

A Portrait of a Penitent

By

Ana Šilović

Submitted to
Central European University
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Advisor: Professor Matthias Riedl

Second Reader: Professor Tijana Krstić

Budapest, Hungary

2010

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

Marko Antun De Dominis (Marcus Antonius de Dominis), Bishop of Senj (*Segna*), Archbishop of Split (*Spalato*), *primas* of the kingdoms of Croatia and Dalmatia made his life fascinating to the posterity not only by his elaborated ideas on the scope of the papal power and Church organization, but, even more, with his deflection from Rome to England 1616 and with his subsequent return to the Roman Catholicism in 1622. The text which he wrote after returning to Rome is the object of this study.

The text, titled “ *The Second Manifesto of Marcus Antonius De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato; wherein for his better satisfaction, and the satisfaction of others, he publicly repents, and recounts his former errors, and sets down the cause of his leaving England, and all Protestant Countries, to return unto the Catholic Church*” (*Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit Romae*) belongs to the genre of conversion or confession narrative. The main characteristic of this genre is refuting sins of a convert and affirming his newly found true faith. Besides abjuring his sins and heresies, and affirming Roman Catholicism, Marko Antund de Dominis also developed argumentation to diminish the seriousness of his transgressions, and to fashion an image of himself as an old and sick man, of considerable erudition and experience, willing to serve the Roman Catholic Church the best he could.

The thesis also shows that the genre of conversion and confession narratives serves not only as a source for studying religious and conversion issues of a chosen time and society but also as a source for studying values appreciated in that society and desirable qualities of a useful member of that group.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
1.1. Presentation of the Case.....	5
1.2. Thesis statements.....	8
1.3. Presentation of the Source.....	8
1.3.1. Motives for writing the Manifestos.....	8
1.3.2. Short Overview of the Second Manifesto.....	11
1.4. Theoretical considerations.....	13
2. Marko Antun de Dominis and His Time.....	18
2.1. Contextualization Via His Life.....	18
2.1.1. Early Years.....	18
2.1.2. Bishop of Senj and International Diplomat.....	20
2.1.3. Reasons for Leaving Academic Life.....	23
2.1.4. From Archbishop to Renegade.....	25
2.1.5. Years in England and Return to Rome.....	27
2.2. Ideas of De Dominis in Their Historical Context	32
2.2.1. Venetian Interdict (1606-1607).....	32
2.2.2. Ecumenical Promise: James I and the Church of England.....	36
2.2.3. European Irenic Movement.....	37
2.2.4. Echos of the Irenic Movement in The Republic of St. Marc	39
3. Strategies of Repentance or Constructing penitent self.....	43
3.1. Positioning the Problem.....	43
3.2. Sinner as a Mad Man.....	46
3.3. One and the Only Church.....	50
3.4. Different Shades of Gray.....	52
3.5. Conclusion.....	59
4. Scholar, servant, saved?.....	61
4.1. "I reject, detest and accurse all the aforesaid errors, and all other opinions whatsoever..."	61
4.2. Biblical Pictures Evoked.....	65
4.3. Knowledge as an Asset.....	68
4.4. Layers of Identity.....	71
4.5. The audience.....	72
4.6. Conclusion.....	73
5. Conclusion: The Second Manifesto: Before and After.....	75
6. Bibliography.....	78
6.1. Primary sources.....	78
6.2. Secondary Sources.....	78

1. Introduction

1.1. Presentation of the Case

It caused a no small sensation when, in 1616, Marko Antun De Dominis (Marcus Antonius de Dominis), Bishop of Senj (*Segna*), Archbishop of Split (*Spalato*), *primas* of the kingdoms of Croatia and Dalmatia, left the territory of the Catholic Republic of Venice and went to Anglican and Protestant England. Being a scholar, scientist of some renown, theologian, but above all, a highly positioned Catholic official, he was considered a worthy addition to the Reformation cause by his English and other Protestant contemporaries. Yet, when after spending six years in England, he decided to come back to Rome, it caused disbelief and great opprobrium. It was not only his contemporaries who left written accounts and opinions about de Dominis' travels; he himself, accompanied his deflection to England and his return to Rome with texts in which the Archbishop gave his reasons and motives for the afore said journeys.

The first text, entitled *A manifestation of the motives whereupon the most reuerend father Marcvs Antonivs de Dominis, archibishop of Spalato (in the Territorie of Venice) vndertooke his departure thence (Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archiepiscopus Spalatensis, suae profectionis consilium exponit)* de Dominis wrote in order to present himself, his work, his opinions and his reasons for leaving Rome. However, the second text, written shortly after his return to Rome provoked an intense reaction on the behalf of the contemporaries.

“This may seem a small worke, good Reader for so great scandal as has been given by the Author” wrote the contemporary English translator of the, originally Latin, text which Mark Antun de Dominis wrote in order to present his reasons for coming back into the Roman Catholic Church and to justify himself. The title was “ *The Second Manifesto of Marcus Antonius De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato; wherein for his better satisfaction,*

and the satisfaction of others, he publicly repents, and recounts his former errors, and sets down the cause of his leaving England, and all Protestant Countries, to return unto the Catholic Church" (*"Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit Romae"*). It required no small amount of courage to come back to Rome, and ask for pardon, which this Second Manifesto was. It is this text, the Second Manifesto by Marko Antun de Dominis, which is the primary source for the following thesis. The peculiarity of the Second Manifesto is that it belongs to the genre of conversion narratives, and such texts give an opportunity to observe not only modes of conversion but also how manipulative these texts were. Thus, I will try to explore his manipulations with the content of his manifesto in the context of contemporary practices of conversion or confession narratives. Furthermore, the thesis will try to explain how such text can be constructed and how it can be used in order for the author to fashion certain image of himself.

The early modern period was the era where conversions were visible and easily available. From Catholicism to Protestantism, from Protestantism to Islam, from Judaism to Catholicism... all options were opened. Yet, in some cases stakes were too high; spending, in different periods, his life in Academia, diplomatic services and as a high church official, Marko Antun de Dominis was perfectly well aware where the final lines were and what crossing them meant. The further interest for this case study also dwells in the fact that de Dominis was aware of the consequences for his deflection; it will be interesting to see how he uses his knowledge and expertise in order to mitigate the possible outcomes of his return.

Furthermore, the Second Manifesto should be approached as a sort of re-conversion narrative. Many converts of the time were encouraged to write and publicly announce why they converted thus creating a specific genre within religious polemics and war for souls that was going on during 16th and 17th century. However, the problem would arise when a

convert would choose to come back to his or her original confession. Writing a re-conversion narrative was far more tricky than merely a conversion one. Faith and its manifestation through a "right" confession was supposed to be a gift of God not something a person could pick according to his or her inclinations. Thus any conversion was always suspicious; except of the word of a convert there was no other evidence of the sincerity of one's conversion. In that light, re-conversion was very hard to justify. A significant part of the text of the following thesis will be devoted to explaining how Mark Antun de Dominis's manifesto functions within this scheme. Namely, the text will try to provide answers to whether Marko Antun de Dominis wrote this manifesto as a re-convert or as the person who knew what was asked by the public of his day in order to be accepted in the Catholic society. At least on the formal level.

The purpose of this thesis is to give a small insight into a possible way people tried to define themselves regarding the constantly fluctuating world of religious loyalties in the early modern period. In the early modern period faith was still an important part of life and the novelty of the Reformation and of meeting other civilizations with different religious systems caused a deep sense of insecurity in the contemporary Europeans. The search for the "true" faith was no a small task. Furthermore, during the era, religion was still closely connected to secular power and ambitious people sought to find the best allegiances in order to fulfill their aspirations. Marko Antun de Dominis, a native of Rab, a small island in the Adriatic, was an ambitious man, in search for the true faith and the best possible organization of the church on the Earth. This makes him a perfect case study in order to discern how people of the time tried to resolve some of their pressing problems.

Marko Antun De Dominis has been one of those historical figures who, by his work, ideas and overall influence, could have not been avoided by many authors dealing with the

period in which he lived. However, though he has been mentioned by many, his life still has not been fully researched and there are no systematical and contextualized survey of any aspect of his life yet. By answering these questions I hope to provide some insight into the fascinating life of a great intellectual and religious adventurer of his time.

1.2. Thesis statements

1. The author wrote his manifestos with an intention to present and fashion himself for the European audience with the first one, to justify his return to the Catholic Church and to fashion himself as a penitent, but still a useful son of the Holy Mother Church with the second one. Moreover, he wrote both of them as public documents; with the first one he introduced himself to the European literate public and with the second one he re-introduced himself to his Roman patrons as, above everything, a scholar, than as an expert on Protestant schism and, at last, as a theologian.
2. The Second Manifesto was the closure of his public career. This study aims to present on the case of Marko Antun de Dominis, a more general problem, namely that early 17th century conversion narratives, due to their public nature, besides being statements of one's religious affiliation, served also as meaning to stir and manipulate one's career.

1.3. Presentation of the Source

1.3.1. Motives for writing the Manifestos

The peculiarity of the First and Second Manifesto lays in the fact that with them Marko Antun de Dominis spoke not to a distinguished few who were concerned with the scope of papal power or with the Church organization; they were written for the wide public and they were treated like that. Namely as soon as de Dominis wrote them they were translated and

distributed to parties who had taken interest in his deflections. Though there are some more of his publications which aimed wide audience¹ the difference is that, as mentioned in the biography, de Dominis might have felt obligated to write anti-papal texts. Similar can be said for the Second Manifesto; he was required if not literally than by a certain public decorum to publicly and in a popular manner "apologize" for his transgressions. It also can be assigned to the genre of conversion or even confession narratives. However, this will be discussed further in the theoretical part of this Chapter as well as in the Chapter III. However, the First Manifesto stands alone as a piece of popular text written of his own choice; de Dominis was not coerced into writing particular content in any way.

The text of the First manifesto is concerned with two major themes; the first is de Dominis's attempt to describe himself through his career and achievements up to the moment of his journey. In the second part he is concerned to describe his attitudes towards the pope, ideas of the Church organization and as an announcement of his future publications. There is no a single sentence in which de Dominis claims that he is in any manner a convert. However, many of his ideas, especially considering the scope and nature of the papal power were deemed heretical at the time and with this particular text he publicly admitted his heretical tendencies, not his conversion.

Although converts were inevitably heretic, I would like to stress that heretic does not equal convert. Michael Questier made a point that mere change of ecclesiastical allegiance was not as important as the possibility of discussing work of God through his grace on examples of converts.² Also, at that point of time many men and women had been sentenced

1 *A Sermon Preached in Italian, By the Most Reuerend father, Marc Antony de Dominis....The first Sunday in Aduent, Anno 1617...* published in London the same year. As the title suggests it was a printed sermon which he gave in the Mercere Chapel in Italian. , *The Rocks of Christian Shipwracke, Discoured by the Holy Church of Christ to her beloued Children*, a pamphlet published in London 1618, a piece of rather viral anti-papal propaganda. Along the lines of anti-papal writings he also published *Papatvs Romanvs: Liber de Origine, atque extinctione ipsius*, in 1617 again in London.

2 Michael C. Questier. *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580 – 1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge

as heretics without any of them changing religion. In this light the First Manifesto does not function as a conversion narrative. It functions as an introduction to a set of ideas that could lead to, almost certain, persecution de Dominis by the Roman Curia. The ideas expressed aim to inform the particular, English, literate audience about de Dominis himself; it functions as an introduction of himself to a public to which he was unknown.

Unlike the First Manifesto the Second one functions as a public confession. It can be seen from the angle of de Dominis' conversion not from other denomination but, primarily, from his heretical ideas and as such it is a conversion narrative. As a text it is more an abjuration of his written and published thoughts, than an account of experiencing a through change of belief. However, though not impossible it is very unlikely that de Dominis could have become the Dean of Windsor without formally accepting a membership in the Church of England. Then, again, participating in a certain ecclesiastic organization does not mean that the person had faith in what was a doctrinal stance of that organization. The Second Manifest is an account of abjuring heretic ideas, but not an account of finding "the truth". In the sense of genre, it formally is a conversion narrative, but I will try to argue that its aim was not to convince the public of his faith but of his repentance.

Malcolm states that the writing of the Second Manifesto was a part of a "bargain" to accept de Dominis back into Rome.³ I believe this to be the truth. The Second Manifest is not de Dominis account of him seeing the light of "the true faith" but is an assertion of opinions kept by Rome to be the truth. The fact that he uses certain elements of conversion narratives of his time can only witness what was the horizon of expectation of the Roman

University Press, 1996) p. 96. "The significance of conversion to and from Rome does not lie in the numbers who tied their evangelical leanings to an ecclesiastical transfer of allegiance but in the very fact that it was possible for contemporaries to exploit the broad topics of grace, election and assurance within the standard forms of ecclesiastical warfare adopted by rivals for control over the English Church."

3 Noel Malcolm, *De Dominis (1560 – 1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic* (London: Strickland & Scott Academic Publications, 1984), p.76. "De Dominis' side of the bargain was that he would compose retractions, and overturn the arguments of his previous works."

audience. The very same Roman audience knew very well his biography, both factual and gossipy one, and it is very probable that the text of the Second Manifesto neither tried nor was aimed to convince them of his newly found orthodoxy. The aim of the Second Manifesto, thus, was his public humiliation, likely the worst penance, for de Dominis, and in a way end of his public, active career. Yet, it he also tried to remind Rome that he can be useful if not as a politician than as a scholar. The question of sincerity, thus is not something that should be asked concerning the text of the Second Manifesto.

The questions that should be asked are what de Dominis tried to tell with this text and how he achieved that. This thesis aims to answer these questions.

1.3.2. Short Overview of the Second Manifesto⁴

The Second Manifest, written after de Domini had returned to Rome but before he had fallen from the grace with the Roman authorities, was finished on 24th November 1622, but was published in March 1623. The Latin title of the original text was *Marcus Antonius de Dominis Archiepisc. Spalaten. Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit*.⁵ The very same year two English and one French translations were published. The first English translation was published in Liege, titled *The second manifesto of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatto: wherein for his better satisfaction, and the satisfaction of others, he publikely, repenteth, and recanteth his former errors, and setteth downe the cause of his leauing England, and all Protestant Countries, to return vnto the Catholicke Romane Church*.⁶ The second English translation was made by the Jesuit Edward Coffin, titled *M. Antonius de*

4 In this thesis I use both the Latin and English version of the text: Marcus Antonius de Domins, Archiepisc. Spalaten. *Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit* (Romae: Ex Typographia Reu Camerae Apostolicae, M.DC.XXIII). The English version of the text used and quoted in the text is from the following edition: Marcus Antonius de Dominis *A manifestation of the Motives*, ed. Vesna Tudjina Gamulin (Zagreb: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997). The 16th century English orthography was modernized by Graham McMaster.

5 Malcolm, p. 76

6 Ibid

*Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatto, Declares the cause of his Returne, out of England.*⁷ This edition was printed in Rome, after obtaining the permission of the superiors. The French one was published in Paris titled *La Déclaration de Marc-Antoine de Dominis.... sur son retour d'Angleterre...avec les impiétez huguenottes, déclarées par le mesme en la confession de ses erreurs.*⁸

The Second Manifesto consists of 31 heads. These heads can be divided according to an emphasis to a topic or attitude of de Dominis which he discusses in them. So, roughly, first to sixth heads are the most personal in tone and content. In them de Dominis gives his own vision of himself. Seventh head is dedicated to the fortunate ascension to the papal position of Gregory XV, which started the change in de Dominis and which resulted on his coming back to the Catholic world. Eighth to eleventh heads are dedicated to discussing varieties of the English religious scene and discussing how these denomination function in regard to each other and in regard to the Catholic Church.

From the head 12 to head 24 De Dominis discusses the righteousness of worshipping of images. These 12 heads are filled with de Dominis' theological erudition; here he uses to the maximum quotations of the Scripture and church fathers to justify the Catholic observance of holy images. It might be surprising that de Dominis devoted twelve heads of his Second Manifesto written with a great care to a discussion about worshipping of holy images. However although this might seem unlikely the style and wording he uses in these twelve heads are consistent with the text written up to the 12th head. This cannot be said for the last eight heads.

The last eight heads (24 - 31) are most puzzling of all. Neither with style of expression nor with content they seem to be in connection with the previous 23. First he repeats claims

⁷ Malcolm, p. 135

⁸ Ibid

stated before in the text concerning articles of faith and the schism. However, without making any reference to the previously written text in any manner. The mildly polemical and confessional tone of the first 23 heads yielded before harsher language of accusations, expressed through a set of short questions or downright accusation of Henry VIII, Edward and Elizabeth for the Schism.⁹ Furthermore, in these last eight heads De Dominis also changes his stylistic form, where, for example, when writing about himself, he uses "I confess"¹⁰ form which he has not used up to the last eight paragraphs.

All in all, the argumentation, style and the tone of these last eight paragraphs is highly puzzling, so puzzling that it might suggest that there is an issue of the authorship of these last eight heads. To definitely answer the question whether de Dominis himself wrote this part which seems to be pretty inconsistent with the rest of the text or these heads were added by the authorities after he had finished his text requires further archival work and is not a focus of this study. However the focus of this study lays in a different area, namely the Second Manifesto as a conversion narrative and a conversion narrative as a tool of social image-making.

1.4. Theoretical considerations

For early modern Europeans religion was a very important question. Like their forefathers they believed it could provide them the eternal life and save their souls. Unlike their ancestors, they faced an occasionally deadly dilemma: which religion can provide salvation? In that context it was not unusual for a man or a woman to convert from their native denomination to another or to a third one or to change the religious system altogether in the courses of their lives. The reasons for any such move were many; some were driven by genuine belief that one way of worshiping is more correct and better than another, some

⁹ De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, pp. 174-5

¹⁰ De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 172

took the step for the advancement of their career. Furthermore, members of different denominations fought for every soul by propaganda, proselytizing in mostly non-violent ways. Every soul that went from one to another denomination was a proof of the divine favour towards the "winning" denominations. The combination of the urge to convince members of one denomination in the sincerity of a conversion and the need of a group for proselytizing fodder, led to the rise of a literary genre of the conversion narrative.

The genre itself was not invented at the time; one of the most famous conversion narratives of all the times is probably written by Augustine of Hippo¹¹ in the Late Antiquity. However in the early modern period conversion narrative had become a part of wider narrative of the denominational polemics of the time.¹² In this sense, it should be distinguished between this greater narrative of conversion as a phenomenon of the era and of personal narratives, basically accounts, of one's conversion. Furthermore, the novelty of the early modern era was that writing accounts of oneself had become available to every literate person with the means to print. Combining these two factors we have a rather large corpus of texts which use the language of theological discussion while writing personal accounts of belonging to one faith or another. However, these texts also contributed to a certain perception of their authors. The looming question concerning these conversion narratives is how to approach them as historical sources that tell us stories of persons who wrote them.

According to Carl Gesine¹³ conversion narratives belong "... within a growing field of research on narratives of the self, an area whose importance for the analysis of religious

11 Paula Frederiksen, "Paul and Augustine: Conversion Narratives, Orthodox Traditions, and the Retrospective Self," *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (April 1986).

12 Questier, p. 96

13 Carl Gesine, "Catholic Lutheran Catholic: Strategies of Justification and Conceptions of the Self in the Conversion Narratives of Johannes Ferdinand Franz Weinberger (1687 – 1690)," *The Medieval History Journal* 12 (2009), p. 330

conversions is rapidly being recognized." For Gesine, narratives of the self are translations of oneself into a medium of language and writing.¹⁴ For David Snow and Richard Machalek conversion narratives always have a reconstructive narrative and the experience of the conversion invariably influences the converts' views of themselves.¹⁵ They certainly have the goal of presenting their authors to a new community or old community. With these narratives the authors fashion themselves according to the ideal model of a group in which they want to be accepted. They "adjust" themselves and their narratives to expectations of a certain group. According to Carl Gesine in order to analyze the narratives one has to pay attention to several elements of both literary and theological nature.¹⁶ The use of rhetorical devices in order to convey emotions and experience of their conversion and their spiritual state immediately before and after the conversion is quite conspicuous as well as of the biblical quotations. But here the important question is how an author understands his or her conversion and how these particular traits of the genre can be manipulated to achieve whatever authors wanted to achieve. With conversion narratives the converts are rebuilding themselves as new men and women, and here they had free hands to use the genre to achieve novelty in a perception of themselves. And this "newness" of themselves was something which they could, to an extent, choose. In this sense, it is evident that they use language and written text to achieve a specific self-fashioning. After all, it had been in the not too distant Renaissance that the art of self-fashioning had been revived and the early modern period inherited it whole-heartedly.

In his seminal work, Stephen Greenblatt¹⁷ argues that in the Renaissance period people

14 Ibid p. 330

15 David Snow and Richard Machalek, "The Sociology of Conversion," *Annual Review of Sociology* 10 (1984) 167–90.

16 Gesine, 331

17 Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

developed a sense of the self and that it can be fashioned, and that there is always some kind of purpose and intention in forming and expressing the identity of an individual in the period.¹⁸ Furthermore, for Greenblatt, self-fashioning of the day is inseparable from literature which, according to him, functions in three ways:

- as a manifestation of the concrete behavior of its particular author
- as the very expression of the codes by which behavior is shaped
- as a reflection upon those codes¹⁹

Moreover, in Greenblatt's view, in order to achieve self-fashioning a person has to establish certain relations with the reality outside the self; submission to an absolute power or authority, fashioning of the self in regard to something perceived as alien or hostile, destruction of one authority in order for another to replace it.²⁰ For him self-fashioning is always achieved through the repositioning of oneself towards different authorities and realities perceived as alien which changes through one's life.

Conversion narratives seen in this light can be thought of as self-fashioning narratives. However, one must never forget that these self-fashioning narratives were written with a specific intention and in special circumstances, namely those of changing religion(s) and publicly presenting the self as a genuine believer and sincere convert. Besides being evidence of a new, converted man or woman willing to enter a new community, a convert had a second purpose – to promote and "advertise" a chosen denomination as the truthful religion. Thus, the wording of the text had to be chosen carefully. Fashioning oneself as profound and truthful was not sufficient. A convert also had to present a chosen denomination as the only one which leads to salvation. This consequently also meant the

18 Greenblatt, p. 1

19 Greenblatt, p. 4

20 Greenblatt, p. 9

tarnishing of other religions. In order to achieve these aims writers of conversion narratives deployed both rhetoric and theological devices. Rhetorical formulae, narrative strategies as well as manipulation and interpretation of theological arguments must be taken into the account while analyzing these texts. However, the interesting cases are those in which the sincerity of conversion is questionable, where defection to another side serves utilitarian purposes. The reasons may be sheer avarice, cognitive or moral disagreement, religious relativism or ambivalence, family considerations, etc.

The text written by Marko Antun de Dominis in 1622 on the occasion of the returning to Rome belong to the genre of conversion narratives. However, his reconversion to Catholicism is somewhat questionable and ambiguous. This text provides an interesting case study of how conversion narratives could be used to achieve self-fashioning, self-promotion and as propaganda material. I intend to study this text with all the above mentioned caveats by way of a two-pronged analytical approach. First a rhetorical and narrative analysis of the manner in which the author achieved the self-fashioning as an eager participant in the religious life of contemporary England in the case of the first manifesto and as a penitent heretic in the second one. The second line of inquiry will try to explore arguments deployed in order to convince the target group in the sincerity of the view held towards the opposite denomination(s). There remains a comprehensive, overarching approach as well, in which self-fashioning and rebuilding one's identity themselves are discussed on the basis of these specialized narratives of the time.

2. Marko Antun de Dominis and His Time

"No man is an island, entire of itself ..."

John Donne, *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions: Meditations XVII*. 1624

In order to understand undercurrents that shaped and influenced ideas, so vehemently denied in the Second Manifesto, and decisions of Marko Antun de Dominis, we should take a closer look into contexts within which the ideas had been developed. The aim of this chapter, thus, will be to present some details of his life that could have influenced his decisions, as well as contemporary debates relevant to his choices.

This chapter will aim to present the contexts which Dominick LaCapra considered to be "interactive" – those contexts which are in some relationship with the text that is the object of a study.²¹ The contexts singled out by LaCapra as analytical categories, and used as the points of references in the following paragraphs are: the author's intention, the author's life, society, culture, corpus of the writer and the modes of discourse.²²

2.1. Contextualization Via His Life

2.1.1. Early Years

Marko Antun de Dominis was born around 1560 on the Adriatic island of Rab (*Arba*)²³ at

21 Dominic LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.) pp. 29-31

22 LaCapra, pp. 36-61

23 The life and work of this restless churchman intrigued many, starting from his contemporaries till the modern day authors, yet there has not been written a recent comprehensive monograph of his life and many instances of his biography are still unknown. However, for further information on his life one might consult the following authors. Richard Neile, *M. Ant. De Dominis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his Shiftings in Religion. A Man for many Masters* (London: 1624) is an example of one out of several accounts of de Dominis' English years. Not particularly flattery, but it is a good example and source of contemporary English view on the renegade archbishop. The most important and biographical accounts of written in Croatian are: Šime Ljubić, "Prilozi za životopis Markantuna de Dominisa Rabljanina, spljetskoga nadbiskupa," *Starine Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 2 (1870): pp. 1 – 260, Šime Ljubić, "O Markantunu Dominisu Rabljaninu, historičko-kritičko istraživanje," *Radovi Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 10 (1870): pp. 1-159, Franjo Rački, "Marko Antun de Dominis," *Vienac*, 6 (1874). The most comprehensive overview of Marko Antun de Dominis' biography up to this day, available in the

the time a part of the Republic of Venice.²⁴ His family belonged to the class of minor nobility. The family acquired their noble status from Emperor Sigismund in 1434; however, they had not distinguished themselves in the service of emperors but in the service of the Church of Rome to which the family provided several highly positioned churchmen including Marko Antun.

His early adult years by no means signaled his future controversial participation in European religious debate. He started his education in the Illyrian College at *Loretto* and continued it in *Novellara* where, in 1579, Marko Antun de Dominis became a member of the Jesuit order. He continued his education in Jesuit colleges in Verona and Padua. Within six years, in these two cities, young de Dominis finished his studies in philosophy and theology. While in Padua, de Dominis had started to teach mathematics and natural history to younger students. During this period he developed his theory of the origin of rainbow which brought him some renown within contemporary scientific community. The theory would be published in 1611, titled *De radiis visus et lucis in vitris perspectivis et in iride*.²⁵ Yet, this promising academic career came to an end in 1596 when his uncle, Antun de Dominis, at that time the bishop of Senj (*Segna*), a small imperial port on the Adriatic coast, died in an ill-conceived attempt to take over from the Ottomans the strategically important fortress of Klis.

English language are the one by Malcolm, pp. 7-25, 41-6, 67-79 and by W.B. Patterson *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) pp. 220–60. The above mentioned are also sources for this short biographical account.

Finally, for more on details concerning the discussion on the exact year of his birth see: Vesna Tudić, "Ime, prezime i godina rođenja M. A. de Dominisa," *Senjski zbornik*: 33 (2006): 45-50

24 This fact probably led some authors to anachronistically apply modern relations between one's country and his or her ethnicity, thus claiming that Marko Antun de Dominis was a Venetian or an Italian. However, what can be said with certainty is that Marko Antun de Dominis was Dalmatian, and when speaking of himself threaded within commonly used contemporary Illyrian-Slavic discourse. This discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis and will be considered in details in some other place. For more on 17th century Illyrian discourse in Dalmatia see detailed and most recent study by: Zrinka Blažević, *Ilirizam prije ilirizma (Illyrism before Illyrism)* (Zagreb: Golden marketing - Tehnička knjiga, 2008)

25 On the importance of this study in optics as well as on its influences on future physicists see discussion by Ivica Martinović, "Riječanin Josip Zanchi o Rabljaninu Marku Antunu de Dominisu," ("Josip Zanchi of Rijeka on Marko Antun de Dominis of Rab") *Filozofska istraživanja* 29 (2009): 689-707

2.1.2. Bishop of Senj and International Diplomat

Senj, a small town on the Adriatic coast was a possession of the Hapsburgs. It probably would not have been of much importance had it not been the southernmost tip of the military frontier, established to stop the Ottoman tide into Central Europe, and the seat of the imperial privateers called *uskoks*.²⁶ The *uskoks* were mainly Ottoman subjects who deflected to Habsburg lands and were settled in the frontier areas, where they served as irregular troops which sustained themselves through booty and plunder acquired from the Ottomans. Operating from their base in Senj, these imperial privateers launched attacks on the Ottoman settlements along the entire coast, but also raided merchant vessels in Adriatic, in order to seize goods of non-Christians transported on the unfortunate ships. In doing so, since many a Venetian merchantman was raided by them, they earned hostility of the most serene Republic who considered them, and moreover, treated them, as plain pirates.

Furthermore, since the Serenissima had fashioned herself as the protector of the Adriatic, or "the Gulf" as it was referred to, the Ottomans were accusing her for not being able to provide protection for merchant shipping and Ottoman goods in its own dominion. Therefore, the Ottomans demanded compensation for the goods stolen by the *uskoks* and threatened with the intervention of their fleet in the Adriatic. It is also worth noticing, that Venice had an ambivalent attitude towards the *uskoks*; when the most serene Republic was in war with the Ottomans, the *uskoks* were welcomed allies. In times of peace, however, the *uskoks* figured as embarrassing nuisance, compromising the Venetian position in regard to the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, in peace, imperial administration was also ready, at least, to listen to the Venetian pleas and put some restraint on *uskoks*. However, with the renewal

²⁶ The controversial issue of the *uskoks* has attracted the attention by many authors, most of them from ex-Yugoslavia countries. Yet, Catherine Wendy Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj: Piracy, Banditry, and Holy War in the Sixteenth-Century Adriatic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) provides a throughout study in English. The most detailed one, however, is by Gligor Stanojević, *Senjski Uskoci* (The Uskoks of Senj) (Beograd: Vojnoizdavački zavod, 1973)

of the Habsburg-Ottoman hostilities in 1593 the *uskoks* again intensified their activities, and began the campaign of unrestricted warfare in the Adriatic. All of this had created rather volatile situation between the three powers at the time of Marko Antun de Dominis arrival in Senj.

The predecessor of Marko Antun de Dominis as the Bishop of Senj was his uncle Antun de Dominis who died during the retreat from the unsuccessful attempt to keep previously captured and strategically important Ottoman fortress of Klis. The Klis incident lead to further deterioration of already bad relations between the Holy Roman Empire and the Republic of Venice. Namely, on 7th April 1596, the fortress of Klis, at the time a seat of a *sandjak bey*, was taken by forces sponsored by Emperor (mainly composed of Senj *uskoks*) and supported by some of patricians from nearby Dalmatian towns of Split and Trogir. The capture of Klis by the Christians resulted in eruption of enthusiasm among the Venetian Dalmatian subjects, many of whom joined imperial forces in Klis. This kind of incidents was exactly what Venice wanted to avoid in order to preserve the peace with the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the proximity of the imperial forces led to renewal of the memories of the days of the rule of Hungarian kings among members of the Split patriciate which were dissatisfied with their current political marginalization under the rule of the Republic of St. Marc. Venice was deeply aware of this commotion among its subjects, aiming to avoid further displeasure of the Ottomans, deployed its forces in order to denied to the imperials the access through their territory. In this way Venice practically cut off all supply lines to the fortress of Klis, and, not surprisingly, in less than two months the Ottomans reconquer the fortress.²⁷ These were the circumstances which lead to the death of Antun de Dominis, and appointment of his nephew as his successor.

²⁷ Bracewell, pp. 205-209

Marko Antun de Dominis had helped his uncle in his work in the bishopric of Senj even before the latter's premature death.²⁸ Marko Antun de Dominis was nominated to the position by the Emperor who had a privilege to appoint clerics within his territory.²⁹ Venice also consented to his appointment. Although Senj was administratively part of the Holy Roman Empire, in terms of the church jurisdiction it was part of Aquileian Patriarchate which was controlled by the Republic and Venetian approval was necessary for the position.³⁰ This consent shows that Marko Antun de Dominis was considered to be a loyal subject of Venice by the Venetian authorities, regardless of his uncle's dubious loyalty to the Republic's interests. The Pope named de Dominis administrator of the Bishopric of Senj in 1596, and he was consecrated in 1600.

This appointment was a turning point in Marko Antun de Dominis' career. First, in order to become a bishop of Senj, he had to leave the Society of Jesus, which he did in 1597.³¹ Second, and far more important, was his engagement in the solving of the "*uskok* problem."³² As we have seen the relations between the Republic of Venice and Hapsburgs were at the time of his appointment very much strained due to the *uskok* activities, and De Dominis, as the Senj's nominal spiritual-moral authority, took on himself to help solve this problem. With his active involvement in the search for the solution to the *uskok* affair, De Dominis stepped into the diplomatic and public scene much larger than his academic world, in which he had lived up to that moment. Traversing between Rome, Rudolphine Prague and Venice de Dominis probably started seeing himself in a new, more important role than the

28 Mile Bogović "Biskupija senjska i modruška u vrijeme Dominisove uprave"(The bishopric of Senj and Modruš during the Dominis' administration") in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog, fizičar: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. u Splitu* (Split: Književni krug, 2006) p. 34 and Malcolm, p. 9

29 Bogović, p. 34

30 Malcolm, p. 11

31 Ibid

32 For the details on de Dominis' proposals how to solve the *uskok* question see: Stanojević, pp.178, 185–88, 191–96, 198–201, 203, 204, 206, 207, 230, 232, 291

one of a university lecturer.

His engagement with Senj problems is not easy to evaluate. His ideas regarding the *uskok* question were not accepted by the authorities; however, his diplomatic efforts contributed to prevention of outright war between Venice and the Hapsburgs. De Dominis did not manage to develop good relations with the people of Senj.³³ He was partly blamed for the bloody end of several *uskok* ringleaders executed by Imperial commissioner conducting the investigation concerning the *uskok* misdemeanors. This lack of communication was a result, to an extent, of de Dominis not spending his time in the town itself and of his rather low opinion of the place and people there. While in Split he described Senj in the following manner: "In the town of Senj there are no teachers nor a school for boys, not to mention utmost crudeness and barbarity...",³⁴ which is quite illustrative of de Dominis' opinion of his former bishopric. In 1600 he left Senj never to go back there.

2.1.3. Reasons for Leaving Academic Life

The reasons for de Dominis' considering and accepting active life as a diplomat may lay in the fact that during his stay in Brescia and Padua he, very likely, came in contact with members of the Venetian elite who were studying there, and who would later become carriers of so-called *giovani* party. The *giovani* emerged in the late 16th century and their political programme was "Venice above everything."³⁵ Furthermore, they valued an active civic engagement as much as the time spent in quiet contemplation. For the *giovani*, *vita activa* was as good, even better, if spent in the service to a common good, as *vita contemplativa*.³⁶ Furthermore, one of the members of this elite was Fulgenzio Micanzio, a

33 Malcolm, p. 17; Ljubić, p. 65-66

34 Marko Jačov, *Spisi tajnog vatikanskog arhiva XVI-XVIII veka (Documents of the secret Vatican Archive XVI-XVIII centuries)* (Beograd: SANU, 1983) p. 23. "In Civitate Segniensi nulli mag[ist]ri nullae puerorum scholae, sed summa ruditas, et barbaries..."

35 William J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968) pp. 193-194

36 Bouwsma, pp. 202-4

close friend of de Dominis at one point in their lives,³⁷ and Micanzio himself wrote that in the house of Morosini, whose two members were important *giovani*, many people circulated. "... There were also admitted every sort of talented men [*virtuosi*], both secular and religious. Indeed all the most cultivated personages who might arrive in Venice, from Italy or abroad, would have been found in this place."³⁸ Again, it is very likely that the young gifted natural philosopher found his way into this circle.

The importance of *giovani* for de Dominis lay in their attitude towards papacy and religion. For them, the pope was only spiritual authority whose meddling in earthly affairs was only a result of the pope being a prince of an Italian state, and not because of some particular God-given right.³⁹ As such, the Church was dealt with in temporal affairs almost like any other representatives of any other state. The Church was closely scrutinized and it had no jurisdiction over its members in Venice. Even Inquisition had to accept two Venetian laymen, appointed by the authorities, who oversaw its work. In this *giovani* only revived older Venetian attitude towards the Church which was suspended after the war with the League of Cambray.⁴⁰ Their religion was Catholic, yet they put emphasis on private devotion, and although some of them came very closely to Protestant believes, for example in importance of the grace of God, they never accepted Reformation. According to Bouwsma, "... they were above all repelled by it as innovation, a conception that, whether in church or state, they found almost viscerally antagonistic."⁴¹ Many of these elements were discussed and expanded in de Dominis' later works.

37 Vesna Tadjina Gamulin, "Marko Antun de Dominis u pismima suvremenika Fulgenzia Micanzia u projevodu Thomasa Hobbesa" ("Marko Antun de Dominis in the letters of his contemporary Fulgenzio Micantio in translations of Thomas Hobbes,") in *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijest Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti HAZU* 20 (2003): 168. Micanzio and de Dominis met in 1609. in Venice and stayed in contact till 1622, when their friendship came to the end over de Dominis' return to Rome.

38 Bouwsma, p. 236-237

39 Bowusma, pp. 232–293. Here Bowusma gives a detailed account of their attitudes, opinions and important personalities of the faction.

40 Ibid

41 Bouwsma, p. 259

2.1.4. From Archbishop to Renegade

No matter what were the outcomes of his diplomatic and political efforts in Senj, it is reasonable to assume that Marko Antun de Dominis had left certain impression on both the Venetian and Roman authorities, because in 1602 he was elected the Archbishop of Split (Spalato). This position also carried the prestigious, though empty, title of *Primas* of Croatia and Dalmatia. At that moment de Dominis' career seemed flawless. It had taken him only six years to become, starting from a teaching career, an archbishop and primas of two kingdoms.

Yet, this position was not bestowed on de Dominis unconditionally. Together with the prestigious title, the office of archbishop of Split was also accompanied by many earthly-material obligations. According to the terms of appointment, De Dominis was to give 500 Venetian ducats per year to the dean of Udine, Marzio Andreuzzi, a further smaller sum for the poor Roman clerk Nores and, finally, he was also expected to support a garrison in his archbishopric castle in Sućurac. For these payments he was supposed to rely on the means extracted out of his archbishopric incomes.⁴² However, the problem was that a better part of his archbishopric was in the Ottoman Empire and De Dominis could not receive any money from these areas. Furthermore, in 1607 plague decimated the population of Split, thus further limiting his incomes and the ability to pay these sums. This resulted in accumulation of debts due to which De Dominis entered into ongoing arguments with the Curia about the payments. However, he was usually forced to pay it through different punishments issued against him by the Roman authorities.⁴³ This quite unbearable situation probably somehow

42 Slavko Kovačić, "Marko Antun de Dominis na čelu splitske crkve (Marko Antun de Dominis: the head of the Church of Split)" in *Marko Antun de Dominis - splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar: zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, ed. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), pp. 42–46

43 De Dominis was forbidden to enter a church in 1607 and suspended from his archbishopric honors in 1610 due to amassed debt. This debt was almost completely towards Andreuzzi who, meanwhile, had become the bishop of Trogir, a neighboring town to de Domini's Split and thus suffragan bishop of de Dominis. Kovačić, p. 60

influenced de Dominis' ideas concerning equality of bishops and the meddling role of the Curia which would in later years consequently lead to his flight to England.

Two other moments from this period are also due to be mentioned. The first one concerns the crisis between Rome and Venice which ended in Venice being put under the interdict in 1606. Marko Antun de Dominis was in Venice in late 1606 and stayed there for several months of 1607.⁴⁴ Throughout the debate he was at the very source of the defense of the Venetian republican values and its independence from Rome when it came to temporal problems. Not only was he there but he made his contribution by writing and publishing two works in which he defended Republic's position, thus openly joining the part of the Venetian clergy led by famous Paolo Sarpi who sided with Venice against the Roman Curia.⁴⁵

The second important point is that during his tenure as Archbishop of Split, he wrote the greater part of his main work *De Ecclesiastica Republica*. Finally, living in the frontier town of Split and having to constantly balance between Venice and the Ottoman Empire, brought de Dominis into close contact with not only other Christian denominations but also another religious system altogether, which might have influenced his forthcoming ideas on the Church unity. More on this subject will be discussed later.

As early as 1614 de Dominis, frustrated by his situation, expressed his wish to resign, but the resignation came only in August 1616, when a new archbishop was elected. About the time that Marko Antun de Dominis started publicly to announce his intention to resign his Archbishopric, he also began to exchange letters with the English ambassador in Venice, sir Dudley Carlton, and this is generally taken as the beginning of his journey to England which

44 Kovačić, p. 75

45 The volumes were entitled "Prigovor Mletačke republike" (Objection of the Republic of Venice) and "Martellino." Branko Jozić, "Marko Antun de Dominis u sporu između Mletačke republike i pape Pavla V (Marko Antun de Dominis and the Conflict between the Republic of Venice and the pope Paul V)," in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar: zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, ed. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), p. 126

would actually take place in 1616.⁴⁶ There were several reasons why de Dominis chose England as a final destination of his somewhat lengthy journey across the Protestant Europe of the time, as well as why he left Rome.⁴⁷ As Malcolm notices,⁴⁸ de Dominis traveled through the Protestant part of Europe. One of the countries through which he traveled was the Palatinate where and there he published his First Manifesto, which produced much clamor in contemporary Europe.⁴⁹ The next stop was the Netherlands where he spent a week, spending time in the house of the English ambassador, meeting and dining, amongst other people, including such high persons of rank as, for example, Prince Maurice of Orange,⁵⁰ and the rest of the royal family. All in all, on his itinerary through Protestant lands Marko Antun de Dominis was generally accepted and treated like a curious celebrity.⁵¹ From the Hague, de Dominis finally arrived to England in December 1616.

2.1.5. Years in England and Return to Rome

As Giovanni Battista Lionello, Venetian Secretary in England, reports in the letter dated on December 19 1616 to the Doge and Senate: "The archbishop of Spalatro has arrived here to change his religion. He is awaiting the king's arrival in London to kiss his hands. I hear that His Majesty will receive him gladly and assign some pension to him."⁵² This notion of "to kiss his hands" is actually the only reported symbolic public act which might be

46 Vesna Tadjina "Dominis u Engleskoj (Dominis in England,") in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar: zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, ed. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), p. 135

47 James I lead interesting religious politic and England of his time occupies a rather peculiar position within the contemporary world, both in geographical and in metaphorical sense. Due to this a special part will be devoted to description of English influences, relationships and attitudes in this Chapter. The same can be said about discussing of the reasons of his journey.

48 Malcolm, p. 43

49 Ibid. Noel Malcolm describes that as soon as it was published in Palatinate it was shipped to Venice and from there to Rome, to be promptly put on the Index. "Within two months it was in its second printing at Heidelberg; by the end of 1617 it had appeared in at least nine Latin editions as far afield as Frankfurt and Edinburgh, and it had been translated into Italian, French, German, English and Dutch."

50 Taken from a letter by Christoforo Surian, Venetian Resident in Holland, to the Doge and Senate. Nov. 28. Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, vol. 14, 1615-1617, ed. Allen B. Hinds, 1908. p. 360 (Henceforth CSP)

51 CSP, vol. 14, p. 355

52 CSP, vol. 14, p. 395

interpreted as an official conversion to Anglicanism. However, De Dominis was quite clear on his official reasons for fleeing to England which he reported to the Venetian ambassador in the Hague: "He showed great disgust with the pope and wished me to understand that he had not changed his religion. He had decided to seek the protection of the king of England to save his life."⁵³ No matter, how pompous it may sound to the members of Venetian elite, who lived through interdict and two assassination attempts on the chief theologian defender of the Venetian Republicanism, Paolo Sarpi, these reasons could sound plausible.

Furthermore, Lionello's letters also convey some of the English cynical voices concerning de Dominis arrival and reception in England, told to the Venetian by Sir Ralph Winwood, secretary of the state at the time: "He did not seem to think much of him. He said jestingly to me that we in Italy have more need of English soldiers than they here in England have of Italian learned men."⁵⁴ Be that as it may, De Dominis was given a place to lodge at Limbeth palace, seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was treated with great cordiality by the King and other high officials, receiving for example an honorary doctorate at Cambridge. The Archbishop, however, occupied himself mostly with printing of his books, so between December 1616 and April 1622 he managed to publish the majority of his works.⁵⁵ It is very probable that this ability to freely publish his works was one of the reasons he left Venice.⁵⁶ De Dominis also got a position of the Dean of Windsor and with it a small appanage and certain privileges that went with the title. However, English honeymoon of de Dominis was rather short; by the 1621 he had started publicly contemplating return to

⁵³ CSP. Vol. 14. p. 360

⁵⁴ Ibid, Malcolm, p. 44 also gives an account of the letter written by John Chamberlain in 1612 who had reported a distaste of English bishops towards renegade non-Protestant Christians, seeking in England not only a haven but also a financial support. This gives us a glimpse at possible, division in English religion policy between official acceptance of those who migrated to the kingdom due to religious persecutions and those who rejected it on various grounds.

⁵⁵ Tudjina, "Dominis u Engleskoj" p. 136

⁵⁶ Patterson, p. 231. Patterson mentions that de Dominis' *De republica ecclesiastica* was put on the Index of Prohibited Books as early as November 1616.

Rome and in 1622 he left England for good.

The reasons for this were multiple. First of all, de Dominis, again, was not able to stabilize his financial situation which prompted him to ask again and again for financial help from the King. It had taken some time for de Dominis to realize that his financial security depended on writing, preaching and publishing anti-papal material.⁵⁷ Second, due to his sense of duty towards his patron, Sir Dudley Carlton, he entered into the dispute over one of the vicarages which was under his power.⁵⁸ His inability to satisfy expectations of Carlton lead to the cooling of the friendship and, subsequently, to withdrawal of Carlton's protection.⁵⁹ However, far more important reason was that his ideas for reunification of the Churches were not taken into any account. As soon as he started publicly preaching that the Roman Catholic Church was not heretic he "...earned great opprobrium..."⁶⁰

De Dominis, also, kept contact with the Spanish ambassador in England at the time, Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondamar, who tried persistently to influence de Dominis' decision on return to Rome.⁶¹ And finally, the ascension of his friend and teacher⁶² Alessandro Ludovisi to the papal position furthered his decision. De Dominis was a disinterested for theological debates and for taking sides. In 1622, however, everyone participating in the public sphere was required to take a side. Time for advocating peaceful

⁵⁷ Malcolm, p. 67

⁵⁸ Vesna Tadjina Gamulin, "Regeste dokumenata iz Arhiva Public Record Office u Londonu koji su vezani uz boravak Marka Antonija de Dominisa u Engleskoj (Regestae of the Documents in the Archive of Public Record Office in London Concerning a Sojourn of Marko Antonije de Dominis in England,)" in *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne Zavoda za povijesna i društvene znanosti HAZU*, 13 (1983): pp. 209 - 11

⁵⁹ Malcolm, p. 69

⁶⁰ Malcolm, p. 62. It is interesting that de Dominis nowhere stated that the Roman Church was heretical.

⁶¹ Francisco Javier Juez y Gálvez "Tri Dominisova pisma grofu od Gondomara (Three Letters by Dominis to Count of Gondamar,)" in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, ed. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006) p. 143

⁶² Juez y Gálvez, p.146; Ivan Golub "Marko Antun de Dominis u Arhivu svetog Oficija (Marko Antun de Dominis in the Archive of the Holy Office)" in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, ed. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), p. 166

ideas had expired.

At the time, already for four years, the Thirty Years War was escalating, bringing with itself irreconcilable polarization. De Dominis had an earnest wish for reunification of Christendom. He might have understood his *vita activa* as the service to common good by laboring for the reunification of the Churches which would bring the absolute good to every community – namely, the peace. Unfortunately, the peace would be restored only in 1648 but the possibility of reuniting Christendom was destroyed within those 30 years. With England, although remaining officially neutral in the conflict, taking its ideological and religious side, there was no hope left for de Domins there.

The English hosts of de Dominis were not particularly thrilled when de Domins in 1622 asked the permission from James I to leave England.⁶³ He was questioned by the Bishops of London and Durham and the Dean of Winchester on January 21 about his intentions to leave England; the author of the questions was James I himself.⁶⁴ However, all of this did not manage to sway Marko Antun de Dominis from his intention and he finally left England in late April 1622.

"The route was a Catholic counterpart to the journey through Protestant territories which he made on his way to England..."⁶⁵As with his going to England, this trip had its symbolic but also social value. Symbolic in a way that, although he was accepted wherever he went,

⁶³ Malcolm, p. 71

⁶⁴ Ibid. During this questioning de Dominis expressed his problems with the doctrines of the Church of England, and many of these statements de Dominis would repeat in his Second Manifesto. De Dominis also told to the Bishops and King that he hoped to influence the Pope regarding the official Roman stance on the temporal power of the Roman Bishop and to persuade the Pope to allow English Catholics to take an Oath of Allegiance. Although Malcolm attributes this solely to de Dominis' "...exaggerated view of his own value as a counsellor in affairs of state" I am not of that opinion primely because it is very hard to assess a psychological profile and motivations of a person dead for 450 years. In this particular situation it is not without grounding to suppose that de Dominis counted on his friendship to the Pope more than to his personal grandness.

Furthermore, even Malcolm does not deny that de Dominis still was pursuing his personal mission of uniting of the two Churches, and this statement of de Dominis also might be interpreted as a promise of his relentless effort on the behalf of this agenda.

⁶⁵ Malcolm, p. 75

this route may be understood as a penitent pilgrimage especially if we take into consideration that during this journey he made a " ... deposition in which [he] confessed his errors" in the house of the Papal Nuncio in Brussels, where he lodged.⁶⁶ He arrived to Rome in October 1622 and was received as the Biblical "Prodigal son"; with kindness and acceptance, although he was to make another abjuration on his previous statements in front of the Head of the Holy office.⁶⁷ He was officially rehabilitated on November 17.⁶⁸ On November 24 de Dominis finished his Second Manifesto titled: *Marcus Antonius de Dominis Archiepisc. Spalaten. Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium Exponit* (*The second manifesto of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatto: wherein for his better satisfaction, and the satisfaction of others, he publikely, repenteth, and recanteth his former errors, and setteth downe the cause of his leauing England, and all Protestant Countries, to return vnto the Catholicke Romane Church*). At the end of this process Marko Antun de Dominis was again a son of the Holy Roman Catholic Church.

Unfortunately for De Dominis, this tranquil phase of his life did not last long. When his old friend, pope Gregory XV died in July 1623, he was succeeded by Urban VIII and political circumstance in Rome changed significantly. De Dominis, in spite of signs of unfavorable attitude of the new pope towards his person, continued to live in Rome seemingly quietly until April 1624 when he was imprisoned as a relapsed heretic. Marko Antun de Dominis died while preparing his defense on 8 September 1624.

Marko Antun de Dominis was condemned as a relapsed heretic. Ivan Golub in his article argues that Holy Inquisition had doubts whether to declare de Dominis a heretic postmortem or not.⁶⁹ After all, de Dominis abjured one last time his errors on his deathbed and received

66 Ibid

67 Malcolm, 76

68 Golub, p. 166

69 Golub, p. 167

all sacraments the Roman Church prescribed for the dying.⁷⁰ Furthermore, Golub's explanation that Urban VIII wanted to send message with this verdict to all who, in the time of Thirty Years War, were "flirting" with the Protestantism or irenicism seems a plausible one. The message was one of no reconciliation, no common ground and no forgiveness.⁷¹ Earthly remains of Marko Antun de Dominis were burnt at the *Campo di Fiori* alongside his portrait and writings.

2.2. Ideas of De Dominis in Their Historical Context

The choices, actions, and the very life of Marko Anton de Dominis had been motivated by his elaborate view of the Church organization, the role of the pope and, what he had felt to be his life mission, of reuniting the Christendom. His voyage to England, his stay there and return were the consequences of these. Marko Antun de Dominis had become (in)famous due to his concepts of the nature of the papal role, church organization and uniting of Christendom. The discussion in the following paragraphs revolves around these three themes.

2.2.1. Venetian Interdict (1606-1607)⁷²

As mentioned earlier, De Dominis first entered the arena of anti-papal debate during the years of Venetian Interdict (1606 – 1607).⁷³ His opinions on the role of the pope were along the line of the official Venetian narrative.⁷⁴ Namely, de Dominis argued that "...the temporal power devolves immediately onto princes by divine right, and extends to all external actions

⁷⁰ Malcolm, p. 79

⁷¹ Golub, p. 167

⁷² Literature dealing with Venetian interdict is vast and beyond the scope of this paper, however still up to date, the most detailed account of this historical event remains already mentioned work by William J. Bouwsma: "Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation," which also contains an extensive bibliography. Bouwsma, pp. 629-655

⁷³ For the joining of de Dominis to the Venice-Rome debate see the footnote 45 above.

⁷⁴ For the more elaborate account of the genesis and peculiarity of the Venetian attitude towards the Roman Catholic Church, see the following section dealing with the Venetian Interdict.

of the people, whilst the jurisdiction of the church is spiritual, internal and ministerial."⁷⁵

The second part of these early anti-papal writings was consisted with attacking the Roman Church' attempts to exercise temporal power over other states as motivated by greed and political ambitions which "... have corrupted religion itself and created scandals to the faithful."⁷⁶ In his main work *De Republica Ecclesiastica* he would elaborate and expand these basic opinions on the scope and nature of the papal power.

Since de Dominis allotted to the pope only the spiritual power, consequently, for him "... the church was instituted to serve purely spiritual ends, and therefore its powers must be purely spiritual also."⁷⁷ Other consequence of this postulation was that the temporal rulers had all the authority once outside the Church jurisdiction; de Dominis also recognized the power of princes over certain church matters "... for which there is no real secular equivalent, such as acts of warship."⁷⁸ With this last description of the temporal ruler's power, de Dominis went somewhat further in allowance for the temporal power than it was usual in other anti-papal writers.⁷⁹

Indeed, de Dominis was not particularly more extreme in his criticism of the papal role or power than other anti-papal writers which had dealt with the subject before him or even his contemporary ones.⁸⁰ The debate on the scope, limits and relationship between the spiritual power embodied in the pope and temporal power represented by secular rulers had been going on since the late antiquity.⁸¹ The circumstance that made de Dominis' argument against the pope, as well as of his Venetian think-alikes was that during the Interdict over

⁷⁵ Malcolm, p. 27

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Malcolm, p. 29

⁷⁸ Malcolm, p. 30

⁷⁹ Ibid

⁸⁰ Malcolm p. 29

⁸¹ For the detail discussion on the issue of the clash between the spiritual and temporal powers see: Joseph Canning, *A history of medieval political thought*, 300-1450. London: Routledge, 1996.

Venice in 1606 – 1607, Roman Curia tried to assert the spiritual power of the pope as superior, indeed as more significant than the temporal power of the corporate aristocratic ruling body of the *Serenissima*. It was also one of the first attempts of the Roman Curia to assert its renewed and strengthened understanding of the pope's role as it was defined during the Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent was an arena of struggle between different approaches towards future Church organization. The winners were, amongst other things, "... concentrated on the tightening up of an intense discipline under the Pope in a great effort to regain Christendom for Roman Catholicism by both spiritual and temporal weapons."⁸² Other extraordinarily important result of the Council of Trent was the Catholic Reformation.⁸³ With this Catholic Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church reaffirmed the role of pope as the head of the church as well as the policy that the spiritual and temporal powers were inseparable.⁸⁴ Building on these Tridentine ideas, the Curia's "political aspirations were based on the firm conviction that a universal state is the only proper form of the political organization..."⁸⁵ This attitude had made yet another clash between Rome and Venice inevitable.

The inevitability of the clash had been underlined by the Venetian claim on the special position within the Christendom. This claim had a long history, going back all the way to the middle ages. Its specific geographical position, protection of the sea between the islands and the mainland allowed Venice freedom in reactions to all situations that had been happening

82 Frances A. Yates, "Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent," *Journal of the Warburg and Courland Institutes* 7 (1944): 132.

83 Bouwsma distinguishes between Counter Reformation and Catholic Reformation. The later was concerned with the Catholicism and redefining the Roman Catholic Church as an institutions as well as the meaning of being a Roman Catholic. Bouwsma, p 294

84 For the detailed discussion on the subject see Bouwsam, Chapter VI. "The Roman Challenge: Catholic Reformation as Counter Renaissance" pp. 293–339

85 Bouwsma, p. 313

on the Apennine Peninsula. So Venice early developed the myth, one of several that would be perpetuated throughout its history, that she had never been a subject to anyone.⁸⁶ When it comes to the relationship between Venice and the Roman Catholic Church, the most serene Republic claimed that she had been founded by Saint Mark, one of the original 12 apostles as well as Peter; in practice this meant that Venice upheld that her Christianity was of the independent yet apostolic origin and in that sense not subordinated to Rome but equal to it.⁸⁷

Thus, since the Papacy and Venice were understood to be equal in all but particular spiritual matters for which Venetians allowed the pope to have authority. The Republic denied rights to Rome to exercise unchecked control over institutional church affairs in the city and in that way she claimed for herself a version of "ecclesiastical independence" manifested primarily in a level of the government control over the Church as early as 11th century.⁸⁸ The *giovani*, who looked to the older days as the model of their approach to governing, revived and renewed myths which were celebrating and confirming Venetian liberty and independence. On the practical level this manifested itself in a set of laws which strengthened the regulation of bodies of the church, its jurisdiction and its property on the territory of the Republic of Saint Marc. After the Council of Trent Rome felt that situation should change and that Venice should either adopt its results or cease to be considered a part of the Catholic world. Venetian *giovani* begged to differ.

"Thus during the years when Venice, under the leadership of the *giovani*, were increasingly conscious of her heritage as a free republic, the papacy was deepening its universalism and growing more articulate and aggressive in promoting its own authoritarian

86 Bouwsma, pp. 53-4

87 Bouwsma, pp. 53-80

88 "The church, both in Venice and throughout the empire, was generally administered almost as though Rome did not exist, and also with little concern to preserve a distinction between clerical and lay responsibility. In Venice the nobility supervised ecclesiastical as well as secular administration." Bouwsma, p.74-75

perspectives and values."⁸⁹ This was the main cause of the Interdict with which the pope tried to force Venice into submission and obedience. The Interdict, proclaimed by the pope Paul V, started to be effective in May 1606 and was revoked in 1607. The immediate cause for the interdict was Venetian refusal to hand over two imprisoned clergymen⁹⁰ to the Roman Catholic Church' jurisdiction. The second, maybe even more important reason, was a set of laws limiting a right of the Church to acquire and keep property on the territory of the Republic. Venice refused to acknowledge the Interdict on the ground of it being unjust.

For the next 11 months the frenzy of writings between two states went along centuries-old temporal vs. spiritual power lines of argument. Yet, the reaction of Venice to the Interdict was not a small sign of the changing world and it attracted a huge interest of the contemporary European public. With ignoring the papal decree they were actively challenging the authority and power of the papacy. Moreover, this particular debate was very important for de Dominis because it gave him an opportunity to formulate and express his own ideas on this subject. The other part of the importance of this clash laid in the fact that amongst those who were quite interested in this struggle was England.

2.2.2. Ecumenical Promise: James I and the Church of England

The reason to single out contemporary England, besides it being the future destination of de Dominis, lays in the person of its sovereign of the time, James I Stewart. In 1603 when he inherited the throne of England he was the most powerful Protestant ruler in Europe and, more importantly, the ruler who pursued his own religious politics, both in his domain and abroad. It is also necessary to mention that, before he was crowned the king of England, he was the king of Scots; with this coronation England and Scotland were united under the one

⁸⁹ Bouwsma, p. 336-7

⁹⁰ One was a canon of Vicenza, Scipione Sraceno, charged with "...tearing down, with manifestations of scorn, a public announcement bearing the seal of Saint Mark...". The other was an Abbot Brandolino of Nervesa, "... who was accused of sorcery, incest, and murder." Bouwsma, p. 346

crown which certainly contributed to perception of him in the Isles and abroad.

So, the clash between Rome and Venice, which combined both politics and religion, attracted the attention of James I. On one hand, the king's reaction was a hope that traditionally Catholic Venice would become Protestant and deny the role of pope altogether.⁹¹ This hope was to an extent facilitated by the Gunpowder Plot, which occurred a year before, and for which Catholics had been blamed.⁹² However even this plot did not fall hard on the James' I religious policy of advocating a greater ecumenical council between Protestants and Catholics with which he hoped to perpetuate "general Christian union".⁹³

James I was not alone in this reconciliatory ambition; as stated above, Marko Antun de Dominis had this reconciliation as the driving force of his career. This particular hope for achieving reconciliation between Christian denominations got its expression within the irenicist movement. Due to the fact that irenicism was central to the strivings of de Dominis it deserves some closer attention.

2.2.3. European Irenic Movement

Howard Hotson in his essay "Irenicism in the Confessional Age" argues that there were at least two phases of irenicistic movement. The first phase, starting roughly after Luther had gone public with his theses, was centered around preserving an endangered unity.⁹⁴ However after 1555 and the official recognition of Lutheranism at Augsburg, the debate shifted towards "...restoring a unity that the church had once enjoyed..."⁹⁵ According to the same author, "irenicism" is "a term which acknowledges the state of theological warfare and

91 Yates, p. 128

92 On the Gunpowder Plot and its effects see: Patterson, p. 73-90

93 Patterson, p. 36

94 Howard Hotson, "Irenicism in the Confessional Age: The Holy Roman Empire, 1563 – 1648," in *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 - 1648*, ed. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), p. 232

95 Ibid

the basic goal of achieving a confessional cease-fire, whether as a first step towards full reconciliation, as a precondition of enduring political alliance, or even as an end in itself."⁹⁶

De Dominis' irenicism can definitely be positioned within this concept of "theological warfare." This "warfare" was creative and constructive as noticed by Karen Maag.

According to Maag, "Conciliation, on the other hand represented a more constructive quest for theological unity."⁹⁷ In order to clarify the terminology, since both irenicism and conciliation signify search for unity they will be treated as synonymous.

Whether the arena for overcoming the division was a council, as James I proposed, or dialogue that appealed to reason, irenicism was a non-violent common-ground-searching approach to the problem. While the sword-and-fire approach to solving the problem of disunity was all too prevalent, irenicism sought to find such a communicational framework that enabled participants in the debate to talk of what was common and thus *a priori* unifying.

Furthermore, irenicism had also denominational prefix; while some irenicists like de Dominis or Valerian Magni strove to alleviate tensions between Catholics and Protestants, others tried to find a common ground between Lutherans and Calvinists, leaving Catholicism completely out of discussion. Indeed, it has been argued that irenicism was far more prominent among Protestants,⁹⁸ especially among Reformed intellectuals, aiming for the unity between the denominations stemming from the Reformation especially after the Council of Trent.⁹⁹

It would be incorrect to say that the Catholic irenicism was not prominent at the time;

⁹⁶ Ibid

⁹⁷ Karin Maag, "Conciliation and the French Huguenots, 1561-1610," in *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 - 1648*, ed. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), p. 135

⁹⁸ Hotson, pp. 228-85

⁹⁹ Ibid

one of the first irenicists and promoters of toleration was Desiderius Erasmus, a Catholic, whose work *De bello Turcico* set the tone for toleration discussions as early as 1530. However, his *De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia* (On Mending the Peace of the Church) went further in the tone of restoring the unity of the Church. Although, in her study "Erasmus and the Restoration of Unity in the Church," Erika Rummel shows that Erasmus' suggestions on the Church unity was an exercise on how not to make enemies of anyone, the act of asking with his authority of all the participants in the religious debate of the day to put an extra effort in finding the unity through compromise and maintaining the status quo (amongst other suggestions) testifies to Erasmus' awareness that a reconciliation would be hard to achieve.¹⁰⁰

2.2.4. Echos of the Irenic Movement in The Republic of St. Marc

However, for this discussion it will be important to mention two Venetians. First of them is Cardinal Contarini, a patrician from Venice who in mid-16th century developed "... a scheme of reconciliation..."¹⁰¹ which was discarded, but nevertheless it suggests a certain intellectual climate amongst the elite which did consider the reconciliation as a solution to the division. The second is, quite famous, Fra Paolo Sarpi, a chief Venetian counselor on the legal issues of the Venetian government during the Interdict, himself contributed to an irenicistic debate to some extent, by writing the book *History of the Council of Trent*.¹⁰² This volume was a contribution to the debate in stating that the pope was the chief obstacle to the reunion¹⁰³--the opinion shared by de Domins' at the time. It might be assumed that although Venice never left Catholicism it nevertheless had developed more open and tolerant version

100 Erika Rummel, "Erasmus and the Restoration of Unity in the Church," in *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 - 1648*, ed. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 62-73

101 Yates, p. 132

102 Yates, pp. 123-43

103 Ibid

of it. It is worth mentioning that de Dominis was responsible for the publishing of de Sarpi's work. Though Sarpi and his contemporaries were attacking the pope due to his attempt to usurp the temporal authority over the Venetian government, their resentment cannot be reduced to the local grudges held against the Curia. In the contemporary papal powers and policies a part of Venetian intellectual elite saw also a barrier to achieving solutions to far more general problems of contemporary Western Christianity.

This Venetian irenicism and anti-papal climate probably influenced the formation of de Dominis' ideas to a great extent. However, it does not explain the depth of the commitment to the irenicistic cause that de Dominis was showing for the greatest part of his life.¹⁰⁴ This urge he described in the First Manifesto in his own words:

As for myself, I have always had an inborn desire (which ever since my admittance into the Clergy I have cherished) to see all the several parts of Christendom consenting, and united together. The distraction of the West from the East, of the South from the North (in matters of faith) as I never could brook, so I never left searching into the causes of so lamentable a divorce, and sounding whether any means might be found for the recombining, and reducing them to their ancient union.

And the more I longed to see this happy conjunction, the greater was my inward grief, to behold the manifold divisions among the Professors of Christianity, the bitter hatred, and unquenchable broils between the most renowned Churches, the shameful cutting, and tearing of the seamless garment of our Saviour. This consideration, this compassion, so just, so necessary, has in deep measure seized upon me, possessing my heart with no small anxiety, and ceases not daily yet more and more to grow upon me.¹⁰⁵

I would like to emphasize that in the above-quoted paragraphs, when talking about reuniting of the Christianity, de Dominis speaks not only about Protestant – Catholic reunification, but also about finding a common ground with the Eastern, Orthodox Church. Unlike many of his contemporary fellow irenicists, being an archbishop of Split made him aware of the proximity and existence of the Orthodox Christianity in more substantial way.

¹⁰⁴ Whether this urge was due to his personality or there were some other, more substantial reasons are not within the scope of this thesis.

¹⁰⁵ De Dominis, p. 36

The Orthodox Christians, living in Split and its closest vicinity were a regular part of religious picture of the place.¹⁰⁶ However, I believe that the root of his irenicist activities was in the Venetian church-political discourse in which he enthusiastically participated.

The last thing that remains to be tackled is the final connection which bound de Dominis to go to England. This connection was the shared vision of the church organization – namely episcopate as the governing form of the *ecclesia*. De Dominis elaborated his ideas on the church organization and administration in *De republica ecclesiastica*. Basically, for de Dominis the church is "...an association of bishops who carried out work the apostles had been commissioned by Christ to perform."¹⁰⁷ Other concepts he applied to this episcopalian idea of the foundation of the church was hierarchy among the bishops, councils as a remedy for disputes; de Dominis's idea, in a nutshell, was a return to the "ancient" Church, in which the pope, though enjoying certain primacy between other bishops, due to the similar status of St Peter in the Scriptures, still did not have any rights to run the church as a monarchy nor to usurp jurisdiction over every other bishop and trying to extend that power over, even, temporal powers.¹⁰⁸

In that regard, the Stuart England appeared especially attractive to De Dominis. James I already as the king of Scots successfully advocated episcopalian church organization, which he legislated with the "Black Acts" in 1584. Specifically, these acts called "...the bishops to set their dioceses in order and declaring the king supreme over the spiritual as well as the temporal estates."¹⁰⁹ By 1610 James managed to introduce some other steps which prompted

¹⁰⁶Republic of Venice had a long tradition of tolerating religious diversity in its domains, especially Orthodox Christians: Greeks in the city herself and members of other Orthodox Churches in various parts of *Stato di Mar*. For a detailed account of Venetian policies in towards Orthodox in Dalmatia see: Mile Bogović, *Katolička crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji za vrijeme mletačke vladavine (The Catholic Church and Orthodoxy in Dalmatia during the Venetian Rule)*, (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1982.)

¹⁰⁷Patterson, p. 241

¹⁰⁸Ibid

¹⁰⁹Patterson, p. 9

the episcopalian church management, but he also managed with gradual, negotiated changes to combine "...presbyterian and episcopal forms of government."¹¹⁰ The church policy of James I must have seemed to de Dominis as the realization of his own ideas, aspirations and hopes. That he chose England as his destination is not necessarily connected only with the relative peace of the Isles at the time or with political sympathies between England and Venice; for de Dominis it probably felt as going to a place that was home.

¹¹⁰Patterson p. 12

3. Strategies of Repentance or Constructing penitent self

*For I do wholly submit myself, and all my books to the most holy judgment, and censure of the holy Roman, and Apostolic see.*¹¹¹

3.1. Positioning the Problem

As mentioned before, Marko Antun de Dominis returned to Rome at the end of October 1622. His Manifesto about the reasons for leaving England was handed to the Roman authorities on 24 November of the same year, yet it was published four months later, in March 1623, entitled, *Marcus Antonius de Dominis Archiepisc. Spalaten. Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium Exponit*.¹¹² In the light of de Dominis' active and prolific rhetorics concerning church issues this work was rejected as not being written by de Dominis both by modern scholars and de Dominis' contemporaries alike. Noel Malcolm, in his detailed study of de Dominis, states that the immediate reaction "...of most Protestant and anti-Papal writers was that the work was a fabrication."¹¹³ This reaction, however, has not been restricted only to de Dominis' contemporaries¹¹⁴; aside from Malcolm's two-page, somewhat derogatory, account on the Second Manifesto, other authors, besides mentioning it was written, have usually ignored this text and have not devoted any time to it.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 131

¹¹²Malcolm, p. 76

¹¹³Ibid

¹¹⁴Not all of his contemporary participants in the public religious polemics rejected the Second Manifesto as fabrication; Malcolm mentions a notable exception in the person of Hugo Grotius who accepted it as totally plausible. Ibid

¹¹⁵Though many mentioned Marko Antun de Dominis in their books not many mentioned his Second Manifesto. Noel Malcolm, Vesna Tadjina and W.B. Patterson mention both Manifestos. In *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* on pp. 223-5, 251-2 W. B. Patterson mentions both Manifestos. Patterson's gives a good summary of the Second Manifesto and it can serve as an illustration of the pattern in which the Second Manifesto is considered, if considered at all: "The Second Manifesto seems to have been written as a kind of spiritual purgation by one determined to show that he was free from heresy." Another author who mentioned both Manifestos is James Doelman, *King James I and Religious Culture of England*, (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000). On the page 129 he makes a passing comment of the printing of the First Manifesto in England and on the page 132 he notices the publication of the Second Manifesto and its translation in English. On the other hand, authors who mentioned de Dominis but not his Manifestos (or his publications at all) are far more numerous. Such for example is the case with: Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490 – 1700* (London: Penguin Books, 2003) pp.409–10; briefly

Moreover, even those like Noel Malcolm, who have dedicated some attention to it, have found it a work of little significance. Thus, Noel Malcolm argues that the main body of the Second Manifesto was a "... re-modelled compilation of parts of ..." other de Dominis' text *De Pace Religionis*.¹¹⁶ According to Malcolm, except for the first part which contains "...the show-trial confession and extreme vilification of the Church of England..." the rest of the text is in relation with *De Pace Religionis*. *De Pace Religionis* is a title given by later publishers to the letter that de Dominis sent to Joseph Hall. Malcolm provides a theory that the Manifesto's origin should be found in that letter by de Dominis, which adaptation he offered to the Roman authorities as the first version of the Second Manifesto's text.¹¹⁷

However, the Second Manifesto does stand for a totally new set of ideas presented in a strikingly different way if compared with ideas presented in his previous writings, and as such the Second Manifesto has much to offer. Noel Malcolm's book was published in 1984 before the introduction of a theoretical discussion of conversion narratives as a specific sub-genre within self-narratives so, unfortunately, he could not position the Second Manifesto within this particular genre. As discussed in the theoretical chapter, this particular genre requires its authors to deny and abjure previous public statements.¹¹⁸ And indeed, in the Second Manifesto, de Dominis not only re-modeled *De Pace Religionis* but also some of the claims and statements expressed in his *First Manifesto* as well as those formulated in *The Rocks* and his published *Sermon*.

The discussion on de Dominis and his works has so far mainly revolved around his ideas on Church organization and his irenecist activities. A good example of this approach is

comments the figure of de Dominis but does not mention any of his writings. Questier, pp. 6, 9, 22, 42, 49, 55-6, 95, 189, 189n discusses de Dominis' shifting in religion without making any notice of his Manifestos.
116 Malcolm, p. 77

117 Ibid

118 For more see Chapter I

Malcolm's *De Dominis (1560 – 1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed*

Heretic.¹¹⁹ However, the shift which brought the introduction of conversion narratives as a specific genre of the time allow us to put under scrutiny the text of his Second Manifesto, which has been up to this date, at best, neglected and at worst despised and rejected, as a source for understanding a peculiar development in de Dominis' biography. As Carl Gesine¹²⁰ pointed out "...on the one hand, there is the conversion itself, that is, the convert's personal change of faith and on the other hand, there is the (oral or written) *conversion narrative*, that is, *the coherent and credible representation of this change with a view to communicate it to an audience*."¹²¹ In this light, de Dominis' Second Manifesto unfolds as a case study of the man who tries to restore himself to the Catholic faith after he left it. At the same time he tries to diminish and justify his membership in the Anglican Church as well as to mitigate what he had publicly stated and what provoked the extreme reaction of the Roman Curia.

Thus, the aim of this chapter is to examine possible strategies around which such a conversion narrative can be constructed. The Second Manifesto of Marko Antun de Dominis is a good case study to see how a repentance can be formulated in order that a target audience accept it and, more importantly, approve it. The narrative itself has the purpose to publicly renounce and abjure his heresies. In order to achieve this goal I will concentrate on analysis of applied strategies used in this, above everything, statement meant for a wide audience which was interesting in de Dominis as a penitent and humiliated sinner and not in de Dominis the reformer. As the rest of this chapter will show, his strategy can roughly be systematized in the following manner:

119 Malcolm, 1984

120 Gesine, pp. 327-8 (my italics)

121 Gesine, p. 328.(my italics)

- Presenting himself as an ill man
- Abjuration of certain of his works published in England and putting them into the context of his illness
- Rejecting his previous works and confirming that his current beliefs are in accordance with the Dogmas and teachings of the Catholic Church
- Confirming and emphasizing that the Roman Catholic Church is the only non-heretic church
- Damage control
- Minimizing a negative perception of his transgressions by presenting the Anglican Church not as heretical as other Protestant denominations.

In the following few paragraphs I will follow the above outlined lines of argumentation in order to provide an analysis of de Dominis' approach in making himself acceptable to the Church of Rome and, more importantly, authorities of Rome, in the above mentioned terms.

3.2. Sinner as a Mad Man

...correct myself in public before all the world, and condemn to the pit of hell my infinite errors sprung from the wicked intention of my spirit going into England...¹²²

An aspiring penitent can hardly find a better way to start a conversion narrative but by mentioning St. Paul, the author of the first conversion narrative. De Dominis states his sins which had led him to leaving the Church of Rome by quoting the holy Ghost speaking through the mouth of St. Paul. The actual transgressions "of flesh" are "... contentions, emulations, anger, quarrels, dissensions, and sects...."¹²³ He continues, by admitting to have had "... too much trial in myself of the unhappy fruit of this unlucky tree...". Considering his reputation¹²⁴ this statement contributes to his plausibility as a penitent; he is aware of his deficiencies, he admits them as parts of his personality which he intends to correct through,

¹²² De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128

¹²³ Ibid. Galatians, 5:20

¹²⁴ Noel Malcolm here discusses how his contemporaries wrote about de Dominis, but he also noticed that most authors who had derogatory words for de Dominis were connected with the people who had reasons to dislikes de Dominis. Malcolm, pp. 1–5

no less than "...a potion of Divine grace..."¹²⁵ However, in the situation of Saint Paul where he was blinded by God in order to repent, for de Dominis' the situation is inverted; the potion of Divine grace had worked as a healing potion. Namely, de Dominis implies that his heresy was a byproduct of his madness and disease. Where Saint Paul was made ill by God in order to be healed, the grace of God healed de Dominis' illness, which was a product of his own flawed personality.

As shown in the above paragraph, De Dominis presents himself as a convalescent; his errors were a consequence of a disease which led him to madness and in that madness he committed his heresies. In the early modern period relations between the microcosm of a body and the macrocosm of the Universe were regarded as mutually influencing each other.¹²⁶ In this sense jeopardizing a soul by a heresy meant jeopardizing the health of a body but it also worked *vice versa*. The very beginning of the text belongs to this presentation of his case. He does not hide his heresies yet he does imply that it was to an extent out of his power to control it.

... a *potion* of Divine grace for my *recovery*, must vomit filthiness which before through *the sickness of my mind*, and corruption of my taste, I had greedily *devoured*...¹²⁷

The disease of my mind (in which before my departure from the Roman Church I languished) was, that contrary to the wholesome counsel of the wise man, I trusted too much to my own prudence, and out of the confidence of my own wit being nobody, I would give very rash judgment in matters of faith, unto which also was joined a certain frenzy of anger.¹²⁸

And as long as *the inward disease* increased, and the spurs of anger pricked my *exulcerated mind*: the itching of my tongue and pen, broke forth into *madness*: and now my understanding being darkened, many things which the Enemies of the Apostolic (transported with heresy) did believe, affirm and profess: seemed unto me credible and some things also true...¹²⁹

Not only that his mind was out of proper order when he promoted heretical ideas, but he

¹²⁵Ibid

¹²⁶For the detailed account of the early modern ideas on medicine see Marcilio Ficino, *Three Books on Life* (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1989)

¹²⁷De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128 My emphasis

¹²⁸De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 129 My emphasis

¹²⁹De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 130 My emphasis

further diminishes his own responsibility by using tentative expressions e.g. "...seemed unto me credible and *some things* also true..." The above also states his first criticism of Reformed heresies, namely that a man must be in a state of "darkened" judgment and understanding in order to find the statements of the "Enemies of the Apostolic" true. Moreover, this disease, which can be traced all the way back to Adam,¹³⁰ thus making any man eligible to get it, explains many of his publications in which he defended his "mad" ideas through the ancient disease of "...counterfeit cloak of Justice, and honesty..."

... when we fall into any error, or slide into any vice, we do either out our filthy excuses... or else we defend our faults, and endeavor to cover them with a counterfeit cloak of Justice, and honesty: and I confess that this was my case, for which I am very sorry.¹³¹

De Dominis continues in this manner also when speaking of how he should be dealt with or, more exactly, how he plans to deal with himself in order to rescue himself.

...and if the voluntary contrition, and bruising of myself, may heal venomous wounds of others (if any be wounded by me) I will esteem this my bruising, humiliation and mortification most happily.¹³²

Under "... bruising, humiliation and mortification..." de Dominis understands repudiating the content of the publications written by himself while he was in England. Those are the *First Manifesto*, *The Rocks of Christian Shipwrecke*, *A Sermon* which he held in Italian in London (in Mercer's Chapel which was the gathering place for Italians in London)¹³³ and *De Republica Ecclesiastica*.¹³⁴ Not only denying but, as he formulates it:

¹³⁰De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 129

¹³¹De Dominis, *A manifestation of the Motives*, p. 129

¹³²De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, pp. 131-132

¹³³De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 14

¹³⁴It should be pointed out that in the Second Manifesto, de Dominis, in fact, rejects only those claims expressed in his works written after leaving Venice, that is: *The First Manifesto*, *The Rocks*, and *A Sermon* which contributed on him being perceived as a heretic by the Catholic side. He does not abjure his ideas as they are, but only those that were published and which consequently had been publicly proving him a heretic. His "public correction" can be related only to his publicly available statements and this is the reason why he abjures specifically these publications and not all what he wrote. This is conspicuous especially because he had not devoted any special attention in the Second Manifesto to his main work *De Republica Ecclesiastica* which was his ten-tome master-piece. De Dominis regarded *De Republica Ecclesiastica* as the most important source for his vision of the Church. Although, in the Second Manifesto, he does mention it occasionally denying or restating certain claims from *De Republica Ecclesiastica*, there is no systematic rejection of this work.

...and now also I abhor and detest these little books, because they contain manifest heresies against Catholic truths, and are repugnant to the sound Doctrine; that is to say, to the Doctrine which the holy Catholic Roman Church does, and has always maintained...¹³⁵

Moreover, to *The Rocks* and *A Sermon* each, he devoted a head, fifth and sixth respectably.

The fifth and sixth heads have a similar structure. In the first parts of these heads he enumerates and "...reject, detest, and abhor..."¹³⁶ heretical ideas he had stated in the above mentioned publications (for example "the Pope of Rome is not the Vicar of Christ upon earth, ... the Mass is not a true sacrifice, the ceremonies of the Mass are Apish toys..."¹³⁷).

The second parts are confirmations of the official Catholic stands on the enumerated issues. These Catholic stands are directly opposite to his ideas stated in *The Rocks* and *Sermon*: and now, for the repented *ie.* "cured" de Dominis, the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, the Mass is the true sacrifice and so forth. Two parts of these two heads mirror each other thus attracting attention to each other; it can be assumed that he went into this detailed account of his ideas in order to abjure his claims that were *publicly* available to every literate person of the time.

Moreover, *Sermon*, as is the character of the genre, was first delivered to the audience and later written down. In another words, he rejected the ideas which were disseminated to a large number of people and upon which his image and reputation had been created. In order to make himself available to Rome he had to shatter that public picture of himself. In the light of his introduction to the Second Manifesto where he attributes his heresy to madness and disease, abjured ideas and opinions can be seen as fruit of that, unfortunate, a condition curable only by public humiliation and exposing himself to mercy and healing powers of higher authorities:

...and yet sometimes when rotten ulcers cannot be cured with gentile medicines, it is both fit and necessary that the Physicians should use more forcible remedies.¹³⁸

¹³⁵De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 131

¹³⁶De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 139

¹³⁷Ibid

¹³⁸ De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 144

Fortunately for de Dominis, the arch-Physician came in the person of the new Pope, Gregory XV. Gregory XV was the taken name of Alessandro Ludovisi who had met de Dominis much earlier, while students at Padua, and the two forged a friendship which lasted till the death of Gregory XV in 1623.¹³⁹ De Dominis attributed to his friend almost miracle – making powers which set him into the path of reconciliation and healing of his mind and soul:

But when the inward burning of the infirmities of my mind was allayed almost by a miracle about the beginning of the Popedom, the most holy Gregory the 15 (whose rare piety, singular prudence, and continual holiness of life was such, as that I do not doubt but that it was cause of his advancement to that high dignity) the holy Ghost illuminating me with a certain divine light, my mind began to think upon wholesome courses.¹⁴⁰

Considering their friendship as well as his circumstances (de Dominis was writing this text in Rome), it was probably not hard for de Dominis to write these words and to actually mean them. Though through his explanation of him being mad when publicly preaching and printing ideas which were in the eyes of the Roman Catholic public heretical he might provide some reason to be accepted back, but he yet had to convince his fellow Catholics that he considered the Roman Catholic Church to be the one which provides the salvation of the soul and which is beyond error or mistake. The majority of the text of the Second Manifesto is dedicated to this goal.

3.3. One and the Only Church

In order for the Catholics to think of him as a penitent and as someone who abjures his errors and heresies, de Dominis repeats throughout his text a rather simple statement, namely that the Holy Roman Catholic Church is:

...the one, and only pillar and excellent ground of Catholic truth, and the Mother of all Catholics, from whom I had most wickedly departed.¹⁴¹

¹³⁹Vesna Tadjina, introduction to *A Manifestation of the Motives*, by Marko Antun de Dominis (Zagreb: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997.) p. 14; Malcolm, p. 71, 78

¹⁴⁰De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 144

¹⁴¹De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128

This first statement on the exalted and the unique status of the Roman Catholic Church is significant for two reasons. First, it will be reiterated whenever he confronts reformed ideas or movements with Roman Catholicism. Second in this sentence he equalizes Rome with Catholicism which he, as well as other theologians and polemicists of the Venetian circle¹⁴² (previously discussed in Chapter 2), had not done in any of his previous publications. He goes even further by giving his (re)definition of Catholic. He states that, besides the Church of Rome, Catholic are all those and only those Churches which

adhere unto the Church of Rome ...in the unity of faith, and in obedience to the Pope in what place soever they be, yea in the utmost confines of the earth.¹⁴³

As long as a church acknowledges the Church of Rome as supreme it is a member of the official Catholic world. This is his real public self-humiliation. De Dominis was renowned (or notorious) exactly for his ideas on Church organization as well as of his criticism of the role of the Pope (see Chapter 2). Besides constantly repeating the tune of the Church of Rome's uniqueness and truthfulness he also states in many places the role of the Pope: it is good and just in the terms with which the institution is defined within the Holy Roman Catholic Church.

...I endeavoured to take away the title of Catholic and universal, from the Church of Rome, in which I erred very much; for by the Catholic Roman Church, is understood not only special and particular Church which is at Rome, but also the whole multitude and company of all the Churches adhering unto the Church of Rome in the unity of faith, and in obedience to the Pope¹⁴⁴

With these statements, repeated in many places, though in other words, throughout the text, he puts himself into the position of extreme vulnerability; either he is insincere in the Second Manifesto or he had been insincere in the texts which had prompted him to go to England and in those written there. In any case, his image with these statements was greatly altered, as witnessed by disbelief and later not-that-positive biographies authored by his

¹⁴²For the details on the Venetian attitudes, see Chapter II.

¹⁴³De Dominis, *A Manifestation of Motives*, p. 134

¹⁴⁴Ibid

contemporaries.¹⁴⁵ These statements are not only denial of what he stated in his other work; they are meant, in the sheer contradiction with his claims printed before his Roman comeback, to publicly discredit him not only as a man, but as a theoretician and polemicist as well. After this Second Manifesto he lost any credibility on either side of the debate particularly due to his "new" ideas on the Church and papacy. If the "mad and ill man" strategy can be understood in terms of personalizing his case and mitigating his heresies, the statements on Catholicism and the role of the Pope might be seen in a twofold manner. Either his transgressions were understood by the Catholic authority as being of such a magnitude that even the friendship of the Pope could not protect him without de Dominis publicly euthanizing his career, or de Dominis was arrogant enough to assume that he would be able to continue as if no one read the text of the Second Manifesto. However, being an extraordinarily intelligent man who understood the power of the printed word, it might be hard to suppose that he underestimated the readers of the time so grossly. This is not a question that will be answered anytime soon, if ever.

3.4. Different Shades of Gray

Regarding the extreme vilification of the Church of England as mentioned at the beginning of this text, the author of this thesis begs to differ. Although de Dominis did condemn it in a manner, his sharpest expressions are reserved for other Protestant movements, namely for Puritans and Lutherans. Moreover, on more than one occasion, de Dominis expressed positive reflections on the members of the Church of England who did not have either Puritanical or Lutheran inclinations.

The most dense parts in which de Dominis writes about a religious situation in contemporary England are from the eighth head to 12th. In them de Dominis draws parallels

¹⁴⁵Malcolm, pp. 1-6

between the Roman and English Churches in order to, on the one hand, present himself as an erroneous and heretical but ultimately repentant son of the Holy Mother Church, and on the other, to show, somewhat subversively, that the Church of England is not as heretical and evil as, for example, the Puritans are.

The reasons for this might be twofold. The first was that de Dominis tried to present the Church of England as less evil or less heretical in order to present himself as a lesser sinner. It was less heretical to become an Anglican than a Puritan. At least in de Dominis' eyes. The second reason might be simply that he still had certain emotional attachments to the Anglican Church. To achieve this de Dominis uses several strategies: defaming Puritans and Lutherans, explaining good things about the Church of England, using certain words and omitting others. In his own words:

Concerning Religion, there are in England sundry Sects; there are Puritans that is the rigid Calvinists; there are some milder, who call themselves Protestants, and reformed; there are Anabaptists who are also divided into diverse Sects; there wants not Arians, nor Photinians, and such a mish-mash of wicked people, who though they be not permitted to profess their errors publicly, yet they are not cast forth of their Church nor punished, but tolerated whilst they publish their poison.¹⁴⁶

He goes into further explanations by explicating specific denominations:

Moreover, that the Anabaptists swarm with heresies, none but the Anabaptist himself will deny it, yet they have their free meetings in England, and the King's Majesty one day told me, that lately at London a woman did in an assembly of Anabaptists both make a public Sermon, and also administer their supposed Sacraments¹⁴⁷

It is interesting that in a narrative of this type, aiming to convince certain public of sincere repentance, the author refers to James I with his full title "the King's Majesty." While this kind of referring to a king is desirable in public, James I is at the same time the religious head of the Church of England, of the very heretical institution that de Dominis is leaving at this point. By using his official title without any derogatory used adjectives, de Dominis shows his respect. However, to which particular office of the king it is up to a reader to

¹⁴⁶De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 145-6

¹⁴⁷De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 146

decide. De Dominis does not dwell on the King with any sentence but only quotes him. His attention is focused on English denominations. Besides outrageous Anabaptists there are other "sects":

The heresies of the Puritans are well known, which are these: that there is no free will: that God is the Author of sin: that God for his pleasure condemns many without cause: that Christ did not die for all men: that Christ sustained the pains of the damned: that the Infants dying after Baptism, may be the damned etc¹⁴⁸

De Dominis explicitly states a number of differences between Puritans (Calvinists) and Catholics, which the latter consider heretical. However, adherents to the doctrine of the Anglican Church are depicted in the following words:

The milder Protestants, although *they endeavor by all means to free themselves* (forasmuch as concerns their opinions) *from heresy, for that they seem neither wholly to follow Luther nor Calvin: but the pure Doctrine of the English Church which they called reformed:* yet can they not be free from the heresy both of the Puritans and Anabaptists; for that they communicate with them without scruple; and if any of the Puritan or Anabaptist come to their Ecclesiastical Assemblies, they neither avoid, nor exclude them¹⁴⁹

Anglicans (for the lack of better terms) commit heresy only by communicating with Lutherans and Calvinists. Although at the time there were a number of differences considering doctrines and practices between the Anglican Church and the Roman Catholic Church, de Domins does not draw any attention to them. Moreover, when he says that "milder Protestants ... follow the pure doctrine of the English Church which they called reformed..." he sets a definition of the doctrine of the Anglican Church in a slightly ambiguous way where "reformed" and "the Church of England" can become interchangeable, which will be used later in the text when he will discuss certain theological issues.

It is not always clear when he says "Church of England" whether he talks about the Anglican Church or Calvinist Church of England. Granted, at the time the Church of England encompassed in itself several streams with which it would be completely done after

¹⁴⁸Ibid

¹⁴⁹Ibid, My italics

Cromwell's dictatorship.¹⁵⁰ However, it can be argued that de Dominis uses this in order to acquire positive outlook (from the Roman perspective) on the Anglican church. De Dominis thinks that they cannot be freed from heresy not because of their doctrinal differences with the Roman Catholic Church (as he had shown in the case of Calvinists or Anabaptists), but because of their free communication with obviously heretical sects. The refusal of Protestants (the adherents of the Doctrine of the English Church at least in this part. Later in the text it is not always clear to whom he refers when using the term "the Protestants") to condemn Anabaptists, Lutherans and Calvinists makes them heretical not doctrinal differences. The following quotation can illustrate the ambiguous usage of the terms quite accurately:

In the Royal City of London by public leave of the king, are not the Churches of French, Dutch and Italian Calvinists open, and esteemed most loving Sisters of the English Synagogue, although they detest the English doctrine, profession, and rites, and be the chiefest favourers, and promoters of Puritanism in England: and also the English Synagogue as much (as in her lies) is most ready to communicate with the Lutherans, ..., that these may be made a union of all the Churches as they call them;¹⁵¹

It is known that the Churches of French and Dutch and Italians were Calvinist, but calling them "Sisters" to the institution which was before defined as "mildly Protestant" and which rejects Calvinistic doctrines would not make sense. Especially if connected with the statement that "they detest the English doctrine, profession, and rites..." It might be probable that when de Dominis says "English Synagogue" he means English Calvinistic(Puritan) Church not the (Anglican) Church of England. With the diffused religious situation in the Anglican Church, the way to explore these religious shades of gray in order to present Anglicans as not totally unacceptable to the Church of Rome laid open for de Dominis to use it. And he did.

Furthermore, later in the text he states, that it irreconcilably diverged from the Roman

¹⁵⁰ For details see MacCulloch pp. 502–44

¹⁵¹ De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 147

Catholic Church, it can only be deduced from the terms he uses: the English, they, Protestants, the English Protestants... Though he describes the history of the schism between London and Rome¹⁵² and the consequent heresy of the former, the very term "the Church of England" is never used. The terms like the "English Protestants", "English sect", "English Agents" are used but they are not specified in any way. We cannot know for sure on whom he thought; it can be only concluded due to the genre of the text that he was talking about the Church of England/Anglican Church in which he had converted and which he had been supposed to reprobate, not from him specifically stating the denominations of the villains.

When it comes to the doctrinal differences between the Church of England (Anglican) and the Church of Rome de Dominis says:

Of the other English heresies about Faith, and Works, and Justification, about the blessed Sacrament, and private Masses, about merits, and invocation of Saints, the veneration of holy Images, holy ceremonies, the soul of the departed, and the like which these heretics condemn in their heretic spirit, and which I also in their companies with the same spirit of heresy in former time have in some part condemned, it is not now my intent to speak much, by and by I will give them a touch according to the nature of this place: at some other time I will speak more largely of them, now I come to speak of their Schism¹⁵³

The problem is that the above enumerated differences are generally the Protestant – Catholic problems not only those concerning the Church of England (Anglican). The quoted passage shows that de Dominis was not willing to enter into discussion about doctrinal issues existing at the time specifically between the Church of England (Anglican) and the Roman Catholic Church, where he would be required to state clearly that the Church of England is heretical as a consequence of the discussion.

From this he moves to his view of the attitude of the Church of England towards the Roman Catholic Church. He begins with the following question directed to the English Christians:

¹⁵²De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, pp.173-175

¹⁵³De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 148

... why they separated themselves from the Church of Rome and her adherents, whether for any heresy? And truly none of them could either by words or writing, show me that the Roman Catholics either of our time, or in the time of our ancestors in their general public profession were at any time stained with any heresy. The King's

Majesty himself of great Britain, granted to me publicly, and plainly, and so did the wiser sort of their Ministers of all sorts, and not a few of their learned men, that the Church of Rome did not err in fundamental points of Faith; wherefore the Church of Rome is not heretic, if we will take but that which they grant¹⁵⁴

Introducing the term "Articles of Faith" might be another of those ambiguities in regard to the Church of England with which he permeates the text of the Second Manifesto. Namely, in the 16th century, early in the course of Lutheran reformation, many humanists were suggesting reconciliation of the more, and more divided Christian groups, by settling the fundamental, axiomatic points or articles of faith common for all and tolerating liturgical and slight dogmatic differences.¹⁵⁵ Marko Antun de Dominis here does not defend the correctness of this opinion, he tries to prove in the rest of the chapter that there is no difference between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith, that they are all equally fundamental, but even introducing the idea in the context of the Church of England might have made readers of the humanistic education remember of the public discussion which ended quite recently with the outbreak of the Thirty Years war. It also might be placed there in order to remind the Roman authorities that the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England might have more in common than could be seen at first glance, and along these lines provide implicit reason for him being attracted towards it.

"I confess that the English Protestants deceived me..."¹⁵⁶ is his statement closest to giving the reason of deflection (besides compulsory vanity and other character flaws confessed in the first five chapters of the Manifesto). This "confession" is expressed while he was discussing for the second time in this text the schism of the English Protestants. He

154 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 151 According to the Catholic doctrine heresy is one of the reasons for legal separation of churches.

155 For a more detailed discussion about humanistic concepts of toleration see Gary Remer, *Humanism and Rhetoric of the Toleration*. (University Park; The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

156 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 172

calls them "the English Protestants" which in his usage of this term can mean either "all English Protestants" or "the Protestant members of the Church of England". While he expresses milder opinions of the Church of England by naming the King (the head of the Church of England) as the author of positive statement about the Roman Catholic Church,¹⁵⁷ when he passes judgment of irreconcilable differences like in this second discussion of the schism between the Christians of the Isles and Rome, he uses terms like the English Protestant, or the English.

Furthermore, he scorns the English Protestants who took part in the Synod of Dort¹⁵⁸, where the Dutch Reformed Church were discussing problems concerning the rise of Arminianism.¹⁵⁹ Although the Church of England sent a delegation which actively participated in the Synod, de Dominis did not mention the official Church's name. As mentioned above he uses terms like "English Protestants" or "English Agents" but their denomination is not explicitly stated. When de Dominis negates the possibility of reunion between the "English sect" and Rome in the light of the acceptance of certain ideas expressed at the Synod a bit further on the same page,¹⁶⁰ it is not without grounds to suppose that he did not mean under "the English sect" the Church of England but some other denomination, Puritans most likely. Since it is known that de Dominis did not deal with the Puritans or Lutherans, but with the official Church of England, again we can see how he plays with the English religious situation while implying at the same time that the Church of England (Anglican) is not as bad as other English Protestant denominations.

In the light of the other two strategies taken in order for de Dominis to convince Roman

157De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 151 "The King's Majesty himself of great Britain, granted to me publicly...that the Church of Rome did not err in fundamental points of faith;..."

158For detailed discussion on the controversies about the English participation in the Synod of Dort see Patterson, pp. 260–92

159 Catholic Encyclopedia, "Arminianism," <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01740c.htm>

160De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p.173

authorities that his English adventure was behind him, this playing with terms denominating sects and currents of English religious situation can be understood in, as stated above, a twofold manner. The most obvious is that he tries to underplay his participation in the Protestant kaleidoscope. By insisting on minimizing differences between Rome and the Church of England in its mild, Anglican aspect of which he was a member, he also minimizes the extent of his heresies. This he tries to achieve by juxtaposing this institution with other more extreme denominations like Calvinists (Puritans) or Lutherans. Although in de Dominis extreme glorification of the Roman Catholic Church he made himself extraordinary vulnerable to attack by malevolent critics, with this he stated that he did not remove himself from Roman Catholicism as much as it might have seemed. The Church of England might be schismatic and heretical, but not beyond redemption like Calvinists for example. In this manner de Dominis tries to make the Church of England closer to the Church of Rome and through that also to present himself as not erring as badly as might be suggested by his enemies.

The second interpretation might be that he used ambiguous approach to terms while speaking about the Church of England because he still felt affiliated to it. Whatever reasons might be for his return to Rome,¹⁶¹ he might have still thought of the Anglican approach to Christianity to be the most truthful and publicly trashing it against his conscience and deepest religious convictions. Yet, since he was required to write this narrative, de Dominis choose to use his eloquence to satisfy the form while not acting against his convictions.

3.5. Conclusion

This chapter showed that the defense of Marko Antun de Dominis in the Second Manifesto was framed with three major motifs. Roughly we can speak about the personal

¹⁶¹For details see Chapter II

one, which provided and discussed madness as a reason for deflection. The second major motif is his realization of the truth and glory of the Roman Catholic Church. The last one tackles his relationship with the religious scene of England and this one has two parts. The first one is a resolute condemnation of Calvinism and the second of ambiguous usage of the term "the Church of England." By implying with this ambiguity that one stream within the Church of England was closer to Rome than to other Protestant denominations and connecting himself with it, he also suggested that his heresies were more easily forgivable and redeemable. However, the text of the Second Manifesto was written with a particular aim and for the particular public. Therefore, the following chapter will be dedicated to deciphering what de Dominis tried to convey to the picky audience of the 17th century papal court.

4. Scholar, servant, saved?

The previous chapter discussed the strategies around which Marko Antun de Dominis evolves his justification (for his heresies) and around which he builds the text of his Second Manifesto as a conversion narrative. However, we are left to see what kind of man de Dominis tries to outline in the Second Manifesto. Thus, the aim of this chapter is to through the descriptive analysis of his argumentation explore how, in the Second Manifesto, Marko Antun de Dominis was fashioning himself. Furthermore, an attempt will be made to decipher what de Dominis wanted his contemporaries to see and think when they hear his name.

4.1. "I reject, detest and accurse all the aforesaid errors, and all other opinions whatsoever..."

In order to achieve this presentation of himself as a corrected, again-Catholic man de Dominis used several devices. Some of them are rather obvious and expected, as is for example recounting of each and every heresies published in *The Rock and A Sermon* and then renouncing them; these renouncements being followed by the affirmation of the required, post-Tridentine points of view. All of this is not a coincidence; as Karl Gesine noticed in his article: "... every argument which is not sufficiently disproved could be a potential point of attack."¹⁶² In the end this is what a conversion narrative, on a practical level, should be; a safeguard against the public attack on a convert due to statements he or she had made prior to conversion.

Furthermore, also as expected, de Dominis endorses and fully supports the Council of Trent, which he now considers and accepts as the highest authority: "... I reject, detest and

¹⁶² Gesine, p. 329

accuse all the aforesaid errors, and all other opinions whatsoever...which do not agree with the faith expressed in the Church of Rome, and the sacred Councils, especially in the Council of Trent;"¹⁶³ Indeed, he tries to mention, embrace and praise as many of the Tridentine's decisions as possible in the text of his Second Manifesto. This tactic of cloaking his narrative in as many as possible references to the Council of Trent is also not incidental. By doing so De Dominis aimed to create a link between his arguments and the unquestionable position of the Catholic Church on the Tridentine decrees, thus making every attack on his arguments actually an attack on the authority of the Council of Trident.

When it comes to an act of conversion itself, for de Dominis there was no dilemma; it was no less than the act of Divine mercy, expressed through the work of the Holy Spirit. The very first sentence of the Second Manifesto starts with the praising of the holy Ghost: "Most excellently, as he does all other things..."¹⁶⁴ It is not the accident because the holy Ghost was considered to be crucial in the process of conversion.¹⁶⁵ He continues that he received "...divine Grace..."¹⁶⁶, thus implying that his conversion was not prompted by any worldly reasons or ambitions but by the very mercy of God. Indeed de Dominis explicitly says that it was the Holy Ghost that brought him back: "And I do not doubt to attribute my return back again, to a true Divine vocation; the Holy Ghost calling me to return unto my Mother, the Catholic Roman Church."¹⁶⁷ De Dominis positions himself as an object of the divine grace, manifested through the Holy Ghost and the choice of Alessandro Ludovisi for the pope (and the election of a pope is under the influence of the Holy Ghost.) If de Dominis implies that his deflection was of his own volition, due to his own flaws, he aims to convince his readers that that his return and the renouncement of his heresies has been the work of God.

¹⁶³De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 140

¹⁶⁴De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128

¹⁶⁵ Catholic Encyclopedia, "Holy Ghost", <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07409a.htm>

¹⁶⁶De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128

¹⁶⁷De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 132

De Dominis actually stated this in the end of the Manifesto: "God commanded me to be humble under the hand of my Mistress, and in this thing especially it behooved me to follow God."¹⁶⁸

However, the picture of his actual conversion is quite vivid and repulsive one; by using a metaphor of a violent vomit to describe the process of his repentance, he renders himself in front of his readers a sick, helpless man more meriting pity than punishment. This was also intended to function as a challenge to a reader, implying that if God took mercy on this sorry human, how could anyone else dare to judge him. However, another layer of interpretation can be applied on this image of de Dominis as a sick man. At the time, de Dominis was, at least, 62 years old and while traveling to Rome he spent three months in Brussels due to serious illness. He was probably still recuperating from the hardships of the journey and his illness when he was writing the Second Manifesto.

A little further in the text de Dominis announces what he will do in the text of the Manifesto; first he "will prosecute my correction, condemnation, and detestation of my errors..." and secondly he plans to "...declare the other causes why I left England, and other heretical Countries..."¹⁶⁹ It can be easily noticed that in the first part of this statement he uses quite sharp, legal words ("persecute", "condemnation", "correction") which fit better an inquisitor than a penitent. Seemingly, here he announced that he himself would be the harshest judge of his own errors. On the other hand, willingness to submit himself to the judgment of the others is mentioned only on the page 131, as the last sentence of the second head.¹⁷⁰ Indeed as was shown in the previous chapter in the Second Manifesto he basically terminated his carrier by detesting, deploring and repudiating his own anti-papal and irenic

¹⁶⁸De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 176

¹⁶⁹De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128 (my italics)

¹⁷⁰De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 131 "for I do wholly submit myself, and all my books to the most holy judgement, and censure of the holy Roman, and Apostolic see, and chief of all Churches whatsoever."

apologetics. He destroyed his own credibility by his own hand. Yet, with the second phrase ("other causes") he reminds his audience of his first hand experience in England.

Be that as it may, I am of the opinion that these two proclaimed aims of de Dominis' Second Manifesto, also announce how he wants to be seen in Rome. With the first aim he wants to be perceived as someone too old, too tired, too disillusioned, too compromised to make any problem to the community which, as he hoped, would accept him. In the Second Manifesto, with exaggerated praises and affirmation of the pope, Roman Church and Tridentine decrees, he willingly and fully compromised himself and his entire previous public activities. Moreover, whole text is basically elaborate affirmation and praise of the Tridentine decisions, from the Baptism to the justification of images worship. On the other hand, with his second aim he intended to remind the Roman public that he deserved amnesty not only for his willing self-derogation in the name of the true faith, but also as a valuable person who could contribute to the Holy Roman Catholic Church with his experience, expertize and above everything with his erudition.

In order to achieve these goals he connects himself with several rhetorical devices which he uses throughout the text of his confession. Their purpose of these devices in the de Dominis' narrative is to "sneak" the desirable picture of himself. For example, the first rather subtle but, I believe, important application of such a device is the usage of the personal pronoun "I".¹⁷¹ This usage of "I" occurs within the first six heads; from the seventh head till 28th one, he identifies himself with his renewed membership in the Holy Roman Church. In the 21 heads (7 - 28), where he does not elaborate on his own mistakes but juxtaposes English Protestants' heresies and errors with the Truth of the Catholic official postulates of orthodoxy he switches to the plural form "we." In this way he further

¹⁷¹Ibid. "...for *I* have had too much trial in my self...", "*I* had greedily devoured: which that *I* might the more safely and speedily perform, and correct *myself* in public before all the world..."

strengthens "we" Catholics against "them" Protestant and heretical. Furthermore when discussing why certain Protestant beliefs are heretical he hints that he would speak on a given subject in some ¹⁷²other places. In these places he returns to "I" as promising of putting his knowledge on the Church' disposal.

4.2. Biblical Pictures Evoked

Other such device was quite commonly used amongst writers of conversion narratives. Namely, the usage of biblical quotations or images in order to justify their particular cases. De Dominis in the Second Manifesto conforms to this requirement fully; he employs certain images from the Bible as illustrations or as intensifiers of what he wants to convey. He rarely goes into exegesis or a theological value of a mentioned or hinted passage. Biblical passages in the Second Manifesto are in the service of a literary aspect of the text.

Furthermore, at many places where de Dominis discusses his own transgression, he states and affirms the orthodox Catholic point of view; at these places de Dominis often uses a biblical paraphrase or a quotation in order to strengthen this, officially correct, way of thinking. The best example can be seen on the page 136, where he quotes Malachi 1:11 in order to praise the dogmatically acceptable definition of the universality of the Church of Rome. However, the most often employment of Biblical motifs in the Second Manifesto is connected with presentation of de Dominis' personality and with how he tries to fashion himself.

The very opening of the Second Manifesto is a paraphrase of a part from the Epistle of St. Paul to Galatians,¹⁷³ enumerating "works of flesh".¹⁷⁴ Enumerated vices are

¹⁷²"...but will reserve this matter to be handled in another place..." De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 169

¹⁷³Galatians, 5:20

¹⁷⁴De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p 128

"...contentions, emulations, anger, quarrels, dissensions, and sect;"¹⁷⁵ As hinted in the contextual chapter, Marko Antun de Dominis was not shy of a good quarrel. Whether an issuing question was his financial situation or some church issue, de Dominis was more than able to hold his ground. And leaving Rome six years before writing the Second Manifesto made him both a dissenter and sectarian. The choice to paraphrase this particular sentence as an introduction into the text of confessing his heresies and witnessing about his conversion heralds that in the text, which a reader is about to read, de Dominis will part from these flaws and sins of his character which lead him into heresy when opportunity presented itself. Here he announces that the text has been written by a new man, simple and penitent. Furthermore, since many of these flaws, such as anger and quarrel for example, can be connected with the rashness of the youth, by separating himself from them de Dominis also separates himself from that period of life. Thus, he again, subtly attracts attention to his own age and infirmity.

The next conspicuous motif he used was the figure of Adam; as Adam, he also tried to find excuses for his errors, implying that his fall was not something completely extraordinary; it was only human.¹⁷⁶ Here de Dominis uses the motif of the fall from grace, due to a temptation, to draw attention to his own humanity. He left his titles and excuses behind together with his heresies. Now he is only a helpless man, naked¹⁷⁷ and penitent. Adam, besides being the first to fall from the grace of God, he was also the first man. He was a creature of the given chance. So, it might be that de Dominis wanted to attract an attention to a fact that he wanted a new chance as a reborn Catholic. And that he was ready

¹⁷⁵Ibid.

¹⁷⁶De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 129. "It is the most ancient disease of our corrupt human nature descended from our first Father unto all his posterity, that when we fall into any error, or slide into any vice, we do either find our filthy excuses (as the woman which thou gavest me to be my fellow companion, gave me of this tree, and I did eat) or else we defend our faults, and endeavor to cover them with a counterfeit cloak of Justice, and honesty."

¹⁷⁷De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 131

to pay for it. Making a parallel between himself and Adam, he, again, plays with the freshness of his converted self. It seems here that he wants to stress the change that happened in him which lead him back to the Roman Catholic Church.

The next biblical metaphor concerns "...all other congregations of Christians being stained with heresies..."¹⁷⁸ De Dominis describes these other congregations "... as if were blinded, together with their blind Guides do rush, and headlong into the bottomless pit of perdition..."¹⁷⁹ The image of the blind being lead by blind guides is a motif which can be found in the Gospel of Matthew, Gospel of Luke and some other places; quite common as a metaphor of loosing a right track.¹⁸⁰ This particular motif here serves to underline the vagrancy of heretical congregations, and consequently, his own lostness while living within them. Indeed, he was so lost that he thought that of Romans: "...I wickedly affirmed of the Romans to their great wrong;"¹⁸¹

As it can be concluded from the above examples, de Dominis mostly uses biblical images to stress the change that happened to him. From an arrogant, ambitious, quarrelsome man, to a penitent with nothing left to him but his willing to put the last valuable asset of his – his knowledge, at the disposal of Rome. That he is more than willing to put himself at the disposal of Rome can be seen in the De Dominis' usage of the biblical story of Hagar (Agar) from Genesis 16.21, paraphrasing it with the following words: "...my Agar hearing the voice of the Angel reproving her, and saying: Return unto thy Mistress, and humble thy self under her hand: was forced of necessity to return unto the most holy Church her Mistress."¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 134

¹⁷⁹De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 135

¹⁸⁰Matthew, 15:14: "Leave them; they are blind guides. If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit." and Luke, 6:39: "And He also spoke a parable to them: "A blind man cannot guide a blind man, can he? Will they not both fall into a pit? "

¹⁸¹ His transgression was to think that the Romans were lost. De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 135

¹⁸²De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 176

Identifying himself (his conscience) with Hagar, who was Sarah's maid (slave), de Dominis *de facto* offered himself to the Church as a servant.

Throughout the entire Second Manifesto de Dominis uses the Scriptures in similar manner: to intensify his claims, arguments, comments, and so forth. The examples above were singled out because they underline his statements about himself and serve to de Dominis to illustrate the picture of himself without putting too much words into it.

4.3. Knowledge as an Asset

De Dominis mentioned scholarship quite early into his text. Or, to be more precise, scholars. With the following phrase "...some weak Scholars..." misinterpreted his motivation for deflection¹⁸³, he might be suggesting that there were not-weak scholars who understood the reasons for leaving; kindred spirits who will understand his reasons for coming back as they understood his reasons for the departure. This is the part of his audience for whom he hints about his own erudition especially in the parts of the text which deal with the worship of the holy images and other ritual aspects of Catholicism that the Protestants understood as superstitious and idolatrous. In these passages, de Dominis displays his erudition to the full; I suspect that de Dominis devoted such a disproportional part of his text to the devotion of saints, their feast days, angels, the Mother of God and so on, in order to be able to enumerate all the Church Fathers who dealt with the issues and to discuss them with his comfortable expertise.¹⁸⁴ In this way he showed that even in a genre like conversion

183 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 129

184 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, pp. 156 – 167. By all means, this footnote does not list each and every notion of all authorities which de Dominis used. Only those mentioned between 156 and 167 pages: **Defense of sainthood:** Origen lib.8, contra Celsum, Epiphanius, heres. 79, Augustine epist. 44. Et. Lib. De quantitate anime, ca. 34. Et lib de vera relig. ca. 55. Et contra faustum lib. 2C cap 21, Ciril Alex lib. 6. contra Julian, Theoderet in hist. Sanctorum Patrum ca. 24 Cyprian lib. 3. epist. 6, St. Johanes Chrysostom, serm in Martyrem Pelagiam, St August. **praying to saints:** Moses (For Moses many times averted the anger of God from the people of Israel), Job ca. 42.18, Paul: Ephes. 6.19. Colos. 4.3.1 Thess. 5.25.2 Thess 3.1. Heb. 13.18. etc., Hiram. 15.1. Ezekiel 14.14. Apo 3.8. and 8.3. Gen. 26.45.24. Exod. 32.13.3. Reg. 18.36.1 Par. 29.18. 3. Reg. 11.12.32.34.15.4. and 4 Reg.8.19 and 19.34. and 20.6. and Isa. 37.35. Chrisostomes hom. 2 Psalm 50.. Luc.16.9. ... and by virtue of this place St. Augustine de civitate dei lib 21 ca. 26; **On angels:** Gen. 28.12. Heb. 1. 14. Augustine epist. 122 Gen.48 . 16, Exod.23.20, Psal. 33.8, Math. 18.10, Act. 12.15, Greg. Wissen:

narrative he can skilfully put and remember all the authors which were relevant for his argument.

Besides being well versed in the theological sources necessary for the defense of his restored Catholicism, de Dominis does not lose the chance to remind, at least some of, his readers of the field within which he was a real expert – namely, of natural philosophy. De Dominis mentions the subject only once in his text while defending the Catholic postulate of transubstantiation: "Let natural Philosophy judge what may be done by nature; but let her reverence and not judge those things that be above nature."¹⁸⁵ Marko Antun de Dominis had an outstanding gift for natural sciences. As mentioned in the contextual part, he was a lecturer in mathematics and he performed certain experiments during these lectures which lead him into postulating the theory on the nature of rainbow, or to put it into modern vocabulary, he participated in one of the first explanations of the refraction of light. He also provided an explanation on the nature of ebb and tide. Though he could not possibly know anything on the gravity he guessed pretty correctly that the moon influenced the phenomenon. He also experimented with the applied optics, laying down some theoretical contribution on how to build a binocular.¹⁸⁶ Stating that "natural Philosophy" should deal

*de vita Moysis. Basil upon the psal. 33 Hieron. In Math. Ca 18 & c. Anthony the father of Monks, epist. 2 ad Arsenios, Anastasius of Sinai in Herem. Lib. 5, Antiochus the Abbot hom. 61. Chrysostom de incomprehens: et Nat. hom 3 and hom. In Martyres agiptias. Hierom. Epist I Ciril Alex. Apud Anastasium Nicenum quest. 9. , Damascen lib. 1, Paralel. ca. 7. &c. On the intercession of other saints: Cyprian lib. De mortalitate, Hierom. Against Vigilantius Aug. de baptismo lib. 5. ca. 17, lib 7. ca. 1 and de verbis Apostoli Sermon. 47. and Sermon. 46 of the Saints, and li. 9. of his confessions cap. 3. lib de cura pro mortuis cap. 16 and against Faustus lib. 20. ca. 21 and in his Meditations, cap. 20. Leo the great Sermon. Of St Laurence Gaudentius Brix. Sermon. 17. Greg. The great lib. 7 indict. 2. epist. 53. Bernard upon the Cant. Cantic. Sermon. 77. **Invocation of Angels, Saints and the Mother of God:** "St. Chrysost. Speaks, Sermon. In Sanctum Meletium...Ireneum lib. 5. 19. Athan. in Evang. De Deipara. Nazianzen: orat in Cyprian: Basil: Selencia, Orat. 1 de verbo incarnat. Aug. serm. 1 de Anunciat: Cosmam Hierosolym: Sophronium item Hyerosalym: orat 6 de Angelorum exelencia... 185 De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 153*

186 For the details on de Dominis' studies in physics and optics see the following articles: Žarlo Dadić, "Prirodnofilozofski i metodološki temelj Dominisovih fizikalnih radova (Natural Philosophical and Methodological Foundation of the Dominis' studies in Physics)," in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog, fizičar. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. u Splitu*, ed.. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), 327 – 334, Mladen Martinis "Marko Antun de Dominis kao fizičar (Marko Antun de Dominis as a physicist)," in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog, fizičar. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. u Splitu*, ed.. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006), 335 – 40, Ivo Derado, "De Dominis i Galileo o plimi i oseci" ("De

with nature seems like an advertising of his own knowledge in this area. He reminds his readers that he is a natural philosopher and if they want to use that knowledge he is at their disposal.

The next instance where he implies his experience is in the heads in which he discusses English religious scene. He goes into many details showing that he was aware of a great specter of what had been going on there; from rumors of Anabaptist female preacher,¹⁸⁷ discussing in Puritan heresies, differences between Puritans and Lutherans and so on.¹⁸⁸ This being said, it should be stressed that de Dominis does not lecture about these differences and peculiarities as if the Catholic readers have no clue about it; quite contrary his tone is light and the style lively. He writes as an ex-insider, which might imply that he is more aware of their inter-relation problems. He suggests that he has a valuable first-hand experience with the diverse English religious scene. The last knowledge which he advertises here is one of the King.

Already Noel Malcolm noticed that he might have offered himself to the Roman curia as someone who knew insider information about the English.¹⁸⁹ And indeed, De Dominis himself, when he mentions James I in his Second Manifesto, does that casually almost implying that they conversed regularly.¹⁹⁰ Though Malcolm seriously doubts de Dominis'

Dominis and Galileo on the Ebb and Tide," in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog, fizičar. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. u Splitu*, ed.. Vesna Tadjina (Split: Književni krug, 2006). 341–46

187De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 146

188De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, pp. 146–51

189Malcolm, p. 72. "His illusions about his importance as an advisor on affairs of state continued to flourish there, and may have received some positive encouragement from the Papal authorities who, in that words of the Venetian Ambassador at Brussels, "hope to make great use of the knowledge which he claims to have of the affairs of state, not only of England, but also of this most serene Republic..." Once he was settled in Rome, the Venetian Ambassador there commented that he spoke about his stay in England as if just returned from an embassy." However, this quoted Venetian ambassador wrote this from Rome in January of 1623, *prior* to publication of the Second Manifesto. Whatever hopes de Dominis had, it was probably clear to him that with the publication of the conversion text his public career would be finished. Indeed, nothing concerning politics, church, theology or an other controversial issue by de Dominis was neither preserved nor published between his return to Rome and his arrest in April 1624.

190De Dominis, *A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 146. "...and the King's Majesty *one day* told me, that lately at London a woman did in assembly of Anabaptists..." (my italics). It is stated in a way that suggests that de

value as an advisor I would not discard that he was not debriefed about the English situation after his return. After all, it was the fourth year of the Thirty Years War and James I, the richest and thus most influential Protestant ruler in Europe, was also the father-in-law of Ferdinand of Palatinate "Winter king," the Bohemian king in exile.

Although thus far, James I had not decided to provide real material support in forms of money and troops (nor he will, as we with the benefit of the hindsight know) against the usurpers of his daughter's and her husband's thrones, Catholic party kept watchful eye on him, and any information concerning his attitudes, intentions and plans was valuable.

4.4. Layers of Identity

Karl Gesine in his article argues that Johannes Ferdinand Franz Weinberger in his reconversion narrative presented himself as "a Christ's watchdog" who not only protected the faithful from the snares of Lutheranism but also who "bark" against any possibility of a heresy; it was felt by Weinberger to be a reparation for his sins.¹⁹¹ Marko Antun de Dominis, though in places differed from this picture, in the end did something similar. Unlike Weinberger, Marko Antun de Dominis does not give a hint that he is truly sorry; what he gives are the reasons to be accepted.

First of all, de Dominis is perfectly aware of the value of his erudition and as was presented above, I believe that he, in the Second Manifesto, tries to remind his audience of that fact. Second, it is not impossible that the illness which he endured during his voyage to Rome made him aware of his fragility due to his age. This possible sense of his vulnerability

Dominis and James I were meeting every day so on "one of those regular day" he told him the Anabaptist hear-say. On the p. 151, after stating that even Anglicans could not prove that the Church of Rome was heretic he confirms that with the following words: "The King's Majesty himself of great Britain, granted to me publicly and plainly, ... that the Church of Rome did not err in fundamental points of Faith." p. 159. "I *myself* heard in England..., one of *my canons of Windsor* preaching before the King..." again, there is an implicit notion of frequenting the English Court.

¹⁹¹Gesine, p. 342

might, willingly or not, enter certain honesty into his presentation of himself. So when he tries to present himself as a new man, naked and unprotected, it might be simply how he really felt at that moment, in the old – new city, at, practically, end of his life about himself. The Second Manifesto, besides being a confession of his mistakes and confirmation of the post-Tridentine Catholicism, might have been his way to tell his readers that he was changed as a human being, but not as a scholar.

This can be taken as an interesting point of departure into speculation concerning his self-identity which should be understood as a multi layered one; a part of his identity was being a scholar, another being an irenecist (this part had been diminished even renounced by the Second Manifesto), third layer was one of a churchman, and the last one which we might glimpse, the identity of himself as a mere private person, with no titles, no prestige, no goals; an old man nearing the end of his life. All of this combined, does not provide a picture that much of a man who is tortured by his conscience, but more of a man who is tortured by his disappointments, age and a sense of failure.

Though he was not willing to be a "watchdog" he was willing to serve with his knowledge. Furthermore, by making a reference about "the learned Adversaries" he also puts emphasis on himself as a competent participant in a possible debate. So, when de Dominis tries to stress his value as a scholar in his conversion narrative he is trying to "bribe" his readers with the only asset he still possesses. This poses the last question to tackle, namely, who were the readers whom de Dominis primarily addressed in his Second Manifesto.

4.5. The audience

In the introduction of *Representations of the Self from The Renaissance to Romanticism*, Patrick Coleman, one of the editors, invoked Bakhtin's suggestion that in "... confession,

finalization can only come from God, and so the text itself cannot be completed."¹⁹² Yet, in public confessions, which conversion narratives were, as well as in an auricular confession, it was the Roman Catholic Church who had the power to finalize the text of a confession by either absolving a penitent from his or her sins or by denying to him or her absolution, thus, dooming the person to eternal damnation. That is the authority which had the power to allow Marko Antun de Dominis to live the rest of his day in peace. So the audience which the text of the Second Manifesto targeted was at the same time the authority in relation to which de Dominis tried to fashion the picture of himself.

Since the original text of the Second Manifesto was written in Latin it is not to be assumed that de Dominis targeted educated readers, willing to appreciate nuances of his text. These educated readers might also be influential so he tried to appeal to their sense of mercy by trying to convince them that he posed no threat, but was offering himself as an asset, again required in the fight versus Protestants. The threat which people like him might have posed was in their public activities; writing, preaching, propagating and in the Second Manifesto he tried to convince them that he wanted to do all this but on their, Catholic side. With the text of the Second Manifest he renounced ambitions of causing problems. His readers have the power to finalize his conversion and come back not only by forgiving him, but also by putting him into such circumstances where he might be useful.

4.6. Conclusion

De Dominis used this text to fashion himself as a knowledgeable and experienced repentant who was willing to make himself a servant of the Church. In order to achieve this picture of himself de Dominis, as was shown in this chapter, heavily employed his erudition

¹⁹²Patrick Coleman, "Introduction: life writing and the legitimation of the modern self," in *Representations of the Self from The Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Patrick Coleman, Jayne Lewis and Jill Kowalik (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) p. 13

(listing titles and authors concerning worship of saints, angels, etc.), elaborated on his insider experience through the mentioning of the King in rather familiar manner and by using the biblical passages, images and paraphrases in order to illustrate either the novel status of a convert or to provide another layer of argument when disputing Protestant postulates. He also reminds his audience on his scientific expertise. Furthermore, through the Second Manifest he affirms orthodox Catholic dogmas and decrees, thus stressing his return to Catholicism. Yet, another layer is also present, that of the rather tired man who feels that he had enough of the unpleasant side of being a dissenter. This is best shown in the opening paragraphs where de Dominis renounces not only of his heresies but also of the shortcomings which lead him into heresy.

5. Conclusion: The Second Manifesto: Before and After

The intention of this thesis was to reconstruct the set of intentions, reasons and motivations that Marko Antun de Dominis had in his mind when he was writing the Second Manifesto. As was mentioned before, the Second Manifesto had a purpose of public abjuration of the heretical ideas that de Dominis published while living in England, especially those ideas that were published in his two booklets *The Rocks of Christian Shipwracke* and in *A Sermon*.

This thesis has argued that the key term here is "public." This was also stated by de Dominis himself, on the very first page of the Second Manifesto: "... and correct myself in public before all the world..."¹⁹³ By publicly declaring his sins and abjuring his heresies, de Dominis destroyed his own credibility as a public figure. Yet, he still did not give up a hope of attracting attention of the Roman authorities to his erudition and possibility of him being useful to the Roman Catholic Church with his erudition and expertise which he acquired while living in England.

To achieve this, Mark Antun de Dominis developed his argumentation on two levels. The first level was divided into three sub-levels which were matching three strategies of defending himself against the attack of the Roman Church. These strategies can be summarized as personal strategy, explaining his choices as results of madness, positive reinforcement of the decrees, dogmas, opinions and attitudes of the Roman Catholic Church and negative reinforcement of the decrees, dogmas, opinions and attitudes of Protestant denomination. Furthermore, as was demonstrated in the third chapter, de Dominis also

¹⁹³*A Manifestation of the Motives*, p. 128

played an ambiguous word game with the term "the Church of England," subtly implying that the Church of England was "less heretical" than other Protestant denominations, thus mitigating the seriousness his own transgressions.

The second level of the text of the Second Manifesto concerns what he was saying about himself. In this part of the text, Marko Antun de Dominis fashioned himself as a scholar, an experienced man with certain insider knowledge concerning religious scene of England. Moreover, de Dominis subtly suggested in the text of the Second Manifesto that, although being an old and sick man, he was still willing to put his considerable erudition to the disposal of the Roman Catholic Church. De Dominis built an interesting, multi layered narrative with which he managed to achieve not only his own confession, but also to remind the Roman audience of his own value.

Moreover, on the general level, the case of Marko Antun de Dominis and this study, open a question of angles from which the genre of conversion narratives can be approached. The value of this thesis, in my opinion, lays in showing that a text, which first and the most important goals are public abjuration of sins, penitence and humiliation, can be used to promote author's images of himself or herself in order to to be perceived in a certain light in a community which required of them to compose a confession or conversion narrative. This, possible, image building of a penitent was concerned not as much with a religion of a targeted community, but more with other values that a targeted community cherished. Thus, through a study of conversion or confession narratives a scholar can get an insight not only into religious expectations and requirements of a particular group, but also of what was valued and desirable in that community.

In this light, the Second Manifesto gets a new meaning. Although regularly discarded as an anomaly between other works written by Marko Antun de Dominis, the text of the

Second Manifesto deserves to be studied not as an account of the opinions and attitudes of de Dominis, but as a specific document of a specific time which reveals more details about a society that required such texts than about their authors.

6. Bibliography

6.1. Primary sources

Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, vol. 14, 1615-1617, edited by Allen B. Hinds, 1908.

Dominis de, Marco Antun. "A manifestation of the motives whereupon the most reuerend father Marcvs Antonivs de Dominis, archibishop of Spalato (in the Territorie of Venice) vndertooke his departure thence." ("Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archiepiscopus Spalatensis, suae profectionis consilium exponit.") In *Marcus Antonius de Dominis. A manifestation of the Motives*, edited by Vesna Tudjina Gamulin, 27-63. Zagreb: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997.

Domins de, Marcus Antonius, Archiepisc. Spalaten. Sui reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit Romae: Ex Typographia Reu Camerae Apostolicae. M.DC.XXIII

Dominis de, Marko Antun. "The Second Manifesto of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato; wherein for his better satisfaction, and the satisfaction others he publicly repents, and recants his former errors, and sets down the cause of his leaving England, and all Protestant Countries, to return unto the Catholic Church." In *Marcus Antonius de Dominis, A manifestation of the Motives*, edited by Vesna Tudjina Gamulin, 127-183. Zagreb: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997.

Ficino, Marcilio. *Three Books on Life*. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1989

Jačov, Marko. *Spisi tajnog vatikanskog arhiva XVI-XVIII veka (Documents of the secret Vatican Archive XVI-XVIII centuries.)* Beograd: SANU, 1983.

Ljubić, Šime. "Prilozi za životopis Markantuna de Dominisa Rabljanina, spljetskoga nadbiskupa." *Starine Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*. 2 (1870): 1-260.

Neile, Richard. *M. Ant. De Dominis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his Shiftings in Religion. A Man for many Masters*. London: 1624.

Tudjina, Vesna. "Regeste dokumenata iz Arhiva Public Record Office u Londonu koji su vezani uz boravak Marka Antonija de Dominisa u Engleskoj (Regestae of the Documents in the Archive of Public Record Office in London Concerning a Sojourn of Marko Antonije de Dominis in England.)" in *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne Zavoda za povijesna i društvene znanosti HAZU* 13 (1983): 197-218

6.2. Secondary Sources

Blažević, Zrinka. *Ilirizam prije ilirizma. (Illyrism before Illyrism.)* Zagreb: Golden marketing - Tehnička knjiga, 2008.

Bogović, Mile. "Biskupija senjska i modruška u vrijeme Dominisove uprave." ("The bishopric of Senj and Modruš during the Dominis' administration.") In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog, fizičar. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tudjina, 33-40. Split: Književni krug, 2006.

- Bogović, Mile. *Katolička crkva i pravoslavlje u Dalmaciji za vrijeme mletačke vladavine* (*The Catholic Church and Orthodoxy in Dalmatia during the Venetian Rule.*) Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1982.
- Bouwisma, J. William. *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation*. Berkely: University of California Press, 1968.
- Bracewell, Catherine Wendy. *The Uskoks of Senj: Piracy, Banditry, and Holy War in the Sixteenth-Century Adriatic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Canning, Joseph. *A history of medieval political thought, 300-1450*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Catholic Encyclopedia "Arminianism." <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01740c.htm> (accessed June 1 2010)
- Catholic Encyclopedia. "Holy Ghost." <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07409a.htm> (accessed June 1 2010)
- Coleman, Patrick. "Introduction: life writing and the legitimation of the modern self." In *Representations of the Self from The Renaissance to Romanticism*, edited by Patrick Coleman, Jayne Lewis and Jill Kowalik, 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Dadić, Žarko. "Prirodnofilozofski i metodološki temelj Dominisovih fizikalnih radova (Natural Philosophical and Methodological Foundation of the Dominis' studies in Physics.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 327-34. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Derado, Ivo. "De Dominis i Galileo o plimi i oseci" ("De Dominis and Galileo on the Ebb and Tide.") In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 341-46. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Doelman, James. *King James I and Religious Culture of England*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000.
- Frederiksen , Paula. "Paul and Augustine: Conversion Narratives, Orthodox Traditions, and the Retrospective Self." *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986): 328-65
- Gesine, Carl. "Catholic Lutheran Catholic: Strategies of Justification and Conceptions of the Self in the Conversion Narratives of Johannes Ferdinand Franz Weinberger (1687 – 1690)." *The Medieval History Journal* 12 (2009). 327-53
- Golub, Ivan "Marko Antun de Dominis u Arhivu svetog Oficija (Marko Antun de Dominis in the Archive of the Holy Office.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 161-200. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Hotson, Howard. "Irenicism in the Confessional Age: The Holy Roman Empire, 1563 – 1648." In *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 – 1648*, edited by Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman, 228-85. Notre

Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.

- Jozić, Branko, "Marko Antun de Dominis u sporu između Mletačke republike i pape Pavla V (Marko Antun de Dominis and the Conflict between the Republic of Venice and the pope Paul V.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 119-133. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Juez y Gálvez, Francisco Javier "Tri Dominisova pisma grofu od Gondomara (Three Letters by Dominis to Count of Gondamar.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 143-54. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Kovačić, Slavko. "Marko Antun de Dominis na čelu splitske crkve (Marko Anton de Dominis: the head of the Church of Split.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 41-79. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- LaCapra, Dominic. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Ljubić, Šime. "O Markantunu Dominisu Rabljaninu, historičko-kritičko istraživanje," *Radovi Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*. 10 (1870): 1-159
- Maag, Karin. "Conciliation and the French Huguenots, 1561-1610." In *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 – 1648*, edited by Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman, 134-149. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided, 1490 – 1700*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Malcolm, Noel. *De Dominis (1560 – 1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic* London: Strickland & Scott Academic Publications, 1984.
- Martinis, Mladen. "Marko Antun de Dominis kao fizičar (Marko Antun de Dominis as a physicist.)" In *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tadjina, 335-40. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- Martinović, Ivica. "Riječanin Josip Zanchi o Rabljaninu Marku Antunu de Dominisu." ("Josip Zanchi of Rijeka on Marko Antun de Dominis of Rab.") *Filozofska istraživanja* 29 (2009): 689-707.
- Patterson, W.B. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Questier, C. Michael. *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580 – 1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996
- Rački, Franjo, "Marko Antun de Dominis," *Vienac*, 6 (1874): 761-832.
- Remer, Gary. *Humanism and Rhetoric of the Toleration*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.
- Rummel, Erika. "Erasmus and the Restoration of Unity in the Church." In *Conciliation and*

- Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1425 – 1648*, edited by Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman, 62-73. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.
- Snow, David and Machalek, Richard. "The Sociology of Conversion." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 10 (1984): 167-90
- Stanojević, Gligor. *Senjski Uskoci. (The Uskoks of Senj)*. Beograd: Vojnoizdavački zavod, 1973.
- Tudjina, Vesna. " Ime, prezime i godina rođenja M. A. de Dominisa." *Senjski zbornik*. 33 (2006): 45-50.
- _____. "Marko Antun de Dominis u pismima suvremenika Fulgenzia Micanzia u prejevodu Thomasa Hobbesa." ("Marko Antun de Dominis in the letters of his contemporary Fulgenzio Micantio in translations of Thomas Hobbes.") in *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijest Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti HAZU* 20 (2003): 165-82
- _____. "Dominis u Engleskoj (Dominis in England,)" in *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup, teolog i fizičar : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 16. do 18. rujna 2002. godine u Splitu*, edited by Vesna Tudjina, 135-42. Split: Književni krug, 2006.
- _____. Introduction to *A Manifestation of the Motives*, by Marko Antun de Dominis, 9-26. Zagreb: Croatian P.E.N. Centre, 1997.
- Yates, Frances A. "Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent."" *Journal of the Warburg and Courland Institutes* 7 (1944): 123-43.