
William J Chriss, University of Texas
Historically, τὸ Πηδάλιον (The Rudder) of St. Nikodimos has been the primary canonical law book used by the Greek Orthodox Church. It is conservative and exclusivist in outlook, particularly with respect to the status of non-Orthodox Christians, which it portrays as questionable. This article discusses The Rudder’s provisions dealing with the baptisms and sacraments of non-Orthodox Christians. More particularly, the theological and cultural attitudes that produced these provisions are analyzed in the context of the growth of Greek nationalism in the late eighteenth century. This study concludes that the xenophobic insularity characteristic of The Rudder was not theologically required, but rather represents a doctrinal choice between alternative formulations. That choice was determined more by the political and economic actions of Italian Christians than by theological considerations or the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The resulting system of church regulations and its accompanying ethos contributed to the development of Hellenic nationalism in the period just before the Greek Revolution.
Catholics, as well as the theological and cultural attitudes that produced those provisions. It does so in the context of the growth of Greek nationalism in the late eighteenth century. This study concludes that the xenophobic insularity characteristic of St. Nikodimos’ The Rudder was not predetermined by doctrinal theology, but rather was a culturally generated choice Nikodimos made between alternative formulations. That choice both contributed to, and was influenced by, the contemporaneous development of Greek nationalism in the period just before the War of Independence of 1821-1830.

While the influence of secular forces on the Greek revolutionary movement is well documented, including the ideological, educational, and literary contributions of Adamantios Korais and Rhigas Pheraios, and the political contributions of expatriate groups like the Φιλική Εταιρία (Philiki Hetairia) (Brewer 2001:1-35; Runciman 1968:391-393; Pagonis 2001), less attention has been paid to clerical forces that contributed to the popular uprising. It is one thing for Enlightenment thinkers and Freemasons to advocate a revolutionary program. Throughout the world many did so after the American and French revolutions. It is another thing altogether for these avant-garde notions to resonate with conservative and religious common folk. For this, an easily accessible ethos is required, and religion is an extremely powerful ethno-ethical force. One principal reason for the success of the Greek Revolution is that radical secular humanists were able to join forces with reactionary religious leaders in support of a political program of independence from the Turks. It is ironic, but understandable, that while the political movement was anti-Turkish and received Italian support, the ethnic nationalism that produced it had a distinctly anti-Italian and anti-Roman Catholic component.
St. Nikodimos the Hagiorite was the major Greek religious figure of this period. He wrote his most influential book, *The Rudder*, at the end of the eighteenth century, and it was first published in 1800. He was born in 1748 or 1749 on the Island of Naxos as Nicholas Kallivourtsis to Anthony and Anastasia Kallivourtsis. None of his biographies in English discuss his father’s trade, but it is said that his mother, presumably upon her widowhood, became a nun at the Monastery of St. John Chrysostom. Nikodimos was of exceptional intellectual ability as a child and came under the tutelage of his parish priest at a young age, serving as an altar boy. Unlike many Greek children of that time, Nikodimos was fortunate to have received an elementary education at a well-organized school in Naxos that was established and endowed by the Greek Orthodox Church. (Cavarnos 1979:67). At this school, he was taught by Archimandrite Chrysanthos “The Aitolian,” who was the principal of the school. This educator was the brother of St. Kosmas “The Aitolian.” There is some indication (Cavarnos 1979:11) that St. Nikodimos actually met St. Kosmas during this period while Kosmas was traveling throughout Greece as a missionary.

From 1760-1779, Kosmas made three missionary journeys throughout Northern and Western Greece and the Greek Islands. These journeys coincided with the height of the Κολλυβάδες (*Kollyvades*) movement for Greek Orthodox renewal. After spending seventeen years as a monk on Mt. Athos, Kosmas felt called to preach the restoration of Christian and Hellenic education and culture in the areas of Greece most vulnerable to Ottoman Muslim proselytism and amalgamation. As Fr. Michael Vaporis puts it:

In the eighteenth century the Orthodox Church was faced with a growing number of defections among the poor and illiterate Orthodox to
Islam, especially in the areas of Albania and Western Greece. There the Orthodox were under especially severe social, economic, and religious pressures by the dominant Moslems. (1977:8).

Kosmas urged Greek communities under Ottoman rule to establish church-schools to teach Orthodox Christianity and Greek language and culture. Hence, he became a cultural, national, and religious hero to the indigenous Greek Orthodox population. By analogy to Thomas Paine and Benjamin Franklin in North America, Kosmas provided part of the cultural and ideological background that nurtured the Greek nationalism that would ultimately give rise to the 1821 revolution. Like any other young Greek Orthodox scholar, Nikodimos must have been significantly influenced by the brothers Kosmas and Chrysanthos. Having exhausted the curricula of Chrysanthos’ primary school circa 1764, Nikodimos was enrolled by his father in a more advanced school, the Ευαγγελική (Evangeliki) in Smyrna. Nikodimos remained exceptionally brilliant, mastering several western languages and rapidly advancing to become a teacher of his fellow pupils. In Smyrna, he made contact with another important Greek educator of the time, Hierotheos Voulismas, who is quoted as saying “Come my son, even now in my old age, that I might leave you as a teacher at the school, as I do not have anyone else like you in attainments.” (Bebis 1989:11-12; Cavarnos 1979:68-72).

As well as Ancient Greek, Nikodimos studied Latin, Italian, and French, and it was his knowledge of these western languages that allowed him to become familiar with western theological writings, such as Combattimento Spirituale, by the Italian priest Lorenzo Scupoli and Esercizi Spirituali by Giovanni P. Pinamonti. These two books
formed the basis of two later works of St. Nikodimos, *The Unseen Warfare* and *Spiritual Exercises*. (Bebis 1989:29; Cavarnos 1979:31-32).

During Nikodimos’ school years, the Ottoman Empire went to war with Catherine the Great of Russia, who in 1768 dispatched a Russian fleet to the Mediterranean with orders to incite revolts among the Turks’ Orthodox subjects. This continued the general anti-Turkish policy of the Russians since Peter the Great to act as protector and provocateur of Turkey’s Christian subjects. During this campaign the Russian admiral Alexei Orlov burned the Turkish fleet at Tsesme, a small port on the western Turkish coast across from Chios and not far from Smyrna, where Nikodimos was studying. This resulted in a characteristic wave of Turkish reprisals against indigenous Christians on the western coast of Asia Minor. (Massie 1999:539-566; Bebis 1989:11; Cavarnos 1979:70; Woodhouse 1991:118-122; Runciman 1997:338-359, 385-406; Paroulakis 2000:16-21). As a result, Nikodimos (and presumably several other Greek students) fled Smyrna. Nikodimos returned to his native island of Naxos where he was, at age nineteen, able to obtain employment as an assistant to the local metropolitan, Anthimos Vardis. He remained in this employ for five years, during which time he met three Athonite monks, Frs. Gregory, Niphon, and Arsenios, who engendered in the young Nikodimos an interest in monastic life on the Holy Mountain.(Bebis 1989:11-14; Cavarnos 1979:70-74).

At some point during this period, Nikodimos also traveled to the nearby island of Hydra to seek out the hermit Sylvestros of Caesarea who lived in the wilderness there. He also met Archbishop Makarios of Corinth who also happened to be on the island because he had been forced out of his episcopal throne by hostilities in the Peloponnesos during the afore-mentioned Russo-Turkish War. As a result of his exile, Makarios had become
an itinerant preaching bishop. (Bebis 1989:11-14; Woodhouse 1991:119). These two personages also influenced Nikodimos to consider Athonite monasticism, and he soon sailed for Mt. Athos with letters of recommendation from both Makarios and Sylvestros.

Like Kosmas the Aitolian, all five of these figures, Gregory, Niphon, Arsenios, Sylvestros, and Makarios, were Greek ethnic and religious leaders during the pre-revolutionary period beginning with the Russo-Turkish War of 1768 and extending through the turn of the nineteenth century. The international politics and domestic ideological developments of this latter third of the eighteenth century provided the fuel for a growing Greek nationalism. This nationalism was an outgrowth of émigré polemics, foreign encouragement, domestic unrest, and Turkish and Phanariot incompetence and corruption, as well as the monastic agitation against such corruption and against outsiders generally examined hereinbelow. (Woodhouse 1991:119-124; Paroulakis 2000:16-21; Runciman 1997:338-406).

When Nikodimos, age 24, reached Mt. Athos in 1775, the wave of Greek nationalism encouraged by the recent Russian adventure into the Mediterranean was just beginning to swell. One could not then have known that within 50 years it would come crashing down around the Sublime Porte, sending eddies and rivulets of libertarianism throughout the Balkans for another century. In 1825, Greece would be one of two nations to throw off the Ottoman yoke. By 1925, the Ottoman Empire would be completely fractured into independent nation-states. Nikodimos and his teachers and associates were the earliest ideological forbearers and midwives of this movement. Many of these associates were Κολλυβάδες (Kollyvades).
The *Kollyvades* Movement began on Mt. Athos in 1754, during St. Nikodimos’ infancy. The monks of St. Ann’s skete were engaged in building a larger church with monetary contributions from throughout the Orthodox world. In order to accommodate a more strenuous work schedule that would include Saturdays, the monks began holding their memorial services for the dead during Sunday vigil, rather than on Saturdays as had been the previous custom. (Bebis 1989:12; Metallinos 1992:25). This was an innovation because Sundays had traditionally been dedicated to celebration, Sunday being the day of Christ’s resurrection. For example, canons of the church had long forbidden strict fasting on Sundays, as well as kneeling (penitential) prayer. (Rudder:196).

This change in practice at one skete produced controversy and condemnation from others on the Holy Mountain. The leading critic was Deacon Neophytos the Peloponnesian of the nearby skete of Kafsokalyvia. He was joined in his protest by Nikodimos’s mentor Makarios, and by another Athonite personality, Athanasios Parios, a prolific writer known for his criticism of the European Enlightenment and Western influence upon Orthodox tradition. (Metallinos 1992:27-28). The *kollyva* incident was one of several controversies that touched off a religious revival among Greek Orthodox Christians and a renewed interest in mystic and patristic literature as a counterweight to perceived “innovation” and “Western influence.”

The fear of Western influence was a constant concern of Orthodox theology during the Ottoman years, juxtaposed against fear of Islamization. Even the Russian intervention into the Mediterranean had overtones of “Western” influence. Since the rule of Peter the Great, the Russian church had cultivated a reputation for innovation that Greeks came to view with suspicion. The “innovation” began with Patriarch Nikon’s
corrections and changes to old Slavonic Russian service books to bring them into harmony with the Greek original texts (a matter which should not have caused any consternation among Greek theologians), and these changes resulted in a schism within the Russian church caused by the protest of traditionalist “old believers.” (Massie 1999:53-64). After this mid-seventeenth century beginning, the Russian church increasingly came under the influence of Tsar Peter until his death in 1725. By that time, his intervention in church affairs and his well-publicized Western innovations at the Russian court had produced suspicion even among many in the Russian church.  

Although not actually one of the Kollyvades, another Orthodox theologian of the same traditionalist and anti-western bent was Eustratios Argenti (ca. 1687 to ca. 1757) who has been described as “the most eminent Greek theologian of the eighteenth Century.” (Ware 1964:xi). Argenti was the primary theological adviser to Patriarch Cyril of Constantinople during Cyril’s disputes with his synod over the validity of Latin baptism in the 1750’s, disputes that partook contemporaneously of the Kollyvades’ “spiritual reawakening” of the mid-eighteenth Century. In 1756, Argenti’s Manual Concerning Baptism was published by the Patriarchate in Constantinople. By this time he was already a well known theologian and writer. Argenti was also a prominent figure on his native island of Chios, where he was not only a lay theologian, but also a prominent physician. Chios, just off the Turkish coast, had been intersection of Italian city-state and Ottoman commercial and naval power for over two centuries. During Argenti’s time, relations between the indigenous Greek Orthodox population of Chios and the Italian Catholic merchants there were quite strained, particularly after Venetian soldiers and sailors occupied the island at the invitation of the Catholic community, shut
all the Orthodox churches, confiscated the Greeks’ goods, and committed other outrages. (Ware 1964:38-44).

In addition to critics of Sunday kollyva, the term “Kollyvades” came to encompass other traditionalist, Greek nationalist, anti-western, polemicists of the mid-eighteenth Century who were involved in a number of other theological disputes. After the kollyva debate began in 1754, the aforementioned dispute over Latin baptism between Patriarch Cyril V of Constantinople and his synod occurred in 1755. Prior to 1755, the Greek Church’s position on the status of Latin baptisms was that Catholics could be received into the church by mere chrismation and abjuration of error without being rebaptized. De facto, Catholic baptisms were officially considered valid from a conciliar ruling in 1484 until 1750. Then, Cyril V began an anti-Latin campaign that resonated with the people of the Greek capital and resulted in a 1755 Patriarchal decree condemning Latin baptisms as without sanctification and of no avail. This decree, cosigned by the Patriarchs of Alexandra and Jerusalem, was nonetheless at odds with Cyril’s own Constantinopolitan synod, which three months earlier had issued an opposite Synodical Decree that Latins ought not be rebaptized. Cyril, with the support of both the populace and the Turkish authorities, expelled the synod from the capital and prevailed. Argenti’s 1756 book was a fortuitous addition to Cyril V’s rhetorical arsenal. (Ware 1964:68-76).

The Kollyvades also advocated frequent communion, most notably in a book published in 1777, which has been attributed to Neophytos the Peloponessian. (Metallinos 1992:25). While critics of these Athonite monks referred to them as innovators, intolerant, or anti-intellectual. (Bebis 1989:11), in truth, the Kollyvades’ programme was reactionary, a return to the mystic spirituality of the Greek fathers, and a
rejection of Western and Enlightenment rationalism. Nonetheless, during the latter half of
the eighteenth Century, two Orthodox synods issued condemnations of the *Kollyvades*.
(Bebis 1989:12). Two years earlier, one of the many Ecumenical Patriarchs of this
period issued a conciliatory ruling less critical of the *Kollyvades* to the effect that *kollyva*
could be sung on either Saturday or Sunday. (Bebis 1989:12).

It was into this decades-long controversy about church ritual, traditionalism, and
Western influence, that Nikodimos entered with the encouragement of his mentors and
tutors. At the behest of Makarios of Corinth, Nikodimos used his considerable
intellectual talents to accelerate the growing feeling of Greek Orthodox pride made
possible by the weakening of the Ottoman Empire and by the increasing intervention into
the region by Russia and the Western European powers. The movement was puritanical
and reformist in the sense that it sought to remove perceived alien influences and
accretions upon the theology of the Orthodox Church. It was proto-nationalistic in its
emphasis on the Greek intellectual tradition of the church, Greek linguistic education, and
ridding the church of Ottoman corruption on the one hand and foreign (Western)
influence on the other. Agitation along these lines could not help but foster ethnic pride
and solidarity among the oppressed Greek population of the empire. “Proto-nationalistic”
is an appropriate term to us in this context because serious political agitation and
organization to overthrow the Turks did not begin until around 1790 with the
underground Greek newspaper Εφηµερίς (*Ephimeris*) and the aforementioned literary
activities of Adamantios Korais and Rhigas Pheraios. Korais translated a “Greek Library”
of Classical Greek authors into the form of modern Greek known as καθαρεύουσα (*katharevousa*). As will be shown, Nikodimos performed the same function with respect
to Greek theological authors. Hence, Korais’ publishing activities in connection with Greek philosophy and secular literature mirrored those of Nikodimos and the *Kollyvades* in theology. They formed an intellectual basis for Greek national pride and identity. Pheraios wrote a proposed Greek Constitution modeled on Anglo-American and French republican principles. He also wrote a revolutionary nationalist hymn and several inflammatory articles in the underground Greek press. It was not until September 1814 that three Greeks in Russia formed the first political group organized to bring about Greek nationhood, the *Philiki Hetairia*. Napoleon’s conquest of Venice in the 1790s “brought French revolutionary ideas within easy reach of the Greeks,” and this also was a key factor. (Runciman 1997:391-393; Brewer 2001:1-35).¹⁰

Nikodimos’ first literary works, on the other hand, long predated the Philiki Hetairia and had nothing to do with the French Revolution. They were inspired or directed by the traditionalist bishop Makarios, who arrived on Mt. Athos in 1777 and assigned Nikodimos the task of correcting and editing the three sets of Athonite manuscripts that ultimately became *Φιλοκαλία* (*The Philokalia*), *Ο Ευεργετινός* (*The Evergetinos*), and *On Continual Communion With the Divine Mysteries*. (Cavarnos 1979:74-75; Bebis 1989:24).¹¹ Ultimately, *The Philokalia* was published in Venice in 1782 and the other two books in 1783. *The Evergetinos* was a collection of sayings of various fathers attributed to an earlier compilation by a monk named Paul. *The Philokalia* is a much more famous collection of such sayings over a period of several centuries, and this appears to be primarily the work of St. Nikodimos himself, who wrote the introduction to the collection and the brief biographies of the authors appearing before their respective contributions to it. (Cavarnos 1989:14).¹²
The Philokalia compiles the canons, sayings, and writings of a number of Greek fathers of the church, from Evagrios the solitary, through John Klimakos, Maximos the Confessor, and many others. The overall theme of the collection, which has been translated into English in four volumes by Bishop Kallistos Ware and others (Palmer, et. al. 1995), is contemplative (noetic) prayer and mystical theology. In many ways, it is a testament to the theology of St. Gregory Palamas (whose writings appear in the fourth volume), and to the mystical anti-rationalism and anti-Western outlook associated with Palamas, Mt. Athos, and later the Kollyvades. The third of Nikodimos’ initial literary works, On Continual Communion with the Divine Mysteries, was published in 1783. This book was a reworked version of the volume originally written by Neophytos and published on a limited basis in 1777 on Mt. Athos. It is beyond dispute that Nikodimos worked very closely with the two most important Kollyvades reformers, Makarios of Corinth, and the monk Neophytos.

In 1778 and 1779, Nikodimos was at work on copying, correcting, and editing into Modern Greek a 13th Century work titled Αλϕαβεταιλϕαβετός (Alphabetalphabetos), said to be authored by St. Meletios the Confessor. As with the vast majority of his translations of classical text, Nikodimos added an explanatory introduction. This book was not published, however, until 1815. In the early 1780’s, while Makarios was publishing Philokalia, Evergetinos, and On Continual Communion With the Divine Mysteries, Nikodimos went into seclusion on a small island south of Mt. Athos. During this time, he wrote The Handbook of Spiritual Counsel, yet another book about inner spiritual struggle, mystical experience, and noetic prayer. This was a completely original work penned by Nikodimos himself, and in this respect, it is
somewhat unique, since most of his other literary work involved editing, copying, and correcting ancient texts for modern publication; or reworking theological texts of more recent date (as in the case of Unseen Warfare and Concerning Continual Communion). Again, the subject is the mystical theology of the Eastern Church, and in particular, Palamite hesychastic anthropology. “Hesychastic anthropology” refers to the traditional Athonite understanding, systematized and crystallized by St. Gregory Palamas, of the nature and composition of the human person. This Athonite conception of human personality is intimately connection with Athonite views of mystical theology and contemplative prayer. (Bebis 1989:37-42).

In The Handbook of Spiritual Counsel, Nikodimos discusses the classical Athonite theory of the passions and how to guard the five senses from their attacks so as to achieve dispassion and contemplative union with divine grace. This book, and Nikodimos’ others, supplemented the Athonite tradition by, for the first time, emphasizing the ability of ordinary Greek laymen to receive this message, take pride in it, and act upon it. Again, in this his work mirrored that of secular Greek nationalists. Nikodimos’ belief in this regard is best demonstrated by his life-long career of editing, introducing, explaining, and publishing, in contemporary language, works that had been previously known and circulated for centuries only among monastic and priestly circles. The view that holiness is accessible to the ordinary layperson is echoed in other Kollyvades polemics, particularly those that encourage frequent communion. As Dr. George Bebis puts it:

During the last years of the Byzantine period and afterward, the reception of holy communion among the Orthodox was restricted to three
times per year, namely, Christmas, Easter, and the *Koimisis* of the *Theotokos* on August 15. The feeling of unworthiness and the emphasis on awesomeness in confronting the Holy Eucharist created an atmosphere that up to the present time causes Orthodox to hesitate to approach the Eucharistic cup. St. Nicodemos (sic) and Neophytos stress the importance of receiving holy communion (sic) frequently, for when taken with proper physical and spiritual preparation, the sacrament purifies and sanctifies the communicant…(1989:25).

Upon his return to Mt. Athos from solitude, Nikodimos wrote several more books during the five years between 1783 and 1788. (Bebis 1989:43; Cavarnos 1979:82-84). The principal of these were *Manual of Confession*, *Unseen Warfare*, and *Spiritual Exercises*. Before completing these works, Nikodimos edited and translated into Modern Greek, *The Extant Works of Saint Simeon the New Theologian* at the instigation again of Makarios of Corinth, who returned to Mt. Athos in 1784.

*Unseen Warfare* was an adaptation by Nikodimos of *Combatamento Spirituale*, the work of an Italian priest, Lorenzo Scupoli, published in 1589. *Spiritual Exercises* was adapted from another Italian work, *Esercizi Spirituale*, by Giovanni Pinamonte, a Jesuit priest. Bebis and Cavarnos both quote one of St. Nikodimos’ last books, *Εορτοδρόμιον (Heortodromion)* to explain his surprising familiarity with these Italian books:

> We must hate and detest the misbeliefs and unlawful customs of the Latins and others who are Heterodox; but if they have anything sound and
confirmed by the Canons of the Holy Synods, this we must not hate. (Bebis 1989:26; Cavarnos 1979:31).

Thus, what Nikodimos did with these two Catholic books was to “Orthodoxize” them by changes in nomenclature (e.g., substituting “icon” for “image”), and by addition of Orthodox concepts like the Jesus Prayer (“prayer of the heart”). Their basic subject remained the same: the struggle of the Christian person against demonic forces and temptations, and towards holiness. In this they were continuations of, and variations upon, the theme of Handbook of Spiritual Counsel.

In 1787 or 1788, Nikodimos undertook the compilation and editing for publication in Modern Greek of the Athonite manuscripts of the writings of St. Gregory Palamas. However, this work of Nikodimos was never published because years later, Austrian agents destroyed it and the Athonite printing press, in retaliation for the alleged printing of Napoleonic leaflets in support of a Balkan uprising against the Austrian Empire. It is indeed odd that ultra-conservative monastics would be suspected of being in league with Napoleonic radicals. Here is more evidence of proto-nationalistic, anti-imperial sentiment among the Kollyvades and their Athonite brethren. Soon after Nikodimos finished his manuscript on Palamas, a monk came to the Holy Mountain who helped Nikodimos begin the work that would become The Rudder.

Agapios the Peloponnesian arrived on Mt. Athos some time in 1788. He was a learned man who had taught school in Chios, Smyrna, and Demitsana in the Peloponnesos. In some way, Agapios and Nikoidemos agreed to collaborate in producing a new and comprehensive compilation of Church canons. Agapios must have been of great assistance in collating and copying the vast corpus of Athonite texts from which this
compilation was made. However, it is generally believed that the commentaries and explanations of the canons within The Rudder is exclusively the work of Nikodimos. (Bebis 1989:45).  

The entire undertaking took more than two years. When it was completed the manuscript was entrusted to another monk named Theodoretos with instructions to procure its publication. He ultimately did so, but only after adding some dubious commentary of his own to portions of the manuscript. These were abjured by Patriarch Neophytos VII of Constantinople in an 1802 post-publication encyclical letter that otherwise approved the “truth of all that is said in this Handbook…” The contents were also approved by Makarios, Athanasios Parios, and the entire Constantinopolitan synod, although two of the bishops objected initially because the “Canonica of the Church ought not to be published in popular speech, lest the contents of the sacred Canons become familiar to the rabble.” Soon after its publication and Patriarch Neophytos’ public approbation, The Rudder became the standard canonical text in general usage throughout the Greek world. 

It is Nikodimos’ compilation, form various sources, of the canons of the Orthodox Church. More useful to the historian are his revealing notes and commentaries appended to each canon. These canons consist in the rulings or pronouncements of the seven ecumenical councils of the Church, of a few local councils of bishops, and of noted individual theologians like St. Basil the Great. In his initial preface or dedication, Nikodimos makes clear just how authoritative he thought this canonical collection should be:
In fact, this figurative rudder was constructed in yoretime by the Holy Spirit through the agency of the godly-learned apostles and, from time to time, of Holy Councils, Ecumenical as well as Regional, and of individual great hierarchs of the Church. Many others, after them, as collaborators and adjutories, who steered it with joined hands in mending it, and interpreted parts thereof that were hard to understand, harmonizing well enough passages that somehow seem to conflict with one another. (Rudder 1983:x-xi).

Tellingly, Nikodimos admits that, “the present handbook” is “interpretative of the divine Canons (emphasis added).” While he asserts that the canons are divinely inspired through apostolic agency, he must admit that they require his interpretation because they are “hard to understand,” and, more importantly, because many provisions seem “to conflict with one another.”(Rudder 1983:x-xi). For example, Nikodimos admits that “one might rightfully wonder” how the Trullo synod (6th Ecumenical Council, A.D. 691) could simultaneously approve a canon from an A.D. 418 local council of Carthage condemning all non-Orthodox baptisms as void, and its own Canon 95 that accepted many such baptisms as valid and effectual.

In explaining how this could happen, Nikodimos seeks to justify his own obvious preference for the stricter, more exclusivist, rule. In so doing, he draws upon the authority of the so-called “Apostolic” canons, which he believed dated from the Apostles themselves. Modern scholarship has proven Nikodimos wrong in this respect. The “Apostolic Canons” were not apostolic at all, but represent the legislation of the local church in Syria from the late fourth century. (L’Huiller 1996:23).
Nonetheless, from Nikodimos’ perspective, “Apostolic” Canon 46 ordered that any bishop or presbyter who “accepts” any heretic’s baptism or Eucharist “be deposed.” It is evident from Nikodimos’ comment on this canon that he understands it as part of a more general principle that heretics are unbelievers, and that “those who accept the doings of heretics either themselves entertain similar views to theirs or at any rate they lack an eagerness to free them from their misbelief.” Apostolic Canon 47 likewise condemns rebaptizing anyone that has “had a true baptism,” or failing to baptize anyone “that has been polluted by the impious.” The impious are not defined in the canon, nor is a “true” baptism, but these two “Apostolic” canons are the primary authority Nikodimos finds for his criticism of the sacraments of the non-Orthodox, i.e., the Latins and the Protestants. (Rudder 1983:68). His most thorough explanation of the invalidity of heterodox baptism is found in his Interpretation, Concord, and footnotes to this Canon 47, which can be better understood after briefly discussing his comments on several conflicting baptismal canons that force him to face head-on the substantial canonical authority opposed to his point of view. (Rudder 1983:68-72).

Canon 7 of Constantinople (2nd Ecumenical Council, A.D. 381) poses the biggest problem for Nikodimos’ interpretation of the previously mentioned canons of “the Holy Apostles.” Canon 7 has given rise to differing interpretations even among modern Orthodox scholars. It divides heretics returning to the church into two categories, those who are received by chrismation and abjuration of heresy (but who are not rebaptized), and those who require abjuration, chrismation, and baptism. Nikodimos’ interpretation of this canon and his “Concord” to it fill two and half pages of text. His footnotes explain the character of the beliefs of the heretics listed and categorized by the canon.
The Sabbatians were a branch of the Novatians that followed Jewish customs. Nikodimos calls it “a matter of wonder” why Canon 8 of the First Ecumenical Council (Nicaea, A.D. 325) would require mere confession of faith of these Sabbatian Novatians, whereas the instant canon insisted upon chrismation as well. Here, Nikodimos must bring in his notion of οἰκονομία (oikonomia) to solve “this perplexing question.” To generalize, oikonomia may be broadly understood as a Greek variant of the Latin dispensatio, i.e., an exception based on extenuating circumstances. Nikodimos assumes that the First Council applied oikonomia to relax the usual norm of chrismation because of a pressing need to encourage the Novatians to return to the church. He says that the Second Council (Constantinople, A.D. 381) added a “second principle” besides the one of oikonomia: that since the Novatians do not anoint themselves with chrism, this must be performed when they are readmitted. (Rudder 1983:217-219). Thus, for him, the Second Ecumenical Council was more strict, i.e., ἀκριβῆς (akribis) than, and superceded the First.

Under the Constantinopolitan canon, in addition to the Sabbatians and Novatians, those whose baptisms were treated as valid also included Arians, Macedonians, Quartodecimans, and the Apollinarians. Nikodimos cites Zonaras as authority for the proposition that this canonically defined “first group” was not rebaptized because their baptism was performed in the same way as the Orthodox. While this held true for the Novatians, Sabbatians, Quartodecimans, and Apollinarians, it could only have superficially and formally applied to Arians and Macedonians because they were non-Trinitarian sects, and hence while they may have performed triple immersion, one could question whether they did so “in the name of the Trinity.” While Nikodimos acknowledges this, he still adds that an exception based on oikonomia must have been
made in the case of Arians and Macedonians both because of “the vast multitude of such heretics then prevalent,” and a second reason being “that they used to baptize themselves in the same way as we do.” (Rudder 1983:217-218).

Those whose baptisms were treated as invalid and who thus did require rebaptism under this canon were the Eunomians, the Montanists/Phrygians, and the Sabellians and all other heretics “especially such as come from the country of the Galatians.” Phrygians, Eunomians, and Sabellians “who used to say that the Father and the Son were one and the same person and who used to do other terrible things” are totally unbaptized because they “either have not been baptized at all or, though baptized, have not been baptized aright and in a strictly Orthodox manner, wherefore they are regarded as not having been baptized at all (emphasis added).” In his “Concord” to Canon 7 of Constantinople, Nikodimos points out that it is consistent with Canons 7 and 8 of Laodicea, as well as Canon 95 of Trullo, except that Trullo adds that “Manichees, and Valentinians, and Marcionists must be baptized when they turn to Orthodoxy; but Eutychians, and Dioscorites, and Severians may be accepted after anathematizing their own heresies – as may also the Novatians, that is to say, and the rest.” (Rudder 1983:218-219).

Inevitably, Nikodimos is forced to acknowledge that both Canon 7 of the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople I, A.D. 381) and this Trullo Canon 95 are quite liberal in their treatment of the sacraments of the heterodox. Canon 95 merely picks up where Canon 7 of the Second Ecumenical Council (I Constantinople, A.D. 381) left off. As Nikodimos says in his commentary on the Constantinopolitan Canon, the Council in Trullo added Manicheans, Valentinians, Marcionists, Nestorians, Eutychians, Dioscorites, and Severians to the earlier Council’s list of heretics for whom rebaptism
might, or might not be required. The way the text is written, it is open to a more liberal interpretation that these newly listed heretics might, like the Nestorians, be received back into the Church solely by their renouncing heretical belief. However, both in his commentary to Canon 7 of I Constantinople, and in interpreting the Trullo Canon, Nikodimos claims that Manicheans, Valentinians, Marcionists, Eunomians, and Montanists must all be rebaptized, whereas only Nestorians, Eutychians, Dioscorites, and Severians may be received by merely renouncing in writing their heresies and leaders. The actual text of Trullo Canon 95 requires no such thing of the newly proscribed Manicheans. Rather, as to all these, the statement is merely made that:

As for Manicheans, and Valentinians, and Marcionites and those from similar heresies, they have to give us certificates and anathematize their heresy (called libelli) the Nestorians, and Nestorius, and Eutyches and Dioscorus, and Severus, and the other exarches of such heresies, and those who entertain their beliefs, and all the aforementioned heresies, and thus they are allowed to partake of holy Communion. (Rudder 1983:401).

Nikodimos interpolates that the requirement of anathema and certification is in addition to what is required of the Nestorians and others, who he says are more openly accepted “as Greeks.” (Rudder 1983:401). In fact, the text of the canon appears so liberal with respect to admission of all the newly listed heretics, including Manicheans, Valentinians, and Marcionites, that the Byzantine canonist Balsamon, even in his day, believed it must have been somehow corrupted earlier. He proposes that the original text must have begun with “in the same way” rather than “And,” and it must have had some negative conjunction such as “but” between the groups needing rebaptism and the
Nestorians, Eutychians, etc. listed at the end who were accepted “as Greeks.” Thus he reasoned that the “uncorrupted” (and lost) text must have read something like:

_**In the same way** (as the preceding), Manicheans, Valentinians, Marcionites, and all of similar heresies are received; _but_ the Nestorians (merely) have to give us certificates and anathematize their heresy, and Nestorius, and Eutyches, … (Hefele 1997:405-406).

If Balsamon was right, then the lost original text was corrupted indeed, since his reconstruction requires transposition of words within sentences, changing the conjugations of verbs, _and_ the addition of words like “but.”

Nikodimos’ xenophobia towards the Latins appears here in open justification of his anti-Latin position, although it seems a bit gratuitous and out of place:

So, then, get it into your head and understand from this that both heretics and Latins, when they join the Orthodox Eastern Church, ought of their own accord and on their own account to seek to have themselves baptized, and not have to be urged to do so by the Orthodox.(Rudder 1983:402).

It is as if the vehemence of Nikodimos’ sentiments somehow adds credibility to his avoidance of the actual wording of the canon as it had come down to him.

Examples of inconsistent canons with respect to recognizing non-Orthodox baptisms abound. Having identified a significant portion of the problem, Nikodimos gives an exposition of his solution:

In order to have an easily understandable solution of this perplexity there is need that one should know beforehand that two kinds of government
and correction are in vogue in the Church of Christ. One kind is call
*Rigorism* (ακρίβεια); the other kind is called *Economy* and *Moderatism* (οικονοµία); with which the economists of the spirit promote the salvation of souls, at times with the one, and at times with the other kind. So the fact is that the holy apostles in their aforesaid canons, and all the saints who have been mentioned, employed Rigorism, and for this reason they reject the baptism of heretics completely, while, on the other hand, the two Ecumenical Councils employed Economy … because in the times especially of the Second Council, the Arians and the Macedonians were at the height of their influence, and were not only very numerous but also very powerful, and were close to the kings, and close to the nobles and to the senate. Hence, for one thing, in order to attract them to Orthodoxy and correct them the easier, and, for another thing, in order to avoid the risk of infuriating them still more against the church and the Christians and aggravating the evil, those divine fathers thus managed the matter economically. (*Rudder* 1983:70).

Again Nikodimos goes on to state that there was “a second reason” akin to the ground of *oikonomia* why the Second and Sixth Ecumenical Councils were more liberal than the local Council of Carthage or the “Apostolic Canons” with respect to accepting the baptisms of certain heretics:

This is the fact that those heretics whose baptisms they accepted also rigorously observed the kind and the matter of the baptism of the baptism
of the orthodox, and were willing to be baptized in accordance with the form of the Catholic church. (Rudder 1983:71).

Nikodimos even resorts to the example of the Arians in support of this analysis because, although they considered the Son and Holy Spirit lesser members of the Trinity, they did perform triple immersion and at least recited the names of each of the persons of the Trinity.²¹

Nikodimos well understood the importance of these Canons and his theory of them to contemporary treatment of Latins:

All this theory which we have been setting forth here is not anything superfluous; on the contrary, it is something which is most needful, … especially today on account of the great controversy and the widespread dispute which is going on in regard to the baptism of the Latins, not merely between us and the Latins, but also between us and the Latin-minded (otherwise known as Latinizers). So, following what has been said, since the form of the Apostolic Canon demands it, we declare that the baptism of the Latins is one which falsely is called baptism, and for this reason it is not acceptable or recognizable either on grounds of Rigorism or on grounds of Economy. It is not acceptable on grounds of Rigorism: (1st) because they are heretics. That the Latins are heretics there is no need of our producing any proof for the present. … wherefore we must not even think of uniting with them. So, it being admitted that the Latins are heretics of longstanding, it is evident … that they are unbaptized, in accordance with the assertions of the St. Basil the Great.
above cited, and … having become laymen as a result of their having been cut off from the Orthodox Church, they no longer have with them the grace of the Holy Spirit with which Orthodox priests perform the mysteries (emphasis added). (Rudder 1983:72).

Characteristically, the second reason that Nikodimos gives why the Latins are unbaptized is because they “do not observe the three immersions.” He specifically cites the theologian Eustratios Argenti in support of this notion. Interestingly, Nikodimos anticipates the logical question of what happens if a Latin does use three immersions. His response is that if “anyone among the Latins or the Latin-minded should put forward a claim to the three invocations of the Holy Trinity, he must not pretend to have forgotten… that those super godly names are idol and ineffective when pronounced by the mouth of heretics (emphasis added.)” (Rudder 1983:73).

Most importantly, he answers what he knows will be yet another Latin objection, i.e., that Latins had been accepted into Orthodoxy by chrismation alone for centuries. Briefly, chrismation is the equivalent of the Catholic sacrament of confirmation, but the Orthodox perform it immediately following baptism by anointing with oil (chrism). The dominant theory, even in the eighteenth century, criticized by Nikodimos was that this rite of “completion” could be used to supply whatever charisma a non-Orthodox baptism was lacking. As one might expect, his response is that the Church, for some period of time, “wished to employ some great economy with respect to (acceptance of) the Latins.” In support of his argument that such acceptance could only take place by oikonomia, he argues the use of chrismation to accept Latins to its logical extreme:
We reply in simple and just words: That it is enough that you admit that she used to receive them in chrism (alone). So they are heretics. For why the chrism if they were not heretics? (Rudder 1983:73).

This entire argument is often circular, and certainly less than clear. For example, it is odd that, for Nikodimos, the Apostolic Canons and the local canons of Carthage provide the “general rule” while three Ecumenical Councils (I Nicaea, I Constantinople, and Chalcedon) are “limited exceptions.” Also, Nikodimos understands the “form of the ritual” to be a “separate” reason for recognizing the validity of certain heretic baptisms, aside from application of *oikonomía*. One might expect him rather to use form as a justification for extending *oikonomía*. He does not. His explanation for the simultaneous approval by Trullo of mutually exclusive canons is similarly unsatisfying, but most disturbing is his vitriolic attack on Latin baptism, compared to his two-fold apology for Arian baptism. Arian baptisms were considered valid by application of *oikonomía* for the simple reason that there were so many of them. Yet, as a separate “non-oikonomical” reason, Nikodimos keeps alluding to the fact that although they are *non-Trinitarian heretics*, they at least baptize in the name of the Trinity by triple immersion. Yet, Nikodimos says that even Latins who are baptized by triple immersion in the name of the Trinity are not validly baptized “either on grounds of Rigorism or on grounds of Economy.” The only sense one can make of this reasoning is by reference to the temporal threat to the church from the Latins, and *more importantly from the “Latin-minded Latinizers.”* There must have been some reason that Latins were more distasteful to Nikodimos than even non-Trinitarian Arians.
Nikodimos understands that the Church used different standards (canons) in response to changing circumstances. However, he is uncomfortable leaving matters there. He needs a general rule of strictness and a limited exception of liberality, and so, given his own *gestalt*, he must characterize any evidence by reference to these categories. In so doing, he appears to rely rather heavily on his mistaken belief in a higher level of authority being accorded to the “Apostolic” Canons when compared to truly ecumenical (and more liberal) ones like I Constantinople, Canon 7; and Chalcedon, Canon 14.

Nikodimos explains away the similar example of the Carthaginian Council’s liberal acceptance of sacraments performed by Donatists, giving as the reason “the great need and want which Africa had of clergymen.” He then draws the explicit conclusion that “this is the same as saying that they accepted them economically.” He places in the same category the Seventh Ecumenical Council’s easy acceptance of ordinations performed by iconoclasts in A.D. 787.

Since Nikodimos regards these as “relatively rare and occasional” temporal and circumstantial economies, he sees no conflict with the Apostolic Canons. However, anything that is “due to circumstances and that is a rarity is not a law of the church.” (Rudder 1983:121-122). Nikodimos gives the distinct impression in these passages of attempting to explain away the unexplainable. For example, in his footnote to this canon, he is forced to deal with Demetrias Chomateinos’ and John of Kitros’ statements that “we are making no mistake if we deem the sacraments of the Latins holy.” Nikodimos explains away this statement by reference to it having been made at a time when the Latins had “not yet set aside the law requiring three immersions.” He adds that these same two writers nevertheless recommended, “that we ought not to allow any Orthodox
Christian to *receive* communion from the Latins (emphasis added).” So, if a Latin is baptized with three immersions, is the Eucharist of which he partakes holy? If so, why must Orthodox not partake of it? Nikodimos does not say. (Rudder 1983:121).

Moreover, what he does not mention is that all of these more liberal and ecumenical canons are inconsistent with his own strict interpretation of Apostolic Canons 47 and 48 that *all* heretical baptisms are pollutions. His interpretations of all of these canons, taken together, belies that *oikonomia* is the only reason for the inconsistency. If it were, what is the purpose of all the discussion about the form of baptismal ritual, and the particular theological errors of the sect involved? In general, Nikodimos appears to bear much greater enmity toward the Latin Christians of his own day than to the scores of non-Trinitarian or Gnostic sects that espoused creeds much more at odds with Orthodox Christian doctrine.

Thirty-three years after the local Council of Carthage in which Nikodimos put so much stock, the Fourth Ecumenical Council convened at Chalcedon in A.D. 451. Canon 14 of this Ecumenical Council is another obstacle to Nikodimos’ theory of baptismal validity. As his “Interpretation” acknowledges, the Early Church’s practice with regard to chanters and readers was not consistent. In some regions, they were required to be celibate. In others, they were allowed to marry, and several appear to have married heterodox spouses, or even non-Christians. This Canon addresses the situation of readers and chanters already in mixed marriages whose children have been “*baptized by heretics*” (emphasis added).” The Council specifically held that such children were allowed “into the communion of the catholic Church.” There is no requirement of rebaptism, and no mention is made of chrismation or even the laying on of hands. (Rudder 1983:259).
Nikodimos’ interpretation of this canon is puzzling. He asserts, without proof, that the real meaning of the canon is that it acknowledges the heretical baptism of children, if that baptism “does not differ from the Orthodox baptism so far as concerns the matter and form, but, on the contrary, is acceptable to the Orthodox Church.” Presumably, as to “form,” he is referring to baptism in the name of the Trinity by triple immersion. As to “matter,” one can only guess. He goes on to add that, under this canon, the child should still be chrismated, relying on Zonaras for this addition. Unlike his commentary on Carthage, Nikodimos note to this canon does not insert the notion of whether the baptism was performed by an Orthodox cleric. Rather, he hearkens back to the Apostolic Canons’ equation of heretical belief and ritual pollution. He even takes it upon himself to contradict the Chalcedonian Ecumenical Council, stating that it would be “more correct and safer for them to be baptized, seeing that the baptism of all heretics is in the nature of a pollution, and not a baptism,” and citing Apostolic Canons 46, 47, and 48 in support of his position. (Rudder 1983:259-260).

Here, Nikodimos is clearly interpolating requirements that the council did not lay out, as there is no attempt to characterize or categorize heretics or their baptisms, either by the form used, the status of the officiating cleric, or the dogmatic error believed. In fact, Nikodimos’ entire argument with respect to the baptismal canons of all three Ecumenical Councils (Nicaea I, Constantinople I, and Chalcedon) appears based upon an assumption of the superior authority of the Apostolic Canons. Hence, he keeps returning to the point that the Apostolic Canons condemn the sacraments of heretics as outrageous pollutions. As indicated, his assumption as to the superior authority of the Apostolic Canons is evidently incorrect, in that they were the result of regional, rather than
ecumenical legislation. In short, he cannot explain Chalcedon’s Canon 14. He can only disagree with it, even though it is ecumenical.

Finally, there is one other canon of the Council of Trullo (A.D. 691) that is of interest. Canon 72, Trullo, is instructive because like Canon 14, Chalcedon, it deals with mixed marriages between Orthodox and heterodox, rather than with baptisms. It prohibits such marriages “for it is not right to mix things immiscible, nor to let a wolf get tangled up with a sheep.” Evidently, there was some perceived need in the late 7th Century for such a proscription, since the previous Ecumenical Councils did not see fit to promulgate such an edict with respect to lay people. The closest analogy is Canon 14 of Chalcedon prohibiting mixed marriages by tonsured chanters and readers. Interestingly, it is in this same section of The Rudder that St. Nikodimos’ notions of contamination and “intermingling” reappear as his sternest anti-Latin warnings:

Let those prelates fear the penance of the present Council who are in the island provinces and all those regions where there are Latins; and by no means and on no account whatsoever let them allow a Latin man to marry an Orthodox woman, or a Latin woman to take an Orthodox man to husband. For what communion can there be of the Orthodox party with the heretic (emphasis added)? (Rudder 1983:376-377).

From an objective standpoint, Nikodimos’ reasoning appears to be based on little more than xenophobia and Greek ethnic or sectarian pride, although he certainly would not have seen it that way. Any modern theologian must wonder how Latin Catholics could possibly be considered more heterodox to a Greek than non-Trinitarian Gnostics.
However, considering the historical context in which he wrote, his point of view was entirely predictable, irrespective of the purity of his personal motives. His life and the exploits of his co-workers were imbedded within a larger historical fabric, a story that would verify, again and again, the responsiveness of Greek church rules to contemporary geo-political circumstances.

To begin with, historically, the relationship between Greeks and Turks had always been a bad one. The Turkish tradition was epitomized by the “millet system,” whereby subject peoples were treated as ethnic units subject to certain disabilities, and were ruled and manipulated through leaders ostensibly their own, but in reality Turkish puppets, or at best precarious middlemen. Prior to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, this system was used by the Ottomans to govern Christians already under their control, such as those in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt. The Turks did not object to Orthodox subjects professing loyalty to their local bishops, or even to the Byzantine emperor in Constantinople. The power of the emperor was dwindling, and he was not perceived as a significant threat. However, any attempt at armed rebellion in support of Christian solidarity was ruthlessly crushed. While Christians were allowed to worship in their local churches and to entertain illusions of allegiance to the Byzantine Empire, they were still second-class citizens in every respect. Their disabilities included taxation heavier than that levied upon Muslim subjects, restrictions on property ownership, and forced impress into the Sultan’s army. Less institutionalized forms of discrimination were also common, in that Christians received little or no governmental protection from private outrage at the hands of powerful Muslims. For example, Christians were likely to be treated unjustly in
Turkish courts on a de facto basis, and might have to suffer forced seduction, abduction, or rape of family members without retribution. (Runciman 1997:75-81).

From the late fifteenth century until 1575, the Turks were involved in constant warfare with the Venetians. The first war started in 1463 and lasted 16 years, during which the Venetians were able to occupy Athens in 1466, but only for a short time. Venice and Turkey went to war again in the early 1500s, at which time the Turks conquered Venetian possessions in the southwestern Peloponnesos. Venice, however, retained control of Cyprus, which had been bequeathed to her by the last of the Lusignan Crusader dynasty, beleaguered by unsuccessful but damaging Genovese invasions. (Woodhouse 1991:107-108).

Constant wars over territory between the Venetians and the Turks continued throughout the remainder of the 16th century. During that century, there were no less than two more conflicts that ended in the loss of additional Venetian territory in the Ionian and Eastern Mediterranean. By the 1600’s, the Turks were recognized as a player in European power politics and had treated with France and Austria. In the seventeenth century, while the Turks initially continued their territorial gains in places like Crete (taken from the Venetians in 1670) and Poland, increasing pressure on them from the north allowed the Venetians to begin turning the tide in the late seventeenth century. By the late seventeenth century, in addition to Venice in the South, the Turks were also fighting the Austrians and the Russians on the northern frontier. (Woodhouse 1991:109-112).

The constant warfare between the Catholic powers of the West (primarily Venice) and the Ottoman Sultanate gave the indigenous Greek population much opportunity to
observe the difference in political style between the two. This was particularly true in areas that passed back and forth between the Venetians and the Turks, such as Crete, Cyprus, the southwestern Peloponnesus and the Ionian Islands. Grand Duke Lukas Notaras’ famous statement that “Better to see the turban of the Turks reigning in the middle of the city than the Latin tiara” accurately summarizes the dominant view of the subject Greek population during the ensuing centuries of Ottoman rule. (Magoulias 1970:170). As an Austrian observed:

The Venetians kept their subjects in Cyprus (like the Genovese theirs in Chios) worse than slaves … After the Turks came, the poor people are freed of their burden, and are equally free, but their masters, who had tortured them, were caught and sold in Turkey.

Similar accounts come from Crete, the Ionian islands, and the Peloponnesos. (Woodhouse 1991:112).

Bishop Timothy (Kallistos) Ware has written one of the best descriptions of the everyday relationships between common Greek Orthodox Christians and Roman Catholics in the 1600’s and 1700’s. Ware believes that Italian Catholics living in Greek areas were disproportionately powerful as compared to Orthodox Christians because of the presence of Jesuits and other missionary priests and because of Western economic support. Their influence was increased by their willingness and ability to recruit intelligent young Greeks to study in Italy, since educational opportunities in Greece were extremely limited. (Ware 1964:16-17).
Nonetheless, although an underlying hostility towards the West “is never entirely absent,” relations between Greeks and Latins throughout the seventeenth Century were “extraordinarily cordial.” Catholics and Orthodox went to confession with each other’s priests, received communion from each other’s priests, used each other’s altars, were accepted as each other’s godparents, and frequently married each other without serious complication. Bishop Ware gives several anecdotal examples from the Ionian islands of Corfu, Zakynthos and Kephallonia, although he cites similar cases in the Aegean Islands of Mykonos, Naxos, and Chios. These local accommodations were largely without sanction by, or even in violation of, the official pronouncements of ecclesiastical authorities. (Ware 1964:17-21).

These interethnic relations cooled significantly in the 1700’s. Ware ascribes the later deterioration in relations between Greeks and Italians to several factors that combined during the early 1700’s to undermine tolerance among Greek common people, and to induce greater adherence to stricter anti-Catholic formal church pronouncements. Initially, there was the Venetian occupation or reoccupation of the Peloponnesos and various islands from 1685 to 1718 that marked a resurgence of Italian imperialism in the region, as the Ottomans retreated in the face of renewed Venetian military confidence. As rulers rather than visiting merchants, the Venetians were evidently far more unpleasant and oppressive than the Turks. For example, the Venetians occupied Chios in 1694 at the invitation of the resident Latin community, and once in power they treated the Greeks with great severity. “They shut up all their churches, confiscate the goods of many, forbid the Grecian priests the exercise of the function and the administration of the
sacraments, and will suffer none but Latins to confess dying Greeks, or to baptize infants.” 22

When they were expelled the following year, the Greeks were able to demonstrate to the Turks that the Venetian merchant community had instigated the invasion, and then demanded that the Turks deliver to the Greeks all Catholic Church property. Moreover, the Turks did not interfere with informal or individual Greek reprisals against any Italian traders who stayed behind. As long as Italian merchants acted as mercantile intermediaries posing no serious or political threat to the Greek cultural status quo, friendly relations prevailed. When they sought to stay and to rule, resentment and ethnocentrism boiled over quickly. Greek attitudes toward the Venetians in Chios exemplified “the same tolerance and cordiality in the middle of the seventeenth century, followed by the same growing hostility.” (Ware 1964:36).

To exacerbate matters, by the 1700’s the Turks had long been actively pitting the Orthodox and Catholics against one another. Other factors were also at work. Agents of both the Turks and Catholics constantly influenced patriarchal elections in Constantinople and elsewhere by bribery and intrigue. In the 1630’s Cyril Lucaris was the Protestantophile Patriarch of Constantinople. He expressed seriously Calvinist views about such issues as justification by faith “alone.” In fact, his own “Confession” written in 1629 was so revolutionary and Protestant in emphasis “that to this date there have always been Orthodox who refused to believe that a Patriarch of Constantinople could have written such a confession.” (Ware 1964:8-11; Runciman 1997:259-288). The Catholics considered Lucaris’ Protestant leanings as a cassus belli in this regard. Throughout the seventeenth century it was not uncommon to see Ecumenical Patriarchs
come and go in the space of weeks, only to return when their party (either pro-Roman or anti-Roman) again gained the upper hand with the Sultan or the electoral synod of bishops. For example, Joannikos II, probably with Roman help, held the Patriarchal throne four separate times in less than a decade. Meanwhile, the Latins were also secretly obtaining allegiance and even “conversions” from Orthodox prelates everywhere.  

The situation was so corrupted by foreign influence that in 1662, after several decades of virtual control over the Patriarchate of Antioch (by obtaining secret submission of the Patriarchs and their parties to the Pope), Rome received from Makarios III of Antioch not only another secret submission, but also a public toast to the Pope. By 1724, matters erupted into open hostility upon the death of Patriarch Athanasios III. Local pro-Roman clergy and laity assembled in Damascus and elected their own publicly Romanophile Patriarch, while the Synod in Constantinople elected its own Patriarch of Antioch. The schism lasted for decades. As a result of Turkish oppression of the local churches and the *millet* system centered on the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, there was a Catholic Patriarch of Antioch in Damascus, a Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch in Constantinople, and no indigenous Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch. (Ware 1964:25-32; Runciman 1997:195-207, 226-237). “Thus the Venetian occupation of the Peloponnesos, the success of Latin missionary infiltration culminating in the schism at Antioch, and the increase of Orthodox counter-propaganda, together with other factors of lesser import, combined around the beginning of the eighteenth century to accentuate the separation between Rome and the Orthodox Church.” (Ware 1964:32).

Meanwhile, during the seventeenth and eighteenth Century, Russia’s star was on the rise. With all four of the original Orthodox patriarchs (Constantinople, Alexandria,
Antioch, and Jerusalem) operating under Turkish captivity, the Patriarch of Moscow claimed ever-growing authority as a spokesman for Orthodox Christianity. He was, after all, the leader of a church larger in population than any of the other four, and he was the only high ranking prelate free of Turkish control. In 1547, Ivan the IV “the Terrible” became Tsar of Russia. He summoned a Russian synod to attempt to conform Russian liturgical practice to that of the Constantinople Church. However that synod backfired. It determined that the existing Russian practice was correct, whether or not it coincided with the Greek. As Russia grew more powerful, “just as in the middle ages the Orthodox Christians under Arab rule looked to the Byzantine Emperor for protection and the ultimate hope of freedom, so the Orthodox under Turkish rule began to look to the Russian Tsar.” (Runciman 1997:329). By 1589, the Metropolitan of Moscow was raised to the rank of patriarch with the approval of Jeremias II of Constantinople. In addition, Constantinople recognized the right of the Moscow Patriarch to be elected by his own synod of Russian bishops, independent of Constantinople. (Massie 1999:54-55).

The 1600’s in Russia were marked by conflict and reform within the newly powerful Russian church and by further doctrinal independence from the Greek sin Constantinople. The Tsars and Patriarchs provided financial support and political encouragement to Christians under Ottoman rule, and they continued to support the Russian monastery on Mt. Athos, St. Panteleimon, founded in 1169. A council of bishops in Moscow in 1621-22 determined that Latin converts to Orthodoxy must be rebaptized. In 1649, at a time when Greco-Italian relations were cordial, there were anti-foreign riots in Moscow consistent with suspicion of foreigners and Latins. However, when the reformer Nikon became Patriarch in 1652 at the invitation of Tsar Alexis, he
immediately embarked upon attempts to reform the Russian church, including purifying the church from drink and tobacco, warming relations with the West, and (as Ivan had previously attempted) correcting all of the old Slavonic service books to bring them into accord with Constantinopolitan usage. This produced substantial popular opposition. Nikon’s reforms caused a wholesale schism within the Russian church, with those rejecting these reforms being thenceforward known as “Old Believers.” By 1666, the Nikonite church, rid of its conservative wing of Old Believers, held a council in Moscow that reversed the prior decision on the baptism of Latins, confirming that they could be received by chrismation. (Massie 1999:55-63; 108-109, 783-794; Erickson 1991:115; Runciman 1997:333-337, 342, 354).24

Under Peter the Great, who became Tsar in 1682, the Russian Church continued its liberal accommodation of Latin Christians and its Westernizing tendencies until well into the 1700’s. Ultimately, Peter’s impatience with the comparative traditionalism of the hierarchy of the Russian Church led him to effectively abolish the Moscow Patriarchate. By 1718, he was writing the Patriarch of Constantinople for resolution of such Church issues as how to receive Protestant converts. (Massie 1999:108-109, 783-794; Erickson 1991:115; Runciman 1997:333-337, 342, 354). 25

The history of Greco-Italian relations from even earlier periods is consistent with the thesis that religious ethnocentrism waxes and wanes with politico-cultural events. Dr. Tia Kolbaba of Princeton has demonstrated that earlier Orthodox polemic against the West contained the same combination of religious and a socio-political components Ware describes during the later Ottoman period. Kolbaba’s study concludes that the larger the gap was “between the ideal of the universal, eternal empire and reality … all the more
tenaciously” did the Orthodox Church hold on to its “ideal of an unchanging church (emphasis added)” Conservative cultural morays were used by Greeks to reinforce their self-image, their ethnicity, and their culture. Religion and politics “were never far apart.” (Kolbaba 2000:169). Kolbaba shows how religious polemics advocating “an absolute separation of the sacred from the profane” were really manifestations of a desire to maintain ethnic “separateness.” (Kolbaba 2000:69-70). This separateness assured cultural identity in the face of a crumbling practical world by purifying Greek culture and religion from foreign contamination. To a late Medieval Greek, that contamination might well explain apparent Divine indifference to the Greeks’ dreary plight. In this, Kolbaba cites Max Weber for the proposition that “the sacred … is uniquely unalterable. As a result, it is also uniquely stable in an unstable world.” (Kolbaba 2000:167).

Apparently, anti-Latin polemic in the form of lists of their errors waxed and waned in the Greek world relative to the same factors identified by Bishop Ware in his analysis of the cordiality of later relations between ordinary people. Those factors are intense military or political conflict on the one hand, and fear of Latin infiltration or conquest and loss of Greek Orthodox identity on the other. Key is the notion of the ethno-religious survival of Greeks who feared absorption through conquest from without, but more importantly, through subversion from within. (Kolbaba 2000:15-17). Publishing and circulating lists of Latin theological errors was designed to scandalize overly Latinophilic Greeks and to avoid the total cooption of the indigenous population by an affluent, tempting, and visible Latin presence within the Greek world. One of the main conclusions arising from careful study of these lists is that they are “directed less at
Latins than at those who considered themselves Orthodox and yet associated with, married, or even share religious services with Latins.” (Kolbaba 2000:69-70).

Kolbaba identifies several interrelated sociological explanations for the ebb and flow of anti-Latin polemics. First, rigid separation of the sacred and profane within Greek religion and the corresponding emphasis on hierarchical authoritarianism corresponds to an equivalent separation between Greeks and barbarians, Orthodox and Latins. Second, while anti-Latin propaganda certainly increases during times of overt conflict with Catholics (e.g., war with the Normans in the 11th century or the later Venetian and Genoese depredations in the Mediterranean), this only occurs when they represent a real presence within Greek society, a credible “fifth column” with a real chance of contaminating, converting, and “de-Hellenizing” local Greeks. It is this presence, combined with conflict and hard times, that produces the impetus for purification and hence Puritanism. That it is Greco-Roman human nature to assume that bad times result from religious error or contamination is well attested over many centuries, from the mutilation of the Hermæ prior to Athens’ Sicilian expedition, to Gaïus Flaminius’s refusal to take the auspices prior to his disastrous encounter with Hannibal at Lake Trasimene, to the Byzantine iconoclastic controversies of the 8th and 9th centuries. (Kolbaba 2000:15-17, 69-70).26

The Church’s vacillating view of Latin baptisms during the period from 1453 to 1800 is simply a classic illustration of the pendulum-like nature of anti-Latinism. In describing the 700 years culminating in Cyril V’s 1755 decree condemning Latin baptisms, Ware posits three categories of heterodox Christians based on how they were received into Orthodoxy: by simple public rejection of their previous denomination and
its errors; by such abjuration plus chrismation but without rebaptism; and by abjuration, chrismation, and rebaptism. He then observes that:

With an inconsistency more apparent than real, the Orthodox Church has sometimes placed Latin converts in the first class and sometimes in the second or third. As an added complication, the practice of the Russians at any given moment has usually differed from the Greeks: when the Russian Church rebaptized the Latins, the ancient Patriarchates of the east did not, and vice versa. (Ware 1964:65-66).

Rebaptisms occurred from 1054 through 1300 with sufficient frequency to draw Roman protest, but “as a general rule neither Baptism nor Chrismation was considered necessary.” In the late 12th century, Balsamon writes as though neither rebaptism nor chrismation were required. By 1484, a slightly more xenophobic council in Constantinople had required chrismation of converting Latins, as well as abjuration of previous error, but not rebaptism. This was the Greek “official” rule until the disputes precipitated by Cyril V in the 1750’s, although rebaptisms were performed as early as the mid-1600’s in areas like Corfu and Chios that hosted large and powerful Latin populations. Policies towards rebaptizing the new Protestant Christians varied and were too recent and multifarious to be relevant here, although the Russian Church, in reliance upon a 1718 ruling by Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople, received most Protestants without rebaptism throughout the reign of Peter the Great and ever after. (Ware 1964:66-70). 27

While the second half of the eighteenth century was a time of cordiality between Russia and the West, from the Greek perspective it was a time of intense anti-Western
feeling. In both Russia and Greece, the pendulum had swung several times over the previous centuries between friendship and cooperation with Westerners on the one hand and fear and derision on the other. Religious practices in this regard not only varied from time to time, but from place to place. The late 1700’s of St. Nikodimos were the last high point of anti-Western feeling prior to the Greek revolution of the early 1800’s. This xenophobic era coincided with the beginnings of Greek revolutionary agitation and a new Greek nationalism. As proto-nationalism matured into full-blown revolution, need for military and economic assistance from the West would begin to reverse the pendulum once again, in part through the welcome and highly publicized efforts of philhellenes like Edward Everett and Lord Byron. However, the church for which St. Nikodimos was writing had not yet met Byron and the other philhellenes from the West. It did remember, however, the recent depredations of the Venetians and the Genoese, and the money and ecclesiastical intrigues of the Western powers and the Jesuits.²⁸

Like Max Weber, the German sociologist Georg Simmel posited a relationship between the socioeconomic context of cultural and religious groups and their perception of the necessity of rigid faithfulness to conservative rituals and beliefs differentiating them from other larger groups. Simmel believed that:

As the size of the group increases, the common features that fuse its members into a social unit become ever fewer. For this reason … a smaller minimum of norms can, at least, hold together a large group more easily than a small one. Qualitatively speaking, the larger the group is, usually the more prohibitive and restrictive the kinds of conduct which it
must demand of its participants in order to maintain itself. (Simmel 1950a:397-398).

Conversely, the smaller the cultural group, the larger the number of more specific norms required to hold the group together. (Simmel 1950a:397-401).

He goes on to say that “the more general the norm and the larger the group in which it prevails, the less does the observance of the norm characterize the individual and the less important is it for him – whereas its violation, on the whole, has consequences which are especially grave, which single out the individual from his group.” This principle operates with respect to the maintenance of group cohesion, and combined with the first principle, sheds light on the cultural norms of large but powerless and threatened groups, like the Greek subjects of Turkish Sultans or Venetian overlords. (Simmel 1950a:396-401).

Simmel posits an even more relevant theory in connection with what he calls “the stranger.” The phenomenon of the stranger (in this case we should think of the Venetian or other Western interloper into Greco-Ottoman society) crystallizes “the unity of nearness and remoteness involved in every human relation.” The more permanent a stranger becomes, the more he stands out. If he is merely a trader who facilitates interaction between the resident culture and outsiders, he generates less resentment. If he chooses to settle permanently, or worse to exert control, his “strangeness” is amplified, producing a greater need to emphasize norms defining him (and his associates) as “other.” (Simmel 1950b:402-408). Historians often denominate this phenomenon of ethnic or national self-definition by reference to denigration of “the other” by the French
term *alterite*. It has often been applied to the development of a Hellenic identity over time, but has also formed the basis of other inter-ethnic studies.  

Both history and sociology, then, teach that it is human nature (at least in pre-industrial Greek societies) for groups threatened with infiltration and subversion by more powerful neighbors to respond by morally marginalizing them. The intensity of the response is proportionate to the proximity (culturally and geographically) and power of the stranger and the perceived precariousness of the indigenous culture’s position. For example, the Muslim Turks, posing little danger of appearing innocuous and attractive to the Greek Orthodox, required less expenditure of cultural capital to reinforce their “otherness” and to protect Hellenic culture from being unwittingly absorbed by them. Catholic Christians who claimed to be coreligionists, and with whom the Greeks’ only contacts were through resident émigré trading communities posed slightly more danger of not being recognized as “strange,” but not enough to draw reprisals in most instances. However, “coreligionist” Latins who planned to stay, and who ingratiated themselves into the highest levels of politics (ecclesiastic and civic) and into the most mundane community activities, posed the greatest threat of confusion and amalgamation.

It is to be expected, then, that in their temporal aspects, church canons will react differently to “strangers” depending upon the circumstances. They not only will, but perhaps *should*, prescribe rigorous and conservative norms in proportion to the threat posed by such strangers to the church’s cultural existence at that particular moment in time. Rather than being criticized, Nikodimos’ particular treatment of the canons concerning heterodox baptisms in *The Rudder* should be understood as one such response, one that coincided with the historical zenith of a real need in Greece for
rigorous and exclusive norms and that contributed to Greek nationalism and ethnocentrism among common folk, through their parish clergy and the preaching of itinerant *Kollyvades* like Kosmas the Aitolian.

Nikodimos’ view of the subject of heterodox baptisms is a complex philosophical construct. Even heretics who taught serious non-Trinitarian errors, such as the Arians and Macedonians, could be received, by *oikonomía*, without rebaptism. Yet, based upon a misunderstanding of the authority of the “Apostolic” Canons, heterodox baptisms are nonetheless essentially of no effect, and in fact a “pollution,” at least in the absence of *ex post facto* *oikonomía*. For Nikodimos, the exercise of *oikonomía* is heavily influenced by the size and power of the heterodox group involved, and by the historical circumstances of the Orthodox Church at the time. These factors were more important than the other one he mentions more often in *The Rudder*, the form of baptismal ritual used. Whether recognition of the baptisms of schismatic groups who used proper form was based on their being essentially valid, or was based on *oikonomía* is open to question. These are the groups like the Donatists whose schism with the church did not involve serious dogmatic error, and whose baptisms were formally performed substantially the same as Orthodox baptisms. Nikodimos appears to have believed some of these particular baptisms to be valid, in that he does not cite any application of *oikonomía* to explain why rebaptism was not necessary. However, in other places, he calls *all* heterodox baptisms pollutions, and regards separation (schism) of clergy from the Orthodox Church as enough to completely invalidate sacraments performed by them. His theology is less than consistent.
Most tellingly, Nikodimos’ frequent anti-Latin comments prove that he viewed ancient canons through the lens of contemporary events, and they betray a fundamental discomfort with the notion of making reception into the Orthodox Church of his day an easy matter. For example, even in all of the instances where rebaptism was not required, Nikodimos still claims chrismation was required for acceptance into the Greek Church, even when the plain language of the canons says no such thing. His insistence upon chrismation in those circumstances served the subliminal cultural purpose of emphasizing the “separateness” of the heterodox and the uniqueness and elite status of the Greek Orthodox.

These norms both fed, and were fed by, the growing wave of Greek nationalism that would soon lead to independence for both church and nation. They are yet another illustration of the extent to which cultural, ethnic, and religious norms are often determined by the political and economic actions of “others,” and then, in unpredictable ways, create a new group consciousness which itself changes history. Even the wisest of sultans would have been hard put to foresee that anti-Western feeling in Greece would ultimately contribute so significantly to the demise of Ottoman rule.

Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi

NOTES

Acknowledgements. William J. Chriss holds degrees from Harvard Law School, The University of Texas, and the St. John of Damascus Institute of Theology at the University
of Balamand. He teaches history, political philosophy, and constitutional and public law at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The author wishes to express appreciation to all those who helped make this article possible, including his professor of canon law, Fr. Patrick Viscuso, who, together with Elder Dositheos of Holy Archangels Greek Orthodox Monastery, provided difficult to find source materials, Pat Carroll, Ph.D., professor of history at Texas A&M-CC, Professor Lewis Patsavos of Holy Cross School of Theology, and Fr. John Kaloudis who read earlier manuscripts with care and made several helpful suggestions, and all the professors, historians, priests, and monks who contributed to the author’s study of history, religion, and law over the years. This article should not be read as representing the views of any of these friends, except to the extent that it is deemed profound or useful. In all other respects, and particularly with respect to any errors, the author is solely responsible.


2 The 1749 date is attested to by Bebis’ introduction to Nicodemos of the Holy Mountain: A Handbook of Spiritual Council, The Classics of Western Spirituality, trans.

3 Most of this brief biological sketch of St. Nikodimos comes from Bebis 1989:5-65, from Metallinos 1992:28 and from Cavarnos 1979. Cavarnos’ book includes his English translation of the life of St. Nikodimos written by Father Gerasimos Micragiannanitis of Mt. Athos in 1955. Cavarnos states that Micragiannanitis’ work is “based mainly on the biography written by the Monk Euthymios, a spiritual brother of Nicodemos” on Mount Athos. (Cavarnos 1979:150). Euthymios’ book, obviously, was written in Greek. The title translates as The Life, Conduct, and Struggles of the Most Holy and Most Learned Monk Nikodimos of Blessed Memory. Bebis states that Euthemios’ biography was first published in the periodical Gregory Palamas in 1920, and that there were at least two other biographies written in Greek: one by Athanasios Parios which is unpublished; and another by Father Theokletos Dionysiatis, another monk of Mt. Athos. See Bebis’ introductory footnotes (1989:56). While this article has not relied on such Greek primary texts, it is safe to assume that the English biographies of Bebis and Cavarnos repeat or digest the salient points from these earlier Greek works, and that
Fr. Metallinos’ brief biological sketch of St. Nikodimos in *I Confess One Baptism* does not contradict them.

4 According to Micragiannanitis, “The learned hierarchs Theonas, Athanasios, Joasaph, and others” established the school, which was renovated in 1770 and moved to the Monastery of St. George on Mt. Athos in 1781, where it functioned until 1821. (Cavarnos 1979:67).

5 Bebis indicates that the memorial services were held “at the Sunday vigil services.” Metallinos says they were held after Divine Liturgy on Sundays.

6 Peter’s “innovations” included his 1721 ecclesiastical regulation abolishing the patriarchy as the governing chair of the Russian church and substituting a governing synod of bishops. In 1718, with the concurrence of the ecumenical patriarch, Jeremias III, Peter recognized Catholic and protestant baptisms as valid under Russian law and church canon. He also created much consternation within the court and the church by shaving his beard and encouraging his ministers and clergy to be clean-shaven, in the western style.

7 According to Metallinos, Neophytos the Peloponessian of the Athonite skete of Kafsokalyvia was the “original” *Kollyvade* as he was “the first to rise up with a theological campaign against the decision of the monks of St. Anne’s.” (1992:25).
Mt. Athos (1774) and Constantinople (1781) are reported as having issued these condemnations by Bebis 1989:12.

Theodosios II in 1772.

Runciman writes that Napoleon’s conquest of Venice in the 1790’s “brought French revolutionary ideas within reach of the Greeks” and that this was also a key factor.

Bebis mentions only that Makarios and Nikodimos began work together in 1777 on the publication of *The Philokalia*. While Bebis goes on to say that Nikodimos edited *The Evergetinos* and published it in Venice in 1783, Cavarnos claims that Makarios took all three books with him to Smyrna, raised funds for the publication, and successfully managed their publication in Venice. (Bebis 1989: 24; Cavarnos 1979:74-75).

Cavarnos cites Euthymios and Onouphrios in support of this assertion.

Cavarnos attributes the impetus for this work to Makarios, in the form of a request from him that Nikodimos edit and expand the work. However, Bebis is evidently correct in his view that it was a reworked version of an earlier text in that he bases this on the view of Fr. Theokletos Dionysiatis and an earlier source, Theodore the Hagiorite, *Peri Synechous Metalepseos* (Bebis 1989:60).
14 Bebis says Nikodimos was about thirty-nine when he began work on The Rudder. (1989:43). Cavarnos claims The Rudder came after Nikodimos completed translation of St. Simeon’s writings, and after he wrote Manual of Confession, Theotokarion, Unseen Warfare, New Martyrologium, and Spiritual Exercises. (Cavarnos 1979:82-84).

15 Some scholars claim that only the editing was Nikodimos’ work and that the translation had already been done by others. Bebis describes the various conflicting evidence and competing theories. (1989:37-38). Manual of Confession was designed as a pastoral guide to the sacrament, based upon Nikodimos’ experience as a confessor. It includes the rather strict penances prescribed by John the Faster, and it reveals Nikodimos’ belief that some sins are forgivable, and some are not. He includes advice for both confessor and penitent, as well as a compendium of additional recommended penances covering situations not addressed by John the Faster.

16 The Austrians were then at war with the Napoleonic French in Italy. (Cavarnos 1979:83).

17 Bebis says that “Half of the text is composed by Nikodimos himself” because so much of it is interpretive commentary or prolegomena to the Canons themselves. (1989:45).
The 1st edition of the book was published in Greek in 1800. Cavarnos and Macrogiannitis agree that Agapios arrived around the time Nikodimos completed the book on Palamas in 1787-1788. Bebis’ says Nikodimos began work on The Rudder “when he was approximately thirty-nine years old…” Thus the 1788 date. For Nikodimos’ primary role as author and for the story concerning Theodoretos, see Cavarnos 1979:37, Macrogiannitis 1979:83-86, and Bebis 1989:44-45. An English translation of the full text of Neophytos’ letter of commendation appears at the front of the Cummings English edition of The Rudder (1957). The last two quotes are from this letter (Rudder 1983:xi-xii). The two bishops were Gerasimos, former Patriarch of Constantinople and then Archbishop of Derci, and his colleague Archbishop Meletius of Larissa. As for The Rudder being the only common comprehensive canonical text, Patriarch Bartholomew Archonidis, “A Common Code for the Orthodox Churches” KANON I (1973) 45-53, argues that there has been no comprehensive codification at all, and that efforts to accomplish such a task have been ongoing since at least the 3rd Byzantinological Congress held in Athens in 1930. However, this does not belie the known fact that Nikodimos’ Rudder is the only translation of a substantial collection of Orthodox canons into Modern Greek understandable to contemporary readers.

The Rudder is composed of several parts: (1) a preface or dedication by Nikodimos and Agapios; (2) the letter of approval from Patriarch Neophytos VII; (3) a “salutation” to all readers from Nikodimos; (4) an introduction or prolegomena to the entire volume written by St. Nikodimos; (5) a prolegomena to the Canons of the Holy Apostles; (6) the Canons of the Holy Apostles; (7) another introductory prolegomena followed by the Canons of the Seven Ecumenical Councils; (8) Canons of local councils;
(9) an introduction to the Canons of certain fathers of the church, followed by those Canons; (10) a separate chapter specifically concerning marriages; (11) “forms of some letters” including proposed letters for use as wills and testaments, resignations, divorces, etc.; (12) a plan and short explanation of Orthodox Church architecture. The Cummings English edition also contains an index of some 21 pages. Bebis, on the other hand, identifies eleven separate parts of the book (Bebis 1989:45). The Rudder’s English edition also includes an editor’s forward that covers 30 pages and is irrelevant to this study. This may be Cummings own work or his translation of comments by Apostolos Makrakis. If the latter, Mr. Makrakis was not hesitant to extol his own virtues.

For example, In explaining the apparent contradiction between Canon 7 of the Second Ecumenical Council and the Canon of Carthage/St. Cyprian with respect to treatment of non-Orthodox baptisms, Metallinos claims that Zonaras is wrong to simply give preference to Canon VII because it is ecumenical and later because: “Our theologians…living in the Church’s tradition…are not satisfied with this answer. They do not admit even the slightest discrepancy between Fathers and Councils…” (Metallinos 1992:53). It is interesting to note the implication here that some traditionalists do not admit of even the right of an Ecumenical Council to “revise” previous canonical rulings, nor do they seem to accept any difference between dogmatic or “unchangeable” canons on the one hand and disciplinary or “changeable” canons on the other. Thus, Metallinos implies that the only explanation for Zonaras’ interpretation is that he must somehow fall short of “living in the Church’s tradition.” Therefore, Metallinos expects St. Nikodimos’ explanation (as one given by a theologian “living in the Church’s tradition”) to differ
from Zonaras’. That explanation, according to Metallinos, is that “the Church has two methods of governing and correcting, namely acrivia…and economia…According to this saint, the Second Ecumenical Council kept the (previous) Canon partially, acting in accordance with economia and concession…” (1992:54). Dr. Lewis Patsavos of The Holy Cross School of Theology has a different view: with respect to the issue of baptisms performed by non-Orthodox denominations, he relies on the more conventional view that while only sacraments performed by Orthodox ministers are usually valid, the Orthodox Church has, through *oikonomia*, treated some non-Orthodox baptisms as “valid.” He lists those of “Monophysites and Nestorians,” and those of Roman Catholics as “valid.” As authority for this he cites Canon VII of Constantinople I and Canon 95, Penthekte (Trullo). He gives no reason for the differing practice he reports of the former being received by mere confession of Orthodox faith, while the latter are “usually requested…to undergo Holy Chrismation.” Protestants are apparently located farther away on this spectrum. In their case, “According to exactness, the baptism of Protestants is invalid…Current practice recognizes the validity of Protestant baptisms performed with the Trinitarian formula, but requires the performance of Holy Chrismation.” (Patsavos 1975:57-58). Archbishop Peter L’Huiller of the Orthodox Church in America has a less legalistic view: As to the subjects of this article, Archbishop Peter’s position is reflected in his brief discussion of *The Rudder* as a canonical text and in his commentary on Canon VII, Constantinople I. He agrees with the prevailing view that although Agapios is listed as a coauthor, the book is really the work of St. Nikodimus. He praises the iteration of the canons contained within the text as “on the whole correct,” (L’Huiller 1996:5), but he considers the value of *The Rudder* to be “first and foremost, valuable
witness for the understanding of the milieu in which it was formed.” He considers any belief in the dogmatic infallibility of *The Rudder* a “manifest exaggeration,” particularly in connection with St. Nicodemus’ position on the invalidity of Roman Catholic baptism. (1996:5). In his commentary on Canon VII of Constantinople I, L’Huiller refers to Macedonians being received into the Church without rebaptism “by economy.” Also, in a footnote to the introduction to his book, he iterates the accepted rule that “the canons issued or approved by the General Councils cannot be abrogated or modified except by another General Council. (1996:14).

21 Citing Cedrinus and Dositheos, Nikodimos claims that Arians baptized in correct form before I Constantinople, and afterward in the following amended formula: “in the name of the Father the greater, and of the Son the lesser, and of the Holy Spirit the least.” This he adds to his justifications for the leniency shown these heretics by Constantinople. He does not attempt to make a similar claim on behalf of the similarly non-Trinitarian Macedonians. (*Rudder* 1983:71-72).


23 Ware lists as secret converts “several Patriarchs of Constantinople,” three Patriarchs of Ohrid, six Greek bishops in the Cyclades, and the monastery of St. John on Patmos, among others (Ware 1964:26-28).
Meanwhile, further west, the Poles, with Jesuit help, began building churches in Ukraine, which they had conquered in the 1600’s. Uniatism was designed to ease conversion of Cossacks and other Orthodox Ukrainians to Polish Catholicism by allowing them to keep their local language and rituals, and requiring only that they admit allegiance to the Vatican. Both Patriarch Cyril Lucaris of Constantinople, and the Patriarch of Moscow saw this as a significant threat to Orthodoxy. The Jesuits had long been active in Constantinople in Patriarchal elections. Never a pawn of the Jesuits, Cyril cooperated quite closely with Protestants against the Catholics. At this contentious time, Peter Moghila became Metropolitan of Kiev, leader of the besieged Ukrainian Orthodox Church. He disapproved of Cyril’s Protestant leanings and knew Latin theology even better than the Greek because “his training had left him with a sympathy for the doctrinal outlook of the Romans.” Moghila composed his *Orthodoxa Confessio Fidea* in Latin around 1640. He summoned a council in Kiev in 1640 that endorsed it. His Latinization is known to have included acceptance even of the doctrine of purgatory, or something akin to it. By 1691, criticism of Moghila’s *Confessio* was on the rise, mainly from Patriarchs Kallinikos of Constantinople and Dositheus of Jerusalem. However, Patriarch Joachim of Moscow allowed Moghilia’s confession to be translated into Slavonic in 1685, and it was ordered published by Tsar Peter in 1696. Hence within the Russian Church, and throughout the Orthodox world, the period of the late seventeenth century was one of intrigue between the Romanophiles and Protestantophiles, with each group having its supporters and intriguers from outside. (Runciman 1997:335-346; Ware 1964:11-12).
25 For more on the Latinizing tendency in Orthodox theology in the seventeenth Century, see Ware 1964:11-14. For more on Peter’s correspondence with Jeremias II, then the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, see Ware 1964:69.


27 This was the response to Peter the Great’s query referenced in note 77, supra.

28 For a nice description of the Philhellenic movement in Western Europe and Greek reaction to it, see Woodhouse 1971.

29 For some historical applications of this theory, see, e.g., Hartog 1988 and Cartledge 2002. A similar study with specific reference to early Texas is Montejano 1989. For a fascinating literary application, see Hall 1991.
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