefront of this innovative approach, due also to its stronger connections to the other social sciences.<sup>22</sup>

Marc Bloch (joined by Otto Hintze, who agreed that comparison serves to find both similarities and dissimilarities) took up Henri Pirenne's argument (against nationalist historiography) and pleaded for a comparative history of Europe. He believed that improving this method and introducing it to general use were pressing necessities in modern historical studies.<sup>23</sup> Comparative history was, and unfortunately still is, considered a part of the philosophy of history or general sociology, disciplines which some historians still greet with a skeptical smile, but take no interest in practicing when back at the study desk. The aim of the comparative method is not to solely search for similarities.<sup>24</sup> This has actually been a cause for the disbelief voiced by some historians or other scholars as to the actual possibilities and effectiveness of the method.<sup>25</sup>

Comparison means choosing from one or several situations, or historical contexts, two or more phenomena which offer certain analogies

between them; then tracing their causes, individuating their similarities and disparities, and explaining them accordingly. Two conditions are necessary to make a comparison possible: a certain similarity between the facts researched and a certain dissimilarity between the situations in which they have developed.<sup>26</sup> Its flexibility allows us to go beyond the national framework and research specific terms of comparison situated in different contexts, terms which are linked by a common problematic, in most cases the *tertium comparationis*,<sup>27</sup> which could lead to the buildup of a typology.<sup>28</sup> The process of comparison lends itself to two different uses; either selecting societies so far apart in time and space that the similarities between them cannot be explained by mutual influence or common origin (reverting in the final analysis to the fundamental unity of the human mind, or on the other hand to the monotony and poverty of the intellectual resources at man's disposal over the centuries); or making a study of neighboring, contemporary societies which owe their existence at least partly to a common cause, exercising a mutual influence,<sup>29</sup> and, in the case of the transitional regions, transformed by agents of the same kind, and accommodating the same policies of coexistence.

Methodologically, the comparative method is probably one of the most transparent research tools, as these tools must be made explicit right from the start of the inquiry. It situates processes and institutions in broader contexts, distancing itself from a view of historic specificities. Proximity to primary sources, discourse analysis, and the identification of the categories of both self-description or the perception of alterity, as is mostly the case when dealing with sources regarding the Eastern Rite communities in question, remain crucial tools of study in the comparative method. Comparison should also be restrained to a limited number of cases, especially because of the differences and similarities of the primary sources. Contextualization of several cases would produce a more abstract and thus, less convincing solution, as the number of entities compared increases.

The comparative method is constructivist in purpose, as it chooses specific trends, institutions and/or social agents from multiple contexts to answer a given problematic, which guides the research and the narrative. Thus comparison will make sense in two ways: the disappearance or nonexistence of the Eastern Rite hierarchy in Transylvania can be better understood when we analyze the same phenomenon on Venetian Crete; then again, the specialization of liturgical space in the Aegean, with the coming of the Franks, has better chances of fitting a typology when linked

to the mixed iconographical preferences of the faithful of both rites in Eastern areas of the Hungarian kingdom.

Crete presents itself as an ideal case in many ways, as it shared (*grosso modo*) the same ecclesiological destiny as Transylvania. Here I have in mind the political background as well. In both regions, an important part of the population followed the Eastern Rite, and both were under the rule of a state that was officially part of Western Christianity, throughout the major ecclesiological turning points that frame my research. Another important point here is that, on Crete, Catholics and Orthodox lived together for almost five hundred years in a relationship whose complexity had no rival in the Greek East.

I find illuminating the theoretical approach of Molly Green. She wishes to add a third image of the world of the late Medieval and early Modern Mediterranean to those expressed by Andrew Hess<sup>30</sup> and Fernand Braudel. While Braudel wrote a history of the Mediterranean from the bottom up, going beyond the conventional boundaries of state, religion, and culture, and argued for a common experience based on shared environmental constraints, Hess perceives the model proposed by the former as unrepresentative. He states that Braudel rests his account on examples drawn from the experience of Latin Christendom, and thus creates an image of the Mediterranean world that does possess an essential unity, but that cannot be applied to the sea as a whole. His conclusion is that the separation of the Mediterranean world into different, well-defined cultural spheres is the main theme not only of the sixteenth century but of the centuries to follow, when the chasm between Christianity and Islam only grew wider. Green argues for a different view, depicting a world that "had a dynamic of its own," not properly conveyed by the struggle between Christianity and Islam; from the Fourth Crusade onwards (1204), the Eastern Mediterranean was the point of intersection for not two, but three, enduring civilizations: Latin Christianity, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Islam. This mostly applies to Eastern Europe as well.

The year 1204 brought a huge change in the way that the Venetians, and other Franks, were present in the Levant, with the military conquest of some territories formerly belonging to the Byzantine Empire, and the attendant juridical issues. On Crete, the Venetians were present from 1205 to 1669. As in other realms taken over by the knights of the Fourth Crusade, the Latin Church organized itself in the East based on the existing diocesan network, thus substituting for the Greek Church.<sup>31</sup> The Latin Church considered itself as the legally constituted successor of

the Greek Church and thus owner of its possessions.<sup>32</sup> The indigenous church was simply tolerated and placed under Venetian domination. Except for Coron, few other Greek bishops kept their seat uninterruptedly in Venetian territories.<sup>33</sup>

Latin bishops took over the archbishopric of Candia, and other diocesan seats all over the island, forbidding the presence of any Greek bishops. The main seats in the hierarchy of the Levant were taken over by Venetians. Between 1252 and 1387, twelve out of sixteen archbishops of Candia were Venetians.<sup>34</sup> A similar situation is to be observed in the colonies of Modon and Coron and their hinterland, until the end of the Venetian presence there, in 1503. On Negroponte, on 8<sup>th</sup> February 1314, Clement V united the Latin diocese to the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, and this was its position until 1470, when the island was overrun by the Ottomans.<sup>35</sup> After the loss of Crete, the Serenissima kept only Corfu and Zakyntos, in the Ionian Sea.

By 1211 there was a double hierarchy in Cyprus. The church of Cyprus differed from other Orthodox churches in other transitional regions by virtue of its autocephaly, granted at the council of Ephesus in 431. Its archbishops were not appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople, but by the Byzantine emperor. The situation in Cyprus, after the Latin conquest, resembled Antioch (and to a lesser extent the Crusader kingdom of Jerusalem) more than the Frankish states of Greece, or Southern Italy.<sup>36</sup> The church had ministered to a mainly Orthodox and Greek-speaking population, so that customs prevalent in Jerusalem were not easily transplanted. This ecclesiastical situation constituted an obstacle to the aim of absorbing the local Greek rite church into the Latin one.<sup>37</sup> The Latin conquest severed the island's Eastern Rite church from mainstream Orthodox theology and jurisdiction, as in all the regions in question.

After the conquest, several bishoprics were amalgamated into larger Latin dioceses by the incoming Latin clergy. Thus instead of 14 sees only 4 remained, while the new Latin dioceses followed older Orthodox sees.<sup>38</sup> The four remaining Orthodox bishops in Cyprus, though retaining their titles, were regarded in effect as coadjutors to the Latin bishops over them. Their titles were taken from villages in remote localities, but within the four dioceses of the Latin bishops: Solea in Nicosia, Arsinoe in Paphos, Lefkara in Limassol and Karpasia in Famagusta. They ordained and blessed Orthodox clerics on behalf of the Latin bishops, who delegated this particular authority to them.<sup>39</sup> New abbots in Orthodox monasteries performed an act of obedience to their diocesan bishop, who granted the

blessing whereby they were empowered to govern their monasteries, but here also Orthodox bishops officiated on behalf of Latin bishops.<sup>40</sup>

In comparison, from Transylvania we know of only a few Eastern Rite bishops before the second half of the sixteenth century. These hierarchs appear randomly over time (there are fewer than ten bishops for almost three hundred years), but connected to monasteries, and to areas where the Romanian elite and population were more numerous. Both instances are in line with cases documented in Venetian possessions in the Aegean.

The Western institution which the Christian East knew for the longest period was the Church. In its colonies, the Republic supported a Venetian Church highly conditioned by the political power of the state (religion as *instrumentum regni*). While decisions concerning religious matters were mainly taken by the Senate, which by the fourteenth century had become the most important body of the Venetian state,<sup>41</sup> the sources which give the richest information on the topic are the *Misti*, documents concerning the deliberations of the Council of Ten.

The Republic guaranteed the church hierarchy's rights and security, and thus also had expectations of it. One of the most important was the continuous pressure on clergy to reside in their titular offices. Exceptions were the Latin patriarch of Constantinople and the archbishop of Patras, after it rented its city to the Venetians. Residence was required, as nonresidence was thought to imperil the souls of the faithful, who would go from the Latin to the Greek rite. At the same time, nonresidence meant financial pressure on the government which then had to provide for the high clergy from its own treasury.<sup>42</sup>

This policy effectively prevented the development of an indigenous church elite. The Greek Church was deprived of much of its property, while Orthodox bishoprics were replaced by Latin ones. Lack of bishops made ordination very difficult (unless candidates were willing to accept ordination from a Latin bishop) and this led to a certain amount of irregularity. Contemporary Venetian reports state with some horror that there were priests saying the mass who were not even ordained. Some Cretans had to leave the island if they wished to be ordained by an Orthodox bishop, as no such bishops were allowed on the island. It was the Republic's desire that they go to the Ionian Islands, also under Venetian control, where Orthodox bishops were permitted, and secure their ordination there. Still, some of them preferred to go to areas under Byzantine (and later Ottoman) control and receive ordination there. Another possibility was that an Orthodox bishop arrive undetected on the

island and ordain candidates in secrecy. A further aspect is that because of the many cases of nonresidence, even the Latins had to make recourse to Greek priests for the rites.

There is little information about Eastern bishops on Crete. In 1299 the important Kalergi family, archontes in Crete, revolted and received under their care the Greek monasteries in Western Crete, and the right to nominate the bishop of Ario: *item damus et concedimus tibi omnia monasteria comunis que sunt ultra scalas Strubulii versus ponentem... item de episcopatu Ariensi vacante pastore ad presens, quem petis pro uno episcopo Greco.*<sup>43</sup> The promises made to Alexis Kalergis seem not to have been kept. A further document from 1357, issued by the notary Giovanni Girardo, tells of a *frater Macarios, episcopus Grecorum cretensis*. This is actually the only time he is mentioned.<sup>44</sup>

As mentioned above, the only see remaining in Venetian controlled territory was at Coron, but here the Greek rite bishop was not allowed to reside in the city. Nevertheless, it also seems that his relations with the Venetian authorities were better than those of his Latin counterpart. In August 1361, the Greek bishop Markos asked the Venetian Senate for better tax conditions and obligations (right of pasturing for the local *castellani*) for the Greek faithful in the area.<sup>45</sup>

The Orthodox hierarchy never left Cyprus for good, as happened on Crete, although during the thirteenth century they sometimes had to suffer self-imposed exile. The Greek bishops seem not to have had territorial jurisdiction, and in Coureas' interpretation this annuls their full episcopal status, as it would have violated the canons of Lateran IV and would have allowed the existence of two bishops in the same diocese (the situation is described by Pope Honorius III as *intolerable as one body with two heads*<sup>46</sup>). My understanding is that the plenitude of office resides first of all in the ordination service bestowed on the future bishop. Though the candidate had to be assigned a see, many times this was done just in name, with situations such as nonresidence or holding honorary titles being very common. The actual solution of ordaining Greek bishops on behalf of localities other than those where their Latin counterparts would reside, shows the care taken not to infringe the letter of the Lateran canonical solution, but also provides a good example of how rules can be broken. As pointed out above, the actual problem here ever since the Crusades was co-territoriality. Bishops would be ordained on behalf of different sees in accordance with the ninth canon of Lateran IV,<sup>47</sup> but due to the mixed

nature of habitation and rite practice it was practically impossible to create two dioceses that did not geographically superimpose or overlap.

One episode of 1295 is telling for the way the two clergies understood their pastoral duties and for how the Greek clergy viewed its submission to the Latins. The Dominican Berard, Latin bishop of Limassol, visited the Greek cathedral of Lefkara in his diocese. When he asked the Greek clergy to swear an oath on the truth of Latin belief concerning the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, he was duly refused. Though he instituted proceedings against the Greek bishop Matthew, who was ultimately excommunicated three times, this was to no avail as the Greek bishop continued to occupy his seat, seeking refuge in the diocese of Nicosia under the Latin Archbishop John of Ancona,<sup>48</sup> and moreover signed letters to his Orthodox peer in Jaffa as Proedros (president) of Limassol and Kourion, as though his Latin counterpart had never existed.<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, there are instances when Greek clergy sought the confirmation of their bishops by their Latin counterparts, in accordance with the bull of Pope Alexander.<sup>50</sup>

On Crete the Venetian authorities took a twofold attitude: on the one hand it was important to cut all possible ties between Greek priests and the hierarchy in the Byzantine empire, prohibiting ordination by an Orthodox bishop, and keeping an eye on the Eastern Rite priests coming from regions outside Venetian control. On the other hand, no Greek Catholic bishoprics (in the modern sense of that term) were created in the colonies, thus blocking the possible development of a Uniate movement. The local Greek clergy was dependent on the Latin bishopric, especially for security reasons, as the Greek Church remained attached to the memory of the Byzantine Empire. For the same reason, even from the beginning of the conquest, Orthodox archbishoprics and bishoprics were suspended.<sup>51</sup>

The letters of Honorius III to Queen Alice state that the papacy, in line with the decisions made at Lateran in 1215, was ready to accept the divergence in rite:

*in sustaining the customs and rites of the Greeks as far as we can, in accordance with God's wishes, there should not be acceptance on our part in respect of those which cause the peril of souls and detract from the honesty of the church; and then again: Just as it is stated in the rulings of the general council, it would be monstrous for one and the same diocese to have various bishops, as though one body were to have various heads. We have written to our venerable brothers the patriarch of Jerusalem and*



*the archbishops of Tyre and Caesarea... so that from now they should in no way suffer these priestlings to remain in the said dioceses.*<sup>52</sup>

The agreement initially promulgated at Limassol, Cyprus in October 1220, and in a revised form at Famagusta in September 1222 (although its final confirmation by Honorius III was in January 1223), stated in its second article:

*the Greek priests and deacons...should render canonical obedience to the said archbishop and his church, that is those who are and have been in his diocese, just as others who are and have been in the dioceses of the said bishops (should render similar obedience).*<sup>53</sup>

Letters of 30<sup>th</sup> December 1221 to Queen Alice praised the efforts of the bishop of Famagusta in effecting the agreement of 1220. The pope then demanded that the Greek clergy be subject to one Latin archbishop with jurisdiction over all Cyprus, thus rejecting the queen's request that some Greek bishops should remain in office.<sup>54</sup> A letter of 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1222 to the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the archbishops of Tyre and Caesarea criticizes the Orthodox bishops who reneged on the obedience they had initially pledged to the Latin bishops of their dioceses, and accuses them of having reverted to the errors of the Greeks.

Undoubtedly, the leaders of the local Greek priests, such as the protopapas of Crete and that of Negroponte, were nominated in accord with the Latin archbishop, with the opinion of the civil authorities being always decisive.<sup>55</sup> The clergy in Romania lived under the shadow of Venetian power. In 1307, Venice asserted its absolute right to tax the Latin clergy and to submit it to ordinary obligations: if the Latin Church was present on Crete, this was because of Venetian actions: *the Holy See should not compromise the cause of the Church in Crete and should allow Venice to act;*<sup>56</sup> *quia Comune Cretam per pecuniam acquisivit, et in isto titulo in ipsa jurisdictione consistit.*<sup>57</sup>

Even though the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople relocated to Negroponte after the fall of the city to the Byzantines, the local Greek clergy continued to enjoy full liturgical liberty. In 1383, the Greek church in Negroponte was declared united to the Roman church, having to pay 50 hyperpers on an annual basis to the Latin bishop there.<sup>58</sup> Also in 1383, a certain Jani Paraschi, procurator in the name of the Pope, and the protopapas Georges Agiomaniti, on behalf of all the Greek priests in

Negroponte, addressed a petition to the Senate asking that Venetian officials stop their molestations, and, says Thiriet, to be allowed the freedom of cult. The Senate ordered the Baillie to protect them: *Quod scribatur regimini Nigropontis quod non permittat clericos grecos nostre insule molestari contra debitum rationis, quod habeat eos recommissos.*<sup>59</sup>

In 1360, measures were taken by the public authorities to improve the recruitment of Cretan clergy. A college of four papas, elected from among the most respected, was set up with the purpose of examining candidates for priesthood. These four priests could not be chosen from among the 130 papas under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Candia:

*C.F.P. quod, cum sit necessarium et honestati consonum, quod illi qui se promovere intendunt ad gradul sacerdotii, diligenter examinentur, ut cum bona et matura examinatione fiant sacerdotes illi qui fuerint sufficientes et digni, observare debeat decetero talis ordo, vadit pars quod per dominationem eligantur 4 papates greci sufficientes et fide digni qui non sint de numero CXXX subditorum jurisdictioni domini archiepiscopi cretensis.*<sup>60</sup>

The college thus constituted had to examine the candidate, but could not recommend his ordination: *nisi prius habita licentia et consensus dominationis*. On the same day, measures were taken to prohibit monks coming from outside access to the island.

Several times the Senate enforced the status quo, that the protopapas of Crete was elected by the Greek priests, needing only the approval of the regime, such as in 1379, when a pseudoprotopapas, Rampani, together with his son, posing as the protopsaltis, caused trouble with their preaching.<sup>61</sup> Then in 1394, the Latin archbishop of Candia, Marco Giustinian, complained that the protopapas Andronic Cortazi was elected without him being consulted beforehand.<sup>62</sup> All those concerned were reminded of the rights of the state; the archbishop had to respect the agreed order of things. If there was to be a chance to regulate the problem of confessional opposition, local clergy had to be protected from feeling dominated by the Latin clergy.

The local church was thus relatively free regarding the Roman authorities, but dependant on the civil ones. The attitude of the latter towards the Roman see could not but please the local priests. There were good signs of *bon voisinage* and of tolerance, as Venice protected the Eastern religious order, even when this was not in line with the policy of

the Holy See.<sup>63</sup> The Venetian magistrates thus concealed the fact that the autonomy of the local Greek Church was respected. By the end of the fourteenth century, documents prove that Venice tended to decrease the rights of the Roman church.

Especially in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the attitude of the *Serenissima* towards the Eastern Rite softened (probably following the efforts after Ferrara-Florence in 1439). After the 1430s (mainly because of the Ottoman danger and the end of the Great Schism in the Western Church) Venetian policy changed to a certain extent. Beforehand, the College and the Senate received and examined candidates for diocesan seats. They elected those that seemed most suitable for the Republic's interest, and then sent recommendation letters to Rome.<sup>64</sup> While until the thirteenth century the norm was that all nominees for bishoprics or canons in Romania were supposed to be Venetians (the Patriarch of Constantinople had to take an oath in this regard), after Rome took the upper hand, the Senate would vote to elect the candidates to be presented to the Curia.<sup>65</sup> From then on, bishops were nominated in Rome, and the Republic merely sanctioned the nominee, or refused in the case that he was undesirable. The *Serenissima* also took a more tolerant attitude to the Greek Church, as it became more important to have the support of the local population and local clergy. The Venetian state had to build an ecclesiastical scheme to include the Eastern churches, which though defended from the danger of the Ottomans (the greater evil), were still under the domination of the Latin church and perceived the Franks (be they Venetians, French or Catalans) as hated Westerners who had usurped their goods, hierarchy, monasteries and local buildings of worship.<sup>66</sup>

The Venetian authorities took a reserved and hesitant stance, probably because of their intimate knowledge of the situation in Crete; they tried to encourage Greek priests who seemed to be favourable to the Union.<sup>67</sup> Around 1400, Demetrius Kydones, a Dominican, died in Crete, after proclaiming his attachment to the Union of the Churches.<sup>68</sup> The Union was in the making in Venetian Romania. The differences between the Venetian masters and their Greek subjects were fading and, by the beginning of the fifteenth century, they were further reconciled in the face of Ottoman danger.<sup>69</sup>

On 18<sup>th</sup> September 1439, Pope Eugene IV wrote to Fantin Valaresson, archbishop of Crete, informing him that a legate was being sent to the island. The Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, who had signed the act of Union, informed the faithful of Candia of this on 14<sup>th</sup> June 1440.<sup>70</sup> In

1452, Marco Paulopoulos, a sincere proponent of the Union, was elected protopapas by the regimen of Crete after a bitter argument that lasted four days; at the first vote he lost 46 to 53.<sup>71</sup> In 1458-1459, the friar Simon of Candia, former plenipotentiary of the Byzantine emperor in meetings with the pope in 1434-1435, was charged to publish in Crete the apostolic constitution which urged the Greek clergy to add the *Filioque* to the Creed. After 1452, Isidor of Kiev, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, multiplied his efforts to help Uniate propaganda in Negroponte and Crete. Cardinal Bessarion, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople from 1463, founded in Crete a religious house to train 16 Catholic priests of Greek rite, able to teach the Roman doctrines and from whom the protopapas would be chosen. On 30<sup>th</sup> March 1461, the Venetian senators recommended to the pope a certain priest, Jean Plusiadinos, and his twelve companions, who had become Catholics the moment the Union was proclaimed, and who, for this reason, were molested by the schismatics. On 27<sup>th</sup> June, the Senate rewarded them with land close to Chania.

The fall of Constantinople and of Byzantine Morea had important repercussions on Crete and other territories dependant on Venice. A great number of refugees arrived on the island. The influx of Greeks to Crete relates to the revolts of 1452-1453; among the condemned were eight priests and two monks. The Council of Ten blamed the Greek priests for the start of the rebellion on 13<sup>th</sup> November 1454, stopping all ordinations for the next five years, and ordering the expulsion of schismatic priests not native to the island. On 27<sup>th</sup> February 1458, the Council of Ten asked the duke of Crete to expel a hierodeacon from Constantinople who was preaching the Greek faith and advising against the Union. Curiously enough the same deacon was denounced by the Protopsaltis Pierro Gavalla - a coreligionist, one could say - who went to Venice afterwards and even collected a reward.

The Venetian authorities tried several approaches to make their domination more bearable, such as winning over the Greek clergy or at least assuring their neutrality, and seeking a better relation with the local aristocracy.<sup>72</sup> With the passing of time, the attitude of a large number of Greeks was more and more favorable to the Republic.<sup>73</sup> Sources from the sixteenth century note with satisfaction that Greeks and Latins frequented each others' churches, which had not been the case in the past. Latin attendance at Greek churches was considered beneficial because, by showing support for Orthodoxy, the Latins could win the trust of Greeks, and thus state officials were urged to attend Orthodox churches as often as

possible. Latin clergy were not allowed to use their pulpits to speak against the Orthodox faith. The case of Leonardo Dellaporta is recorded, a poet probably of Italian descent, but who declared himself to be Orthodox.<sup>74</sup>

Christian Orthodoxy existed in Venetian Crete in a peculiarly truncated form: while the church hierarchy was entirely absent, monasteries and the lesser clergy were allowed to survive and in later centuries the former even flourished.<sup>75</sup> The state controlled the election of the protopapas and the protopsaltis. Monks and clergy from places under Ottoman occupation were sometimes welcomed. A decision on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1334 limited access to Crete for Greek refugee monks, because of their well known anti-Latin feeling.<sup>76</sup> Another decision on 10<sup>th</sup> January 1408 decided to limit the number of monks and priests on Corfu. Only dead monks and priests could be replaced, for fear that otherwise “everybody” would embrace the religious vocation, and thus devotion to Catholicism would suffer.<sup>77</sup> On Negroponte, the number of clergy increased because of tax exemption.<sup>78</sup>

Venice allowed the existence of Greek rite churches on the island, and by the seventeenth century there were over a hundred in Candia, compared to twenty Catholic ones (which tended to be more opulent).<sup>79</sup> The monasteries experienced a period of economic and intellectual revival, beginning in the mid-sixteenth century, and Crete began to produce so many capable abbots that Saint Catherine’s at Sinai in Egypt was effectively run by Cretans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>80</sup> Some people adapted; such was the case of the monks of Mount Sinai, who owned estates on Crete (especially in the region of Candia) and once recognized by the Roman pontiff enjoyed all the advantages of the Latin clergy.<sup>81</sup> At the moment of the Venetian conquest, the doge Pietro Ziani increased Sinai’s properties and exempted it from taxation. In 1376, tax collectors wanted to levy tax on the monks’ vineyards; after addressing the Senate, they were reminded about the monks’ privileges.<sup>82</sup>

The Orthodox monasteries in Cyprus suffered different fates, with some taken over by the Latins (Benedictines or Augustinian canons) while others continued to exist but had to give up some of their land to the newly established church. The establishment of a Latin church in Cyprus led to the impoverishment of the Greek church as the flight of Byzantine nobility deprived the Greek establishments of future endowments. St Neophytos condemns the Latin presence on the island in several writings, but not always in a harsh tone, testimony to the importance of monasticism in preserving the Greek rite.<sup>83</sup>

Nevertheless, in 1214, the same Neophytos appointed King Hugh I of Cyprus a custodian (epitropos) of his monastery (Engleistra). The main beneficiaries of the despoliation of the Orthodox Church in Cyprus were the crown and the nobility, and not the Latin Church. This action was fought by the Latin churches in the East, while the papacy, through the protection it extended to the Orthodox monasteries in the Holy Land and Sinai, which had dependencies on Cyprus, indirectly prevented further expropriation of Orthodox property by the crown and the nobility.<sup>84</sup>

Assessing the situation of the Orthodox in Cyprus, one can observe that the Latin Church was most successful where its interests coincided with those of the crown and the nobility. Where these interests conflicted, the terms of the agreements were imperfectly applied among the recalcitrant Greeks, as the papacy and the local Latin Church lacked the means to implement them. Coureas sees the Latin monastic orders as having little impact on the Orthodox of Cyprus due to several factors: the Premonstratensians and the Benedictines established themselves in houses formerly belonging to the Eastern Rite communities, which must have provoked resentment among the Greek population and the local clergy. The contemplative observance of the Latin monastic communities established in the countryside, which avoided pastoral duties, prevented the development of further contacts with the Orthodox. The mendicant communities which undertook pastoral duties were mostly active in the towns of Cyprus, where few Orthodox lived. The opulence of some of their establishments must have alienated (but maybe also attracted) many Greeks, as they contrasted with the poverty to which most of their clergy had been reduced.<sup>85</sup>

Church architecture can also provide important evidence regarding the cult and ritual. Crete harbors a number of important ecclesiastical buildings, from the Late Middle Ages to Early Modern times.<sup>86</sup> Celebrations held in common were part of the policy of rapprochement and proselytizing practiced by the Latin Church toward the Easterners. There is also information on Latin clergy celebrating in Eastern rite churches: *Missam in ecclesia audiverunt, ubi ex alia parte altaris, quod in temple medio erectum est, graecum itidem sacrum celebrabatur*,<sup>87</sup> and also on celebrations where faithful of both rites would take part because of the importance of a certain saint or icon at the local level (such is the case of the Messopanditissa icon<sup>88</sup>). A note which Pietro Pisani, bishop of Sitia and Ieràpetra, sent to the Pope, says that in the cathedral of Ieràpetra there were three altars, one of them used by a *papa Greco*.<sup>89</sup> This altar was a

permanent one and the *papa Greco* celebrated according to the Greek rite, which was (in the circumstances) the Uniate rite.

I wish to remind the reader here that at first, the rite remained unchanged in all Uniate churches, pre- or post-Tridentine. Thus, a church in a position of inter-communion with the Roman Church, namely the Uniate Church, used the Greek rite (such a church becomes a community labeled by the rite it practices); and another Church using the same rite as the Uniates, but in a position of extra-communion with the Roman Church. The fundamental problem here is where to draw the line between inter- and extra-communion.

I believe that this line is considerably blurred and that no decisive answer can be given. It is helpful to observe both church and monastic architecture in Venetian Crete to get an idea of where the existence of two rites in the same territory led. The Cretan landscape is dotted with a very awkward type of structure, the double church.

The oldest version of this kind of church goes back to the end of the fourteenth century.<sup>90</sup> Churches with two naves, one larger and higher than the other, typically asymmetrical on the outside, were built up to the end of the first half of the fifteenth century.<sup>91</sup> From the second half of the fifteenth century, the churches were built with two parallel and equivalent naves; these are the cases that truly deserve to be named double churches.<sup>92</sup> The oldest type is represented by churches built by adding a second nave to an older single-naved church, usually by opening up the Southern wall of the original building. The double churches have a sanctuary with two separate rooms (the case of Roustika, see fig. 1). Though there are some differences in the building plan, one can see that the builders strove for a certain symmetry and equivalence between the two parts that make up the double church. That this architectural model continued to be used during the Venetian regime shows that this was not a conjectural solution but the projection of a precise plan. Olga Gratziou concludes that besides providing room for two different religious communities, this type of a church visually displayed the equivalence of the two confessions,<sup>93</sup> especially since the church was also dedicated to two saints.

Apropos of architectural peculiarities in transitional regions, I point here to a case from the Hungarian kingdom. In Transylvania, the three canonized Hungarian kings (Stephen, Emeric, and Ladislas) frequently appear in the mural paintings of Eastern Rite churches (such as Ribița, Crișcior or Chimindia, see fig. 2) dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The monastery/church of Cuhea, in Maramureș had the Holy

Hungarian king Stephen as a patron, in a time and region where the sources place only Vlachs (the Bogdănești, or descendants of Sas, loyal subjects of the Hungarian king, had one of their foundations, the St Michael monastery in Peri, submitted directly to the Patriarch in Constantinople).

This peculiarity, which contradicted the canons, has been seen either as a tribute by local Orthodox feudal lords to the Hungarian state, or as an error.<sup>94</sup> Neither argument is easily defensible, especially since we know very little about the organization, jurisdiction and hierarchy of the Orthodox in Maramureș. Radu Popa also indirectly observes the difficulty of making face value statements or interpretations, as the region was at the far periphery of the Orthodox world, where the canons of the Oriental rite were deviational enough.<sup>95</sup>

Returning to the Cretan landscape, it is worth mentioning that only recently have the double churches been interpreted as being used by the two rites, for two reasons. The architectural type of the double church was also in use in the nineteenth century, when the problem of two confessions no longer obtained. The churches built at this later date express neo-Hellenic architectural eclecticism, which in Crete took on a strong neo-Venetian character, also found in civil architecture.<sup>96</sup> Also, Gerola in his *Monumenti Veneti nell'isola di Creta* failed to see the relation between the double church and the needs of two religious communities.

Building churches with spaces destined for the use of two communities became a tool of mission used by monastic groups in both traditions. Such is the case of the Franciscans, active on the island. In 1626, the church of Christ the Savior, used by the Orthodox, was claimed by the Catholic community in Ieràpetra. A Franciscan monk built a chapel adjoining the church in question, and communicating with it. This chapel was used for the Mass, and resolved the dispute between the two communities of rite.<sup>97</sup> The monasteries of Saint Anthony at Neapoli, and of Saints Demetrius and Nestorius at Katochori Kidonias, also show attempts by the Franciscans to draw the Orthodox to their churches by providing services according to the Greek rite at separate altars. Monasteries of Basilian Eastern rule monks provide a similar example, as in the case of Saint Anthony at Vrondisi, or the famous monastery at Arkadi. The objectives were to attract the faithful of both traditions, increase income and enhance the social prestige of the monastery. It could also be, as in the case of the churches, testimony to a *de facto* situation which had already been going on for four hundred years. The success of the double churches can be linked to the Union signed at the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Olga Gratziou interprets the



use of distinct spaces in the same church as a proof of the failure of the Church Union.<sup>98</sup> I believe this is far-fetched. The use of different spaces is a proof of the existence of two communities differentiated through rituals, but it is not conclusive regarding the Union. The problem here revolves again around what the concept of Church Union denotes throughout the period in question.

The religious policy carefully constructed by the Venetian Senate was not restrained by *a priori* constructed schemes of an absolute character. Policy was determined by the local conditions to be dealt with, by the international conditions, and by different Roman Catholic perspectives (alternating from the desire for reconciliation with the Eastern Church, to a more canonical stance).<sup>99</sup> The Venetian state reduced relations between the Latin and Greek churches to the difference of rite. Not much interest was shown in theological questions; obedience to the pope, which the Latins demanded of the Orthodox bishops and clergy, was not overvalued.<sup>100</sup>

Unlike anywhere else in Western Europe, Venetian law in Crete allowed for the possibility that a child's judicial status could be determined by his father's; if a son could prove that his father was a Latin, even if his mother was a slave, he was declared free because Latins could not be enslaved. Whatever the reason for this innovation, peculiar to Crete, it raises the possibility that the Cretans were accustomed to think in terms of a "public religion" (Latin Christianity), traced through the male line, which brought certain benefits, and a "private religion" (Orthodox Christianity), maintained by the women of the family.<sup>101</sup>

Starting in the thirteenth century, the polarization of religious relations between Orthodox and Latins was symptomatic of polarization in a wider context. Coureas sees the thirteenth century as the most polarized period in Cypriote history, with great rifts (national, spatial, economic and social) appearing in all aspects of life on the island as the two communities spoke different languages and used different liturgical languages. The Latins were mostly predominant in towns, while the Greeks lived in the countryside; economically the Latins were consumers and middlemen and constituted the high echelons of nobility, while the Greeks were primarily farmers/peasants. This polarization lasted at least until the war with Genoa in 1374, after which one can witness an improvement in the legal status of the peasants and an increasing number of Orthodox town dwellers who achieved high office.<sup>102</sup> The standard of education in Orthodox schools, if they existed at all, was very low, and in Cyprus Greeks would attend Latin

schools if possible. Tăutu stated that the lack or poor quality of education for the Greek rite clergy go some way to explain the decadence of the institutions of the Eastern Church. The feudal lords forbade the sons of cultivators and serfs to go to schools. Institutions suffered thereby from a lack of suitable candidates.<sup>103</sup>

The coexistence of the two “confessions” on Cyprus, dating from the end of the twelfth century, was backed up by the formal acknowledgement under archbishop Germanos of both papal supremacy and the Latin hierarchy on the island; this led to some steps in bringing the members of the two communities closer, but also exacerbated the differences between them. The actual impediment for a complete integration of the Greek Church was its Latin counterpart on the island. Throughout the Lusignan and Venetian periods, in the words of Coureas: *the Latin Church remained a richly endowed and highly resented intermediary between the Orthodox and the papacy, inadvertently keeping the two apart, until it was swept away by the Ottoman conquest of the island.*<sup>104</sup> The two communities of rite lived in a no more than formal union, which was not fully acknowledged, ensuring the survival of a separate Orthodox church on the island, formally subject to the Latin one, but in practice an impoverished and resentful rival. The lack of secular support, which further relaxed after the thirteenth century, doubled by the increased absenteeism among the Latin bishops, diminished what little authority the Latin Church held over the Greek one.

The general aim of comparison is not to apply theoretical models to historical reality, rather the other way around. The research on the Eastern rite communities has started from the available historical data and from a parallelism of contexts that has inexplicably not been perceived and exploited earlier. The theoretical approach has changed and been reevaluated several times during the empirical work. This was necessary as the primary sources regarding the entities compared are not homogenous and do not cover the same events or situations identically. The history of how the Christianities dealt with one another is still a matter of debate. Researching the situation in Crete and Cyprus, has led me to discover similar patterns that characterize transitional regions, patterns applicable to Transylvania proper, such as the non-residency of the Eastern Rite hierarchs (sometimes even of the Latins!), monasteries and/or persons from monastic milieus assuming the spiritual leadership of Eastern Rite communities, use of the same church/building for both rites, loose ecclesiastical control, failure of attempts to Latinize the Eastern Church, and, finally, the building

of pre-confessional identities based on the use of liturgical languages and of every-day idioms.

Any story has a counter story. This becomes more obvious when we consider the consequences for relations between the two traditional churches, which originally shared the same openness for reunion.<sup>105</sup> Fedalto suspects that the prolonged situation in the Levant only contributed to the persistence and aggravation of the schism between East and West. The delicate equilibrium in relations between the two churches was very much undermined and tested by the continuous presence of the Venetians, a presence which was probably fundamental to the ensuing disharmony, which (enhanced by the concomitant evolution of the Roman canon law) lead to the radicalization of ideological positions in the two Christianities, and to the build-up of an alterity only ready to abide by the confessional approach which, starting especially from the end of the sixteenth century became established in the Eastern church.<sup>106</sup>



Figure 1



Figure 2

## NOTES

- 1 See N. Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312*, Ashgate, 1997 (hereafter Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*); P. Edbury, "Latin Dioceses and Peristerona: a Contribution to the Topography of Lusignan Cyprus", in *Kingdoms of the Crusaders. From Jerusalem to Cyprus*, Ashgate Variorum, Aldershot, 1999, 45-51 (hereafter Edbury, *Latin Dioceses*); B. N. Florija, "Les monastères placés sous le patronage des laïcs en Pologne médiévale et en Russie", in J.-L. Lemaître, M. Dmitriev, P. Gonneau (eds.), *Moines et monastères dans les sociétés de rite grec et latin*, DROZ, 1996, 419-433; B. A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform. The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998, 43-58; B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States. The Secular Church*, Variorum Publications Ltd., London, 1980; P. Lock, *The Franks in the Aegean, 1204-1500*, Longman, London and New York, 1995; A. Luttrell, *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West, 1291-1440*, Variorum Reprint, London, 1978.
- 2 M. Angold, *The Fourth Crusade. Event and Context*, Pearson Longman, Harlow, 2003.
- 3 D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: two worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance: studies in ecclesiastical and cultural history*, Archon Books, Hamden, CT, 1976; G. Alberigo, *Christian Unity: the council of Ferrara/Florence 1438/9-1989*, Peeters, Leuven, 1991.
- 4 R. Po-chia Hsia, *The world of Catholic renewal, 1540-1770*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- 5 A. A. Rusu, "Bisericile românești din Transilvania și Ungaria în secolul al XV-lea" (The Romanian churches of Transylvania and Hungary in the fifteenth century), in *Medievalia Transilvanica* 1, 1-2, 1997, 11-26.
- 6 For a general overview see W. Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, Routledge, London and New York, 2003 (hereafter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy*); J. L. Boojamra, *Church Reform in the Late Byzantine Empire. A study for the Patriarchate of Athanasios of Constantinople*, Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, Thessaloniki, 1983; J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990, 184-294.
- 7 For an overview of this period see K. M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)*, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, vol. 1, 1976.
- 8 Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy*, 305.
- 9 R. Taft, "At the Sunset of the Empire: The Formation of the Final Byzantine Liturgical Synthesis in the Patriarchate of Constantinople", paper presented at the International Colloquium: *Le Patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople aux XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles - rupture et continuité*, Rome, 5-7 December 2005.

- <sup>10</sup> V. Peri, *Orientalis Varietas. Roma e la Chiesa d'Oriente*, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Roma, 1994, 141.
- <sup>11</sup> M. Diaconescu, "Les implications confessionnelles du Concile de Florence en Hongrie," in *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 1, 1-2, 1997, 29-62.
- <sup>12</sup> This is a highly debated concept, meaning: he to whom the region belongs, imposes the religion. It was the terminology used in the Peace of Augsburg, embodied in the treaty signed in 1555 between the forces of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V and those of the Schmalkaldic League, determining the religious makeup of Germany in a compromise between Lutherans and Catholics.
- <sup>13</sup> See J. Gaudemet, *Droit de l'Église et vie sociale au Moyen Age*, Variorum Reprints, Northampton, 1989; W. Ullmann, *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages*, Methuen&Co Limited, London, 1966.
- <sup>14</sup> M. R. Menocal, *The ornament of the world: how Muslims, Jews, and Christians created a culture of tolerance in Medieval Spain*, Little Brown, Boston, 2002.
- <sup>15</sup> M. Greene, *A Shared World: Christians and Muslims in the Early Mediterranean World*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2000 (hereafter Greene, *A Shared World*); S. McKee, *Uncommon Dominion: Venetian Crete and the Myth of Ethnic Purity*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 2000; V. Peri, "Modelli storici della convivenza nell'Italia meridionale", in *Kanon*, 12, 1994, 8-17.
- <sup>16</sup> J. France, *The Crusades and the Expansion of Catholic Christendom 1000-1714*, Routledge, New York, 2005.
- <sup>17</sup> C. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 2008.
- <sup>18</sup> I. M. Damian, "The Greek Rite Transylvanian Church in the 1450s: Archbishop John of Caffa and the Crusade in East-Central Europe", in A. Dumitran, L. Mádly, A. Simon (eds.), *Extincta est lucerna orbis: John Hunyadi and his Time*, Center for Transylvanian Studies, Cluj-Napoca, 2009, 143-153.
- <sup>19</sup> G. D. Papatomas, "La relation oppositionnelle entre Église établie localement et Diaspora ecclésiale (L'unité ecclésiologique face à la co-territorialité et à la multi-jurisdiction)", in *Contacts* 57, 4-5, 2005, 96-132; "Au temps de la Post-Ecclésiologie (La naissance de la modernité post-ecclésiologique : De l'Église Une aux nombreuses Églises, et donc De la dispersion de l'Église à l'anéantissement du Corps du Christ)", in *Kanon*, 19, 2006, 3-21.
- <sup>20</sup> G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*, S.P.C.K., London, 1962, 177-194.
- <sup>21</sup> H.-G. Haupt, "Comparative Method – a Contested Method", in *Historik Tidskrift*, 127, 2007 (hereafter, Haupt, *Comparative Method*).
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*.

- 23 M. Bloch, "A contribution towards a comparative history of European  
Societies", in *Land and Work in Medieval Europe*, Harper Torchbooks, New  
York, 1967, 44 (hereafter Bloch, *A contribution*).
- 24 Among other risks of the method are forced analogies, fabrications, arbitrarily  
postulated parallelisms needed to prove such and such development, or the  
equivocal aspect of the terms chosen for comparison.
- 25 Bloch, *A contribution*, 58.
- 26 *Ibidem*, 45.
- 27 Haupt, *Comparative Method*.
- 28 Antoon van den Braembussche shows that there are several types of  
comparison: contrasting, generalizing, macrocausal, inclusive and  
universalizing comparison, with the immediate effect that the choice of  
type of comparison determines a specific argumentation and evaluation of  
the particularities of the entities researched. See A. van den Braembussche,  
"Historical explanation and comparative method: towards a theory of the  
history of society", in *History and Theory*, 28, 1989, 2-24.
- 29 Bloch, *A contribution*, 47.
- 30 A. Hess, *The Forgotten Frontier: A History of the Sixteenth Century Ibero-  
African Frontier*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1978.
- 31 G. Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente. Documenti Veneziani*, Casa Editrice  
Mazziana, Verona, 1978, vol. 3 , 5 (hereafter Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in  
Oriente*).
- 32 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 17.
- 33 F. Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne au Moyen Age: Le développement et  
l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII-XV siècles)*, Éditions E. de  
Boccard, Paris, 1959, 284 (hereafter Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*).
- 34 There seem to have been six other bishoprics on the island: Agia (Canea),  
Calamone (Rettimo), Ario, Milipotamo, Arkhadia-Gortys, Hierapetra, nothing  
being certain about the seat of Sitis.
- 35 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 10.
- 36 Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 280.
- 37 *Ibidem*, 252.
- 38 Edbury, *Latin Dioceses*, 49.
- 39 Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 275.
- 40 J. Richard, "Une monastère grec du Palestine et son domaine chypriote: le  
monachisme orthodoxe et l'établissement de la domination franque", in  
*Praktika tou Defterou Diethnous Kypriologikou Synedriou*, Nicosia, vol. 2,  
1986, 61-75.
- 41 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 7.
- 42 *Ibidem*, 18-19.
- 43 C. Mertzios, "'H συνθήκη 'Ενετών-Καλλέργη'", in *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, vol. 3,  
1949, 262-275; also in Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 135.

- 44 F. Corner, *Creta sacra seu de episcopis utriusque ritus graeci et latini in insula Cretae*, Venice, vol 1, 1755, 211-3 (hereafter Corner, *Creta sacra*).
- 45 F. Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, Mouton&Co La Haye, Paris, vol. 1, 1958, 99 (from *Misti*, reg. 30, ff. 12v-13) (hereafter Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, vol. 1).
- 46 A. Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III (1216-1227) et Gregorii IX (1227-1241) e registris Vaticanis aliisque fontibus collegit*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Rome (Pontificia Commissio Ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis), vol. 3, 1950, 115-116 (hereafter Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III*).
- 47 Canon 9, Lateran IV (1215): *On different rites within the same faith*. Since in many places peoples of different languages live within the same city or diocese, having one faith but different rites and customs, we therefore strictly order bishops of such cities and dioceses to provide suitable men who will do the following in the various rites and languages: celebrate the divine services for them, administer the church's sacraments, and instruct them by word and example. We altogether forbid one and the same city or diocese to have more than one bishop, as if it were a body with several heads like a monster. But if for the aforesaid reasons urgent necessity demands it, the bishop of the place may appoint, after careful deliberation, a catholic bishop who is appropriate for the nations in question and who will be his vicar in the aforesaid matters and will be obedient and subject to him in all things. If any such a person behaves otherwise, let him know that he has been struck by the sword of excommunication and if he does not return to his senses let him be deposed from every ministry in the church, with the secular arm being called in if necessary to quell such great insolence. From N. P. Tanner SJ ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Sheed&Ward and Georgetown University Press, vol. 1, 1990, 239.
- 48 A. Tăutu, F. Delorme, *Acta Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio V ad Benedictum XI (1276-1304) e regestis Vaticanis aliisque fontibus collegerunt*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis Fontes, Rome (Pontificia Commissio Ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis), vol. 5/2, 1954, 195-199.
- 49 Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 311, note 208.
- 50 *Ibidem*, 313, note 210; Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, vol. 2, 178.
- 51 Thiriet, *La Roumanie Vénitienne*, 289.
- 52 Tăutu, *Acta Honorii III*, 115-116.
- 53 *Ibidem*, 145-146.
- 54 *Ibidem*, 115-116.
- 55 Institutionally, the protopapas (or rather archdeacon-archydiaconus in the sources) was also the leader of the Romanian priests in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Transylvania. See A. A. Rusu, "Preoți români ortodocși din districtul Hațegului în secolul al XV-lea" (Romanian Orthodox priests



- from the Hațeg district in the fifteenth century), in *Mitropolia Banatului* 32, 10-12, 1982, 644-653.
- 56 Corner, *Creta sacra*, vol. 2, 301, 304.
- 57 R. Predelli (ed.), *Regesti dei Commemoriali*, Deputazione veneta di storia patria, Venice, 8 vol., Venice, 1876-1914, document 44.
- 58 Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 289.
- 59 Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, vol. 1, 161 (from *Misti*, reg. 38, f. 86).
- 60 From *Archivio del Duca di Candia, Maggior Consiglio di Candia*, f. 144 (23 October 1360); quoted in Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 289, footnote 1.
- 61 Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, vol. 1, 147 (from *Misti*, reg. 36, f. 80).
- 62 *Ibidem*, vol. 1, 201 (from *Misti*, reg. 42, f. 160v).
- 63 Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 290.
- 64 *Ibidem*, 285.
- 65 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 13-15.
- 66 *Ibidem*, 20.
- 67 M. Manoussakas, "Recherches sur la vie de Jean Plousiadenos. Joseph de Méthone, 1429?-1500", in *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 18, 1959, 28-51.
- 68 R.-J. Loenertz, "Manuel Calecas, sa vie et ses oeuvres d'après ses lettres inédites" in *Arch. Praed*, 17, 1947, p. 195-207
- 69 Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 302.
- 70 *Ibidem*, 429.
- 71 *Ibidem*, 430.
- 72 *Ibidem*, 291.
- 73 *Ibidem*, 301; see also G. Fedalto, *Ricerche storiche sulla posizione giuridica ed ecclesiastica dei Greci a Venezia nei secoli XV e XVI*, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Florence, 1967, 34-43, 113-115.
- 74 Δινάρδος είναι τόνομα τό επίκλην Τελλαμπόρτας και χριστιανός ορθόδοξος και Κρητικός υπάρχω, in M. Manousakas, *Praktika of the Athenian Academy*, vol. 29, 1954, 34; quoted in Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénitienne*, 302, footnote 2.
- 75 Greene, *A Shared World*, 188.
- 76 Examples in Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 21.
- 77 F. Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, Mouton&Co La Haye, Paris, vol. 2, 1959, 75 (from *Misti*, reg. 47, f. 162v) (hereafter Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, vol. 2).
- 78 *Ibidem*, 151 (from *Misti*, reg. 51, ff. 182v, 183, 183v, 184).
- 79 Greene, *A Shared World*, 176.
- 80 *Ibidem*, 177, footnote 11.
- 81 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 21.

- 82 Thiriet, *Régestes des Délibérations du Sénat de Venise*, vol. 1, 147 (from *Misti*, reg. 36, f. 58).
- 83 Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 253.
- 84 *Ibidem*, 258.
- 85 *Ibidem*, 247.
- 86 See G. Gerola, *Monumenti Veneti nell' isola di Creta*, Venice, 4 vol., 1905-1932 (hereafter Gerola, *Monumenti Veneti*); K. Gallas, K. Wessel, M. Borboudakis, *Byzantinisches Kreta*, Hirmer Verlag, Munich, 1983.
- 87 Gerola, *Monumenti Veneti*, vol. 2, 1908, 13, note 22.
- 88 A. Papadaki, *Cerimonie religiose e laiche nell' isola di Creta durante il dominio veneziano*, Spoleto, 2005, 148.
- 89 Maria Mondelou, "Όψεις της καθολικής εκκλησίας στη Σητεία και την Ιεράπετρα μέσα από την έκθεση του επικόπου Pietro Pisani (1630)" (Aspects of the Catholic Church of Sitia and Ierapetra in the report of the bishop Pietro Pisani), *Acts of the ninth international congress of Cretan studies*, Iraklio, 2004, vol. 2/1, 307, in O. Gratziou, "Evidenziare la diversità: chiese doppie nella Creta veneziana", in C. Maltezos, A. Tzavara, D. Vlassi (eds.), *I Greci durante la venetocrazia: Uomini, spazio, idee (XIII-XVIII sec.)*, Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, Venice, 2009, 758, footnote 5 (hereafter Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità*).
- 90 Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità* Gratziou, 759.
- 91 There are five churches still extant, all in central Crete (Panaghia in Kastri, Milopòtamo, the remains of the church of Saint Michael the Archangel at Axos, the first phase of the church of the Panaghia at Merona-Amari, the second phase of the church of the Panaghia at Valsamonero, and the church of Saint Haralambos at Paliama-Valsamonero).
- 92 Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità*, 759.
- 93 *Ibidem*, 760.
- 94 S. Dragomir, "Vechile biserici din Zarand și ctitorii lor" (The Old Churches of Zarand and their founders), in *Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice. Secția Transilvania (ACMIT)*, 1929, 235.
- 95 R. Popa, "The Stone Church of Cuhea and some issues concerning the 14<sup>th</sup> century history of Maramureș", in *La începuturile Evului Mediu Românesc*, Ed. Altip, Alba Iulia, 2008, 31.
- 96 Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità*, 761.
- 97 A. Stouraiti (ed.), *La Grecia nelle raccolte della Fondazione Querini Stampalia*, Venice, 2000, 25, 249-251; quoted in Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità*, 762, footnote 13.
- 98 Gratziou, *Evidenziare la diversità* Gratziou, 763.
- 99 Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 10.
- 100 *Ibidem*, 11, 20.

- <sup>101</sup> Sally McKee, "Greek women in Latin households of Fourteenth Century Venetian Crete", *Journal of Medieval History*, 19, 1993, 237.
- <sup>102</sup> Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 310.
- <sup>103</sup> A. Tăutu, F. Delorme, *Acta Clementis V (1305-1314) e regestis Vaticanis aliisque fontibus collegerunt*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Rome (Pontificia Commissio Ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis), vol. 7/1, 1955, 11, footnote 4.
- <sup>104</sup> Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, 317.
- <sup>105</sup> M.-H. Blanchet, "La question de l'Union des Églises (13e-15e siècle): historiographie et perspectives", in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 61, 2003, 5-48.
- <sup>106</sup> Fedalto, *La Chiesa Latina in Oriente*, 23.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achim, V., "Ortodoxie și Catolicism în Țările Române. Ordinul Franciscan în Țările Române în secolele XIV-XV. Aspectele teritoriale" (Orthodoxy and Catholicism in the Romanian Principalities. The Franciscan order in the Romanian Principalities in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. Territorial aspects), in *Revista Istorică*, 7, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "La féodalité roumaine du royaume de Hongrie entre orthodoxie et catholicisme. Le cas du Banat", in *Colloquia* 1, no. 2, 1994.
- Alberigo, G. ed., *Christian Unity. The Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438/39-1989*, Leuven University Press, 1991.
- Angold, M., *The Fourth Crusade. Event and Context*, Pearson Longman, Harlow, 2003.
- Arbel, B., B. Hamilton, D. Jacoby, *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Frank Cass, London, 1989.
- Bloch, M., "Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes", in *Revue de synthèse historique*, 46, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Contribution towards a Comparative History of European Societies", in *Land and Work in Medieval Europe*.
- Cohen, D., "Comparative History: Buyer Beware", in *Comparison and History. Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, Routledge, New York, 2004.
- Conrad, C., "National historiography as a transnational object", in *Representations of the Past: the Writing of National Histories in Europe*, 1, 2004.
- Coureas, P., *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 1997.
- Delacroix-Besnier, C., *Les dominicains et la chrétienté greque aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, Ecole française de Rome, 1997.
- Diaconescu, M., "Les implications confessionnelles du Concile de Florence en Hongrie", in *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 1, no.1-2, 1997.
- Dragomir, S., "Cei mai vechi protopopi români" (The Oldest Romanian Protopresbyters), *Revista Teologică* 5, no. 19-20, 1911.
- Dumitran, A., *Religie ortodoxă-religie reformată. Ipostaze ale identității confesionale a românilor din Transilvania în secolele XVI-XVII* (Orthodox religion-reformed religion. Hypostases of the confessional identity of the Romanians from Transylvania in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries), Editura Nereamia Napocae, Cluj-Napoca, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Titlul de vladică și semnificațiile sale în lumea românească medievală" (The Title of vladica and its significance in the medieval Romanian world), in *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 1, no.1-2, 1997.
- Espagne, M., "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle", *Genève*, 17, 1994.
- Fedalto, G., *Ricerche Storiche sulla posizione giuridica ed ecclesiastica dei Greci a Venezia nei secoli XV e XVI*, Olschki, Florence, 1967.

- Fügedi, E., "Hungarian Bishops in the Fifteenth Century (Some Statistical Observations)", In *Kings, Bishops, Nobles and Burghers in Medieval Hungary*, Variorum Reprints, London, 1986.
- Geanakoplos, D. J., *Byzantine East and Latin West: two worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance: studies in ecclesiastical and cultural history*, Archon Books, Hamden, CT, 1976.
- Hamilton, B., *The Latin Church in the Crusader States. The Secular Church*, Variorum Publications Ltd., London, 1980.
- Housley, N., *The Later Crusades, 1274-1580. From Lyons to Alcazar*, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Hsia, R. P., *The world of Catholic renewal, 1540-1770*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hussey, J.M., *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.
- Haupt, H.-G. and J. Kocka, "Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems", in *Comparison and History. Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, Routledge, New York, 2004.
- Iorga, N., *Sate și preoți din Ardeal* (Villages and priests from Transylvania), Bucharest, 1902.
- Kocka, J., "Comparison and Beyond", in *History and Theory*, 42, 2003.
- Lock, P., *The Franks in the Aegean, 1204-1500*, Longman, London and New York, 1995.
- Lukács, A., *Țara Făgărașului în Evul Mediu (secolele XIII- XVI)* (The Country of Făgăraș in the Middle Ages), Editura Enciclopedică, București, 1999.
- Lupușă, Șt., "Biserica Ortodoxă Română din Ardeal și Ungaria în veacul XV" (The Romanian Orthodox Church of Transylvania and Hungary in the fifteenth century), in *Mitropolia Ardealului* 1, no. 3-4, 1956; 2, no. 3-4, 1957; 3, no. 1-2, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Catolicismul și românii din Ardeal și Ungaria până la anul 1556*, Cernăuți: 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Istoria bisericească a românilor ardeleni* (The Church History of Transylvanian Romanians), Sibiu, 1918.
- Luttrell, A., *The Hospitaller State on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306-1462*", Ashgate, Aldershot, 1999.
- Molly, G., *A Shared World. Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Papathomas, G. D., *Au temps de la Post-Ecclésiologie* (La naissance de la modernité post-ecclésiologique : De l'Église Une aux nombreuses Églises, et donc De la dispersion de l'Église à l'anéantissement du Corps du Christ), MS.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "La relation oppositionnelle entre Église établie localement et <Diaspora> ecclésiologique (L'unité ecclésiologique face à la co-territorialité et à la multi-jurisdiction)", in *Contacts* 57, 4-5, 2005.

- Păcurariu, M., *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române* (The History of the Romanian Orthodox Church), Vol. 1, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucharest, 1992.
- Pâclișanu, Z., "În jurul ierarhiei românilor ardeleni în secolul XV" (About the hierarchy of the Transylvanian Romanians in the fifteenth century), in *Revista Istorică Română* 13, no. 2, 1943.
- Peri, V., *Orientalis Varietas. Roma e la Chiese d'Oriente – Storia e Diritto canonico*, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Chiesa Romana e <Rito> Greco. G. A. Santoro e la Congregazione dei Greci (1566-1596)*, Paideia Editrice, Brescia, 1975.
- Ragin, C., *The Comparative Method*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989.
- Rusu, A. A., G. P. Hurezan, *Biserici medievale din județul Arad* (Medieval churches from Arad county), Arad, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ioan de Hunedoara și români din vremea lui* (John of Hunedoara and the Romanians of his time), Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Nobilimea românească și biserica în secolul al XV-lea (exemplul hațegan)" (The Romanian nobility and the church in the fifteenth century - the example of Hațeg), in *Nobilimea românească din Transilvania* (The Romanian nobility of Transylvania), Satu Mare, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ctitori și biserici din Țara Hațegului până la 1700* (Ctitors and churches from the Hațeg region up to 1700), Satu Mare, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Bisericile românești din Transilvania și Ungaria în secolul al XV-lea" (The Romanian churches of Transylvania and Hungary in the sixteenth century), in *Mediaevalia Transilvanica* 1, no.1-2, 1997.
- Sartori, G., "Comparing, Microcomparing and the Comparative Method", in *Comparing Nations: Concepts, Strategies, Substance*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK, 1994.
- Stokes, G., "The Fates of Human Societies: A reviews of recent macrohistorics", in *American Historical Review*, 106, 2001.
- Tăutu, A. "Griechische Klöster im mittelalterlichen Ungarn", in *Acta Historica* 4, 1965.
- Thiriet, F., *La Romanie Vénitienne au Moyen Age: Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII-XV siècles)*, Éditions E. de Boccard, Paris, 1959.
- Werner, M. and B. Zimmermann, "Penser l'histoire croisée: entre empirie et réflexité", in *Annales HSS*, 2003.