DIRK KRAUSMÜLLER

Decoding Monastic Ritual: Auto-Installation and the Struggle for the Spiritual Autonomy of Byzantine Monasteries in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries

In the last thirty years scholars have become increasingly aware of the importance of monastic rules or *typika* for the understanding of Middle Byzantine monasticism. So far, however, research has largely been limited to passages that set out the legal status of monasteries. It was analysis of these passages that permitted John Thomas to trace the rise of the 'self-governing monastery' throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[1] This article would like to draw attention to another aspect of *typika*, namely their regulations for the installation of monastic officials such as abbots, stewards and cellarers. Through analysis of these rituals it makes the case that during the eleventh and twelfth centuries the issue of monastic autonomy was not confined to the legal sphere but also surfaced in the properly spiritual domain where traditional concepts of authority and legitimacy came under attack from the lay church. The primary focus will be on abbots as the leaders and representatives of monastic communities and special attention will be given to the practice observed in the Constantinopolitan monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis.[2]

The Evergetis monastery was founded in the middle of the eleventh century by a layman called Paul who then became its first abbot. Paul's concern for his new flock found expression in a series of writings: an ascetic florilegium, a collection of sermons, and also a rule, which regulated the life of the community.[3] This first rule is lost and the Euergetis-Typikon as we have it now shows numerous modifications and additions, some of which can be dated as late as the 1090s.[4] However, the bulk of the changes were made by Paul's immediate successor Timothy who took over from him as abbot in 1054 and who held this post until at least 1067.[5] Among the passages that are likely to go back to Timothy's revision are the stipulations for the succession of the abbot.[6] When the previous incumbent dies, the position goes to the steward as his second-in-command,[7] and the senior members of the community are entrusted with organising the ritual of his installation:

> You, that is those who are preeminent and the most devout, should place this typikon on the holy table and rest also the staff against it and when the one selected has entered the holy sanctuary, after the prescribed trisagion and these troparia … and thirty repetitions of "Kyrie eleison", and, after he has made three full genuflections before the holy table, you should invite him to take from it the

---

[1] J.Ph. THOMAS, Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire (*DOS* 24). Washington, D.C. 1987.

[2] In the following discussion the terms προχείρισις, προβολή and χειροτονία will by treated as synonyms as they are indeed in Middle Byzantine sources, see below notes 11, 34, 41 and 53.

[3] Cf. A. SOLIGNAC, Paul Évergétinos, in: Dictionnaire de Spiritualité XII/1 (1984) 562–564.

[4] The text of the Euergetis-Typikon has been edited and translated into French by P. GAUTIER, Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis. *REB* 40 (1982) 5–101, text 15–95. The foundation narrative is contained in Euergetis-Typikon 2 (15, 22–17, 32 GAUTIER).

[5] Cf. GAUTIER, Typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis 8–9.

[6] For a discussion of the composition of the text, cf. John Thomas' introductory notes to the English translation of the text in Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments II (ed. J. THOMAS, A. CONSTANTINIDES-HERO, G. CONSTABLE [*DOS* 35]). Washington, D.C. 2000, 464–468 and esp. 466. For THOMAS' authorship of these notes cf. Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents I 11. Cf. also R. JORDAN, The Hypotyposis of Evergetis: a unitary text, in: Work and Worship at the Theotokos Evergetis (ed. M. MULLETT – A. KIRBY [*Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations* 6, 2]). Belfast 1997, 230–249.

[7] Euergetis-Typikon 13 (51, 624–629 GAUTIER).

typikon and the staff while all repeat "He is worthy." You should invite him to go out and stand in his appropriate place and be kissed by everyone and become your next superior ordained by God.[8]

The ritual set out in this passage proceeds in two clearly distinguished steps: firstly the abbot appropriates two objects, the staff that symbolises the authority of his office, and the book that enshrines the traditions of the monastery, while the other members of the community acclaim him; and secondly, the abbot takes up the place in the nave that is reserved for the holders of his rank, while the other members of the community come to him and indicate through gestures their acquiescence in his appointment.

Fortunately for us, the author of the Euergetis-Typikon not only offers a description of this complex ritual but also spells out his understanding of it when he then claims that the new abbot is θεοχειροτόνητος, 'ordained by God'. The part of the ritual that supports this claim is evidently the investiture with staff and typikon: as we have seen, the abbot takes these objects directly from the altar, which can be considered the prime *locus* of divine presence in this world.

Such interpretation is corroborated through comparison with a contemporary illuminated manuscript from the Stoudios monastery, the so-called Theodore Psalter, which dates to the year 1066 and which was commissioned by the abbot Michael Mermentoulos.[9] This manuscript contains an elaborate scene, which shows Mermentoulos receiving a staff from Christ through the mediation of an angel.[10] There can be no doubt that both Psalter and Typikon are part of the same discourse and that the illumination makes manifest the supernatural part of the interaction, which in the ritual at the Evergetis monastery is symbolised through the altar.[11]

What prompted the author of the Euergetis-Typikon to adopt this conceptual framework and to prescribe a ritual that encapsulates it?[12] In order to answer this question we need to start from its most evident consequence, the exclusion of human installers, and establish who would have been affected by such exclusion. Only then will it become possible to identify the specific reasons that led to the author's preference for auto-installation.

The way in which the installation of the abbot was organised at the Evergetis monastery points first of all to the senior members of the community: as we have seen the author demands that they put staff and typikon on the altar but gives them no role in the ensuing ceremony. Thus one can argue that the author of the Euergetis-Typikon prescribed auto-installation because he wished to minimise the role of the monastic elite. This interpretation gains credence when we further consider that it is the monks who are told to accept the new abbot as 'ordained by God'. Such insistence alerts to the fact that the author's

---

[8] Euergetis-Typikon 13 (51, 630–640 GAUTIER): ὑμεῖς, οἱ πρόκριτοι τῶν ἄλλων δηλονότι καὶ εὐλαβέστεροι, τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τυπικὸν ἐπιτιθέντες προσερείσαντές τε καὶ τὴν βακτηρίαν αὐτῇ προτρέποιτε τὸν προκριθέντα εἰσελθόντα τὸ ἅγιον βῆμα μετὰ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον τρισάγιον καὶ τὰ τροπάρια ταῦτα ... καὶ τὰ τριάκοντα τὸ "κύριε ἐλέησον" ποιήσαντά τε βαθείας γονυκλισίας τρεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης λαμβάνειν ἐκεῖθεν τὸ τυπικὸν καὶ τὴν βακτηρίαν ἐπιφωνούντων πάντων τὸ "ἄξιος" καὶ ἐξιόντα ἵστασθαι εἰς τὸν ἁρμόδιον τόπον καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων ἀσπάζεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἑξῆς εἶναι ὑμῶν ἡγούμενον θεοχειροτόνητον. The translation reproduces R. JORDAN, 22. Evergetis: Typikon of Timothy for the Monastery of the Mother of God Evergetis, in: THOMAS, Foundation Documents II 472–500, here 484.

[9] Codex Londiniensis, British Museum, Add. 19.353, reproduced in Ch. BARBER, Theodore Psalter. Electronic Facsimile (*University of Illinois Press, in association with the British Library*). London 2000. For a discussion of the manuscript, cf. I. HUTTER, Theodoros βιβλιογράφος und die Buchmalerei in Studiu. *BollGrott* 51 (1997) 177–208.

[10] Theodore Psalter, fol. 192r.

[11] For a detailed discussion of the parallels, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Installed by God: Depictions of the Investiture of Abbots in Eleventh-Century Studite Manuscripts and their Relation to Contemporary Monastic Ritual, forthcoming in *Basilissa* 2 (2007).

[12] It needs to be emphasised that even where such a conceptual framework existed it did not necessarily find its expression in the actual ritual. Emperors were regularly referred to as θεόστεπτος etc. and in his Psalter Basil II had himself depicted in much the same way as Michael Mermentoulos, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Abbots and Monks in Eleventh-Century Studios. An Analysis of Rituals of Installation and Their Depictions in Illuminated Manuscripts. *REB* 64–65 (2006–2007) 255–282, esp. 269–270. However, unlike Charlemagne, Byzantine rulers did not crown themselves but were crowned by patriarchs. The same can be said about the patriarchs themselves. Nicholas Mouzalon applies the epithet θεοχειροτόνητος to Nicholas III Grammatikos (ed. J. Darrouzès, L'éloge de Nicolas III par Nicholas Mouzalon. *REB* 46 [1988] 5–53, here 45, 540–541) but with reference to the mode of his election – through the casting of lots – and not to his ordination, which was performed by the Metropolitan of Heraclea.

interpretation of the ritual is not self-evident: after all, the monks are actively involved in the process through their acclamation.

Consequently one could argue that the emphasis on divine installation is meant to play down the significance of this act. Such a hypothesis can be corroborated through further analysis of the miniature in the Theodore Psalter. This miniature not only represents the abbot but also six genuflecting monks at his feet. The message conveyed by this configuration is evident: the monks are given the status of passive witnesses who have no part in the abbot's interaction with supernatural beings. Comparison shows that this scene does not correspond to the ritual in the Euergetis-Typikon where the monks stand and acclaim the abbot while he takes up the staff and where they show their obeisance only at the next stage when the abbot has already left the sanctuary. This permits the conclusion that the Studite miniature deliberately conflates two stages of the ritual in order to elide the role of the community in the installation process just as the author of the Euergetis-Typikon did with his command that the monks should embrace their new leader as 'ordained by God'.[13]

How are we to account for this opposition to an active role of the community in the installation? One possible reason would be fear that monastic communities might use their involvement in the ritual in order to challenge the authority of their leaders. There is evidence for unrest at the Stoudios monastery, and the poem that accompanies the installation tableau in the Theodore Psalter suggests that this tableau was created in response to a particular crisis: the last line of the poem, which contains Christ's promise that the abbot will not be overcome by his enemies, is placed directly underneath the kneeling monks.[14] We do not know whether the Evergetis monastery experienced a similar upheaval and one can argue that as a recent private foundation it would have housed a smaller and more homogeneous community than Stoudios, which was therefore less prone to disruption. Nevertheless, the explanation may still hold true because Timothy could have responded to a general climate of crisis.[15]

This, however, does not allow the conclusion that exalting the abbot's authority at the expense of the monastic elite was the only or even the main reason for introducing auto-installation at the Evergetis monastery. Another agenda is revealed when we extend the discussion to the ceremonies for the installation of the steward and other officials of the monastery. The author makes it clear that in all cases the same procedure should be followed.[16] In chapter twenty-nine the ritual is set out in this way:

> The keys should be placed before Christ or the Mother of God, and after a trisagion, the one who is being installed after the three required genuflections should take the keys from there with his own hands, then bow his head to the superior, and receive from him the blessing mentioned above.[17]

This last phrase is a reference to chapter thirteen where we find the following stipulation:

> After that he (sc. the steward) should perform the proper obeisance to the superior and then offer him his head bowed and uncovered and he (sc. the abbot), making over it the sign of the venerable cross, should reverently say as follows: "The intercession of my most holy Mother of God through the prayers of the Holy Fathers is installing you steward of the monastery." Then when he has given him

[13] For a detailed discussion cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Abbots and Monks 259–267.

[14] Cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Abbots and monks 267–270.

[15] In the middle of the twelfth century Gregory of Oxia complained that monks were not prepared to honour later abbots to the same degree as the founders of monasteries, cf. Letter to the Abbot of Kyr Philotheou (ed. P. GAUTIER, Les lettres de Grégoire, higoumène d'Oxia. *REB* 31 [1973] 203–227, here 217, 86–88).

[16] Euergetis-Typikon 29 (71, 972–973 GAUTIER).

[17] Euergetis-Typikon 29 (71, 973–978 GAUTIER): τῶν κλειδίων δηλαδὴ ἐνώπιον τιθεμένων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ τῆς Θεοτόκου, καὶ τρισαγίου γινομένου, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ προχειριζομένου μετὰ τὰς δεούσας τρεῖς γονυκλισίας τὰς κλεῖς ἐκεῖθεν λαμβάνοντος αὐτοχείρως, εἶτα τῷ προεστῶτι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ὑποκλίνοντος αὐχένα, καὶ τὴν ἀνωτέρω ῥηθεῖσαν εὐλόγησιν παρ' ἐκείνου ἐκδεχομένου. The English translation reproduces THOMAS, Foundation Documents II <Euergetis-Typikon, trans. JORDAN, 491>.

the kiss in the name of the Lord, he is to set him in his appropriate place. Next, all without exception are to kiss him.[18]

Taken together, these two passages permit us to reconstruct the ritual. It proceeds in three steps: firstly, the candidate appropriates the insignia of his office; secondly, he bows before the abbot and is given a blessing by him; and thirdly, he takes up the position within the church that is reserved for his rank, and the other monks indicate their acceptance of the appointment.

Comparison with the installation of abbots that we have discussed so far shows one obvious discrepancy. Unlike the abbot-elect, the new office-holder does interact with a human being, namely the current abbot. The function of this interaction is clear: it reminds the official himself and the rest of the community who are looking on that he will perform his functions as a subordinate of the superior.

However, the similarities between the two rituals are much more evident. Like the monastic elite in the case of installations of abbots, the abbot does not personally hand over to the officials the insignia of their offices. Instead they take these insignia directly from icons, which thus clearly perform the same role as place-holders for supernatural agents as the altar in the case of the investiture of abbots. Therefore we can conclude that both rituals express the same concept of direct divine installation. This situation is not significantly modified through the intervention of the abbot at the next stage of the ritual since the formula that he pronounces is merely a comment on the previous interaction: he refers to God, Mary and the deceased founders as agents of the installation without inserting himself into the process.[19]

Now that we have analysed all installation rituals described in the Euergetis-Typikon we can conclude that not only the monastic elites but also the abbots themselves are sidelined through the concept of divine installation. Before we can tackle the reasons for this eclipse of the abbot we need to have one last look at the ritual of his own installation. In the previous discussion of this ritual we have focused on the case where the monastic elite is entrusted with its organisation. Yet the author of the Euergetis-Typikon makes it clear that this procedure is only to be followed if the previous incumbent has died suddenly. In those cases where he has a premonition of his death it is his task to instal his successor. Unfortunately, at this point the Euergetis-Typikon is quite laconic: it simply states that the abbot 'should appoint the steward to leadership'.[20] However, the attention that the author pays to all other rituals and his insistence on uniformity permits us to conclude that there existed a proper ritual for such occasions and that it was a variant of the ceremonies that we have already discussed. Can we determine the specific shape of this ritual? One possibility would be a scenario in which the abbot takes the staff from the altar and personally hands it over to his successor.

There is indeed evidence for such a procedure. In his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* John of Ephesus recounts what happened when Abraham, the abbot of the monastery of John Urtaya, was appointed bishop

---

[18] Euergetis-Typikon 13 (49, 615–620 GAUTIER): Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ προεστῶτι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀπονεμέτω προσκύνησιν, εἶθ' οὕτως ὑποκλινῇ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν ἐκείνῳ διδότω καὶ ἀπερικάλυπτον, κἀκεῖνος τῷ τιμίῳ ταύτην σφραγίζων σταυρῷ, οὕτως πως εὐλαβῶς λεγέτω· "ἡ πρεσβεία τῆς ὑπεραγίας μου Θεοτόκου διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων προχειρίζεταί σε οἰκονόμον τῆς μονῆς", ἔπειτα τὸν ἐν κυρίῳ δοὺς αὐτῷ ἀσπασμὸν εἰς τὸν ἁρμόζοντα τόπον ἱστάτω. Καθεξῆς οὖν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν αὐτὸν ἀσπαζέσθωσαν. The translation reproduces THOMAS, Foundation Documents II <Euergetis-Typikon, trans. JORDAN, 484>.

[19] This is evident from a comparison with descriptions of imperial installations in De cerimoniis. Since these installations all follow the same pattern it is sufficient to give one example. When the emperor appoints the patriarch he utters the following formula: 'The divine grace and our rule that originates from it is installing this most venerable man as patriarch of Constantinople.' Cf. Constantine Porphyrogennetos, De cerimoniis II 14 (ed. J.J. REISKE, De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo (*CSHB* 5). Bonn 1829–1830, 564–566, here 565, 1–3): ἡ θεία χάρις καὶ ἡ ἐξ αὐτῆς βασιλεία ἡμῶν προβάλλεται τὸν εὐλαβέστατον τοῦτον πατριάρχην Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. The similarity with the formula used in the Euergetis-Typikon is striking. Yet there is one important difference: the emperor inserts himself into the interaction whereas the abbot of the Evergetis monastery merely describes an interaction in which he has no part. This difference explains itself when we realise that the new office-holder in the Evergetis monastery is already in possession of his insignia whereas the emperor utters the formula while he is handing over the insignia to the appointee, cf. Pseudo-Codinus, De officiis 10 (ed. J. VERPEAUX, Pseudo-Kodinos. Traité des Offices [*Le monde byzantin* 1]. Paris 1976, 282, 27 – 283, 4).

[20] Euergetis-Typikon 29 (51, 624–627 GAUTIER): τὸν οἰκονόμον ... ὁ προεστώς ... εἰς προστασίαν ὑμῶν ἀποκαταστήσοι. The translation reproduces THOMAS, Foundation Documents II <Euergetis-Typikon, trans. JORDAN, 484>.

in the last years of the fifth century.[21] Faced with the problem to find a capable successor, 'he gave orders and the archimandrite's hood and staff were brought, and laid before the altar.'[22] Once this was done he asked the candidate of his choice to come forward, 'made a prayer and took him and clad him in the hood of the archimandriteship, and put the staff of the pastorate of the convent in his hand.'[23] Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that the Euergetis-Typikon envisaged such direct intervention by the abbot, not only because it is absent from the structurally similar ceremonies set out in chapter twenty-nine but also because later typika that prescribe the same ritual for the installation of new abbots as the Euergetis-Typikon give no sign that their predecessors act as intermediaries, even when it is assumed that they are present.[24] This does not necessarily mean that the abbot was not involved at a later stage, possibly through a blessing of his successor analogous to the one we have found in the rituals of installation of officers. However, even if this was the case it is clear that such additional interaction would not change the overall message, namely that all authority comes directly from God.

We can conclude that the Euergetis-Typikon reflects a consistent strategy to depersonalise rituals of installation, which not only affected the community but also the abbots themselves, both in the installations of other officials and in the installations of their successors. What prompted this development? One possible answer presents itself when we focus on the installation of abbots. Since an unbroken chain of succession is essential for the survival of monasteries, this matter was already dealt with in some of the earliest surviving rules.[25] Unlike the Euergetis-Typikon, however, these texts invariably envisage installation through human beings.[26] Accordingly, the appearance of auto-installation in the Euergetis-Typikon can be interpreted as a radical departure from traditional practice. Yet the differences must not detract from the fact that both types of ritual share one essential feature: they can be performed without recourse to representatives of the lay church and thus preserve the spiritual self-sufficiency of monastic communities. The remainder of this article will make the case that auto-installation was introduced because the concept of self-sufficiency had come under attack by the lay church and installation through human beings had proved to be ineffective in warding off such an attack, even if the ritual was performed by abbots who could claim to hold a religious office.

In order to test this hypothesis we need to track the development of monastic ritual beyond the Euergetis-Typikon. A survey of the texts shows that the new ceremony rapidly became *de rigueur* in

[21] John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints 58, trans. E.W. Brooks (*PO* 19/2, No.92). Paris 1925, 154–284, here 206–214. On John of Ephesus, cf. S. Ashbrook Harvey, Asceticism and Society in Crisis. John of Ephesus and "The Lives of the Eastern Saints". Berkeley 1990.

[22] John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints 58 (trans. Brooks [*PO* 19/2], 213). John based his narrative on oral accounts of prominent members of the community. The episode about the succession is recorded because Abbot Abraham chose a way of selecting his successor that deviated from customary practice. We are given to understand that he did not divulge his choice beforehand, but rather made it during the course of the ceremony, an idiosyncrasy that later caused a rift in the community.

[23] John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints 58 (trans. Brooks [*PO* 19/2], 214).

[24] The abbot's presence is indicated in the Eleousa-Typikon, cf. Eleousa-Typikon 16 (ed. L. Petit, Le monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine. *IRAIK* 6 [1900] 1–153, text 69–93, here 88, 1–33).

[25] By contrast, these generally rather short texts do not concern themselves with rituals for the installation of monastic officials. Here the Euergetis-Typikon provides the first surviving evidence.

[26] To judge by its adaptation for the monastery of Petritzos the Panagiou-Typikon, which dates to the early eleventh century, stipulated that the new abbot be installed by his predecessor, cf. Petritzos-Typikon 5 (ed. P. Gautier, Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos. *REB* 42 [1984] 5–145, text 19–133, here 51–53). For the dependence of the Petritzos-Typikon on the Panagiou-Typikon, cf. D. Krausmüller, Saints' Lives and Typika: the Constantinopolitan Monastery of Panagiou (unpublished PhD thesis). Belfast 2001. A slightly different arrangement is found in the Diatyposis of Athanasius the Athonite for Lavra, which dates to the last quarter of the tenth century: there it is stated that the abbots of Iviron should act as supervisors and installers, cf. Diatyposis (ed. Ph. Meyer, Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster. Leipzig 1894, Nr. 2, 123–130, here 124, 26 – 125, 7). Of course, this role was by no means limited to abbots. In 997 Nikon Metanoeite entrusted the general and judge of the province with the installation of the abbot in his foundation at Sparta, ed. O. Lampsides, Ὁ ἐκ Πόντου ὅσιος Νίκων ὁ Μετανοεῖτε (*Archeion Pontou*, Supplement 13). Athens 1982, 252–256. An identical arrangement is prescribed in the rule for the monastery of Nea Gephyra near Sparta, which dates to 1027, ed. D. Feissel, A. Philippidis-Braat, Inventaires en vue d'un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance. III. Inscriptions du Péloponnèse (à l'exception de Mistra). *TM* 9 (1985) 267–395, here 301, 17–35.

Byzantine monasteries and by the beginning of the twelfth century the older practice seems to have disappeared altogether.[27] However, only two typika from that period, namely Irene Doukaina's rules for her foundations of the Theotokos Kecharitomene and the Philanthropos Soter, reproduce the template of the Euergetis-Typikon without change.[28] In all other cases the divine installation of abbots is combined with another ceremony, the so-called episcopal *sphragis* or 'seal', regardless of what legal status the monasteries may have had.[29]

A typical example for this additional requirement is found in the Mamas-Typikon from the middle of the twelfth century. Its author Athanasius faithfully copied the ritual of divine installation from the Philanthropos-Typikon but then inserted the following stipulation into the text of his model:

Let all the brothers, taking him along, go up to the most holy ecumenical patriarch so that he may receive from the latter's holy right hand the seal and benediction of the office of superior.[30]

It is immediately evident that such episcopal confirmation put paid to the concept of spiritual self-sufficiency that had been maintained in earlier *typika* since the succession was now dependent on the *placet* of patriarchs, metropolitans and bishops. The ceremony through which the episcopal 'seal' was conferred is set out in Byzantine euchologia in the following terms:

Prayer for the installation of an abbot in the holy patriarchate. He who is to be installed is presented in the presence of all the monks who cast their vote for him, and while the deacon is saying 'Let us beseech the Lord!' the patriarch puts his hand on his head, seals him and utters this prayer … And after the prayer he removes his *pallion* and puts another one around him, and with a kiss dismisses him.[31]

---

[27] The latest texts that do not stipulate a ritual of divine installation are the Diataxis of Michael Attaleiates from 1077 and Gregory Pakourianos' rule for his foundation at Petritzos from 1083, cf. Panoiktirmon-Diataxis 26 and 37 (ed. P. GAUTIER, La diataxis de Michel Attaliate. *REB* 39 [1981] 5–143, text 17–130, here 57 and 73–75), and Petritzos-Typikon 5 (53, 554–567 GAUTIER). In his Hypotyposis for Patmos, which dates to 1091, Christodoulos stipulates that a priest should hand the staff to the new abbot, cf. Patmos-Hypotyposis 18 (ed. F. MIKLOSICH – J. MÜLLER, Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana VI. Vienna 1890, 71–72). At first sight this might be considered an even later example for the use of human installers. However, since the priest takes the staff from the altar where it has been deposited before, one can argue that this is merely a variant of the ritual of divine installation, possibly inspired by the Eucharist, which provided the ultimate model for this ceremony, cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Installed by God.

[28] Cf. Kecharitomene-Typikon 11 (ed. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon de la Théotokos Kécharitôménè. *REB* 43 [1985] 5–165, text 19–155, here 51, 540–542). The Philanthropos-Typikon is lost but there can be no doubt that its stipulations closely resembled those of its sister institution of the Kecharitomene.

[29] Cf. Eleousa-Typikon 16 (88, 6–33 PETIT); Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (ed. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator. *REB* 32 [1974] 1–131, here 67–69); Kosmosoteira-Typikon 33 (ed. G.K. PAPAZOGLOU, Τυπικὸν Ἰσαακίου Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ τῆς μονῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς Κοσμοσωτείρας. Komotene 1994, 69); Elegmoi-Typikon 1 (ed. A. DMITRIEVSKIJ, Opisanie liturgičeskih rukopisej I. Kiev 1895, 715–769, here 720). The only exception is the Areia monastery whose rule dates to the mid-twelfth century: here the founder Bishop Leo of Argos maintained that its abbots did not need confirmation from an outsider. However, Leo was well aware that he was straying from an accepted norm, cf. Areia-Typikon 10 (ed. G.A. CHORAS, Ἡ "ἁγία μονὴ" Ἀρείας ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ καὶ πολιτικῇ ἱστορίᾳ Ναυπλίου καὶ Ἄργους. Athens 1975, text 239–252 [Hypomnema 239–244, Typikon 244–252], here 248–249). The monasteries of Kosmosoteira and Pantokrator were 'self-governing'.

[30] Mamas-Typikon 1 (ed. S. EUSTRATIADES, Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος. *Hell* 1 [1928] 245–314, text 256–311, here 263, 3–8): Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα συμπαραλαμβάνοντες αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀνερχέσθωσαν εἰς τὸν ἁγιώτατον οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχην ὥστε τὴν σφραγίδα καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν τῆς ἡγουμενείας δεξάμενον παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκείνου δεξιᾶς …. The translation follows A. BANDY, 32. *Mamas*: Typikon of Athanasios Philanthropenos for the Monastery of St. Mamas in Constantinople, in: THOMAS, Foundation Documents III, 973–1041, here 996. The Mamas-Typikon continues with a passage that has an exact counterpart in Kecharitomene-Typikon 11 (51, 553–556 GAUTIER): Εὐκταῖον μὲν οὖν ἐστί μοι .... There, however, this passage follows immediately after the introduction of the abbess as 'appointed by God'. There can be no doubt that this was also the case in the lost Philanthropos-Typikon.

[31] Euchologium Barberini, no. 167, 1–4 and 168, 1–4 (ed. S. PARENTI – E. VELKOVSKA, L'Eucologio Barberini gr. 336. Seconda edizione riveduta, con traduzione in lingua italiana [*Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae", "Subsidia"* 80]. Rome 2000, 175–176): Εὐχὴ ἐπὶ προχειρίσεως ἡγουμένου ἐν τῷ εὐαγεῖ πατριαρχείῳ. Προσάγεται ὁ μέλλων προχειρίζεσθαι, παρόντων καὶ πάντων τῶν ψηφισαμένων αὐτὸν μοναχῶν, καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου "τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν", ἐπιτίθησιν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ὁ πατριάρχης, σφραγίζων καὶ ἐπευχόμενος οὕτως ... Καὶ μετὰ τὸ "ἀμὴν" ἐπαίρει τὸ περικείμενον αὐτῷ παλλίον καὶ περιτίθησιν αὐτῷ

In order to understand the significance of this ritual we need to consider the context in which it appears in the euchologia: there it is added to a sequence of installation rituals that starts with the bishop and then proceeds to priest, deacon, sub-deacon and lector.[32] Comparison between the rituals themselves shows that the bestowal of the *pallion* on the abbot-elect has exact counterparts in the preceding ordinations: a new bishop receives an *omophorion*, a new priest a *phelonion* and a new deacon a *horarion*. The purpose of this parallelism is evident: it is an attempt to integrate the monastic hierarchy into a framework that derived its legitimacy from the apostolic succession of bishops.[33]

As an expression of the episcopate's claim to be the only mediator between God and this world the 'seal' is at odds with the notion of spiritual self-sufficiency, and its insertion into *typika* can be regarded as a direct challenge to the existing ritual of auto-installation that encapsulated this notion.[34] What had happened to bring about this dramatic change? The requirement that newly-elected abbots be confirmed by their local bishops was not an innovation of the twelfth century. It had been part of both canon and secular law since Late Antiquity,[35] and the corresponding ceremony is attested in the euchologia from the eighth century onwards.[36] That the concept was known in the tenth and early eleventh centuries can be seen from a law that Emperor Basil II (976–1025) promulgated in the year 996.[37] In this law the emperor first enjoins bishops not to appropriate private monastic foundations and then sets out their legitimate rights as supervisors *in spiritualibus*, which include the bestowal of their 'seal' on new abbots.[38]

Moreover, there is some evidence that the episcopal *sphragis* was performed during those years. The Life of Irene of Chrysobalanton, which was composed soon after 980, contains a vivid account of her

---

ἕτερον, καὶ ἀσπαζόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπολύει. That this is indeed the ceremony performed during the episcopal confirmation mentioned in the typika is evident from a later stage in the development of monastic ritual when direct divine installation was replaced with the handing over of the staff by the bishop. Cf. A. DMITRIEVSKIJ, Opisanie liturgičeskih rukopisej, II: Εὐχολόγια. Kiev 1901, 377–378, no. LIII, Codex Alexandrinus (Kairo) 371 (48), a. 1407, fol. 48v: καὶ μετὰ τὸ "ἀμὴν" ἐπαίρει τὸ περικείμενον αὐτῷ φαινόλιον καὶ περιτίθησιν αὐτῷ τὸ παλλίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀσπασάμενος δίδωσιν αὐτῷ δεκανίκον καὶ ἀπολύει. It is evident that here the investiture with the staff is interpolated into the traditional ritual of episcopal confirmation.

[32] The rituals for the installation of bishop, priest, deacon, deaconess, sub-deacon, lector and psaltes are found in Euchologium Barberini no. 157–164 (165–173 PARENTI – VELKOVSKA).

[33] The position of the ritual of installation of the abbot at the end of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is a clear indication that originally it had no place in this context. Significantly, in the Euchologium Barberini the installation of the abbot is followed by the coronation of the emperor whose relation to the church hierarchy was equally ambiguous. However, it needs to be pointed out that by the late eighth century the boundaries had become blurred: the Seventh Council permitted abbots to ordain deacons, cf. P. DE MEESTER, De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam Byzantinam (*Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. Fonti* II.10). Vatican 1942, 249.

[34] From the perspective of the lay church auto-installation would have been just that: a ritual by which the ordinand confers the office on himself. The adverbs αὐτοχειροτονήτως and αὐτοπροβλήτως appear in the synodal condemnation of the twelfth-century mystic Constantine Chrysomallos with reference to his teaching (ed. J. GOUILLARD, Quatre procès de mystiques à Byzance. *REB* 36 [1978] 5–81, Nr. 3, text 56–66, here 58, 19 and 29). In a monastic context the term αὐτοχειροτόνητος was already used in the mid-ninth century when Patriarch Methodius contested the validity of the installations of the abbots Athanasius of Sakkoudion and Naucratius of Studios in a 'rebuke of their self-ordained abbothood', cf. Letter I, tit. (ed. J. Darrouzès, Le patriarche Méthode contre les iconoclastes et les stoudites *REB* 45 [1987] 15–57, text 31–39, here 31): ἔλεγχος τῆς αὐτοχειροτονήτου αὐτῶν ἡγουμενίας. Methodius states that the two abbots had failed to ask Patriarch Nicephorus for a 'blessing' to confirm their accession. However, this does not constitute a strict parallel since Athanasius and Naucratius had been appointed by Theodore of Studios. Moreover, Methodius did not question in principle the ability of abbots to ordain others: this is evident from his argument that just as a bishop cannot ordain his successor, an abbot cannot put another person as an abbot into his own place, cf. Letter I (35, 67–80 DARROUZÈS).

[35] The relevant material is collected in DE MEESTER, De monachico statu 233. Cf. also B. GRANIĆ, Die Rechtsstellung und Organisation der griechischen Klöster nach dem justinianischen Recht. *BZ* 29 (1928/29) 6–34, esp. 12–13.

[36] Cf. PARENTI – VELKOVSKA, L'Eucologio Barberini 19–20.

[37] Cf. THOMAS, Private Religious Foundations 160–163.

[38] Novella of Basil II Γ 1 (ed. N. SVORONOS, Les Novelles des empereurs Macédoniens concernant la terre et les stratiotes, édition posthume et index établis par P. GOUNARIDIS. Athens 1994, Nr. 14, version II, text 200–217, here 209, 151–156): ὁρίζω ... ἵνα ... οἱ ἐπίσκοποι μόνην τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα καὶ τὴν διόρθωσιν τῶν ἴσως γενομένων σφαλμάτων παρὰ τῶν καλογήρων ἔχωσι. Version I on the facing page does not differ in content.

installation.[39] After the burial of the previous abbess the nuns gather in the church of the convent where they elect Irene without telling her about their decision and then set out for the patriarchal palace together with her.

> And when the great Methodius had been notified, as is the custom, all the sisters went in to him together. Having prostrated themselves in the usual way, they lay awaiting his blessing. He blessed them and exhorted them to rise, and then asked to be told whom they had chosen to lead them.[40]

When they pretend to be as yet undecided, Methodius tells them that he already knows whom they have chosen. Then he proceeds with the installation:

> Burning incense and praising God he initiated a hymn befitting the occasion. Then he first ordained Irene deaconess of the Great Church …, and thereafter put on her the seal of hegumenate.[41]

It is evident that this interaction, which is twice called 'customary' in the context, closely resembles the ritual described in the euchologia. However, it seems that in the later tenth century the *sphragis* was only customary in monasteries that were under the direct control of the patriarch,[42] and that it was merely considered one possible type of installation, which while being the prerogative of bishops had no claim to greater authority than the investiture by abbots or even laypeople. Such interpretation is supported by the vast majority of typika from the tenth and eleventh centuries, whose authors seem to have been completely ignorant of the strictures of canon law and were at the same time extremely wary of any form of episcopal interference.[43]

When we turn to the rules of the twelfth century we find a radically changed situation for they show an acute awareness of canonical requirements. The author of the Eleousa-Typikon, Bishop Manuel of Strumica, states that the 'seal' should be conferred by the local bishop 'according to the prescription of the sacred canons' before the ritual of auto-installation can take place in the monastery.[44]

---

[39] J.O. Rosenqvist, The Life of St. Irene Abbess of Chrysobalanton. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Indices (*Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 1). Uppsala 1986, esp. xxviii–xxix for the date of the text.

[40] Life of Irene 7 (26, 14–27 Rosenqvist): Ὑπομνησθέντος τοίνυν, ὡς ἔθος, τοῦ μεγάλου Μεθοδίου εἰσίασιν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ πᾶσαι ἅμα πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν συνήθη βαλοῦσαι μετάνοιαν ἔκειντο τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀναμένουσαι. Εὐλογήσας δὲ καὶ ἀναστῆναι ταύταις ἐγκελευσάμενος ἠρώτα μαθεῖν τὴν προκριθεῖσαν ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰς προστασίαν αὐτῶν. The translation is a slightly modified version of Rosenqvist's translation.

[41] Life of Irene 7 (28, 2–6 Rosenqvist): βαλών τε θυμίαμα καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐλογήσας, ὑμνῳδίας τε προσφόρου πρῶτος ἀρξάμενος, διάκονον τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον χειροτονεῖ τὴν Εἰρήνην ..., καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν τῆς ἡγουμενείας ἐπιτίθησι σφραγῖδα. A similar passage is found in the Life of Elizabeth the Wonderworker, cf. Life of Elizabeth 6 (ed. F. Halkin, Sainte Elisabeth d'Héraclée, abbesse à Constantinople. *AnBoll* 91 [1973] 249–264, here 258): ἦν καὶ ὁ τότε τοὺς τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης διϊθύνων οἴακ-ας μέγας Γεννάδιος ὡς ἔθος σφραγίσας καθηγουμένην τῆς μονῆς προεχειρίσατο. Elizabeth lived in the fifth century but internal evidence suggests that her Life reflects a Middle Byzantine context. Unfortunately, however, the text has been dated as late as the twelfth century and can therefore not be considered secure evidence for an earlier period. Cf. A. Kazhdan, Hagiographical Notes: A Female Saint George. *Byz* 56 (1986) 169–170, and A. Kazhdan, Elizabeth the thaumaturge. *ODB* I (1991) 688.

[42] Cf. Life of Symeon the New Theologian 30 (ed. I. Hausherr, Un grand mystique byzantin. Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien (949–1022) par Nicétas Stéthatos [*Orientalia Christiana* 12]. Rome 1928, 40), where Patriarch Nicholas Chrysoberges appoints Symeon abbot of the patriarchal monastery of St Mamas. At the same time Symeon is ordained priest. This additional step, which has a parallel in the ordination of Irene as deaconess, suggests that the 'seal' alone was not considered sufficient to safeguard the integration of the abbot into the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

[43] There is no reference to such a confirmation in the Typikon and Diatyposis of Athanasius for Lavra (109, 7–10 and 128, 1–129, 11 Meyer). Cf. also the founders' testaments for the monasteries of Nicon Metanoeite (256 Lampsides), and Nea Gephyra (301–302 Feissel – Philippides-Braat). In the document for Nea Gephyra the bishop is expressly forbidden to enter the monastery. Cf. Thomas, Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents I, 323, who interprets this as a sign of ignorance of canon law rather than defiance. Even texts that date to the last decades of the eleventh century such as the rules of Attaleiates and Pakourianos contain no stipulation about the confirmation of the abbot through a bishop. Cf. Panoiktirmon-Diataxis (73–74, 935–959 Gautier). Pakourianos did not even allow the commemoration of the metropolitan of Philippopolis in the liturgy, cf. Petritzos-Typikon 3 (45, 436–444 Gautier).

[44] Eleousa-Typikon 16 (88, 20–21 Petit): ὡς ἐγχώριος ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν κανόνων διάταξιν.

By the second quarter of the twelfth century this position had become firmly entrenched in the capital and its hinterland,[45] and even emperors were no longer able to flaunt canon law. This is evident from the typikon that John II Komnenos (1118–1143) had drawn up for the Pantokrator monastery. Like the Eleousa-Typikon it combines auto-installation with episcopal confirmation 'in order that the exactitude of the canon be preserved'.[46]

However, in this case the stipulations for the latter ceremony are considerably more complex: the monks are to invite a provincial bishop to confer the *sphragis* on the abbot and this bishop is then to obtain a special dispensation from the patriarch.[47] The purpose of this arrangement is evident. The regular procedure would have required that the patriarch of Constantinople perform this function. Such a solution, however, would have permitted the patriarch to intervene in the affairs of the monastery: as the overseer *in spiritualibus* of all religious institutions in his diocese he could have withheld his 'seal' from an undesirable candidate. By having recourse to a bishop who 'happens to be' in Constantinople the monks choose instead a person of their liking who can perform such a ritual but who is at the same time incapable of exerting further control because the canons do not allow bishops to interfere in the running of a colleague's diocese. However, since by the same token the installation itself is not canonical, a specific patriarchal document is required.[48] From this discussion it is evident that John II desired the highest possible degree of 'freedom' for his monastery, and one can still imagine the fierce wrangling that must have gone on behind the scenes in order to achieve this solution. However, it is equally obvious that the emperor achieved his aim of limiting the implications of the episcopal 'seal' through skilful manipulation of the canons rather than through their outright rejection.[49]

The first firm evidence for the acceptance in typika of episcopal confirmation as a canonical requirement comes from the patriarchate of Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084–1111) and thus postdates the first appearance of the ritual of auto-installation by more than a decade.[50] However, by the end of Nicholas' term of office the *sphragis* was already generally accepted practice in Constantinople and its hinterland, which suggests that the patriarchate had started to implement it some time before. Therefore I would argue that the concept of divine installation and the concomitant ritual were a response to the first attempts of the lay church to enforce the new regime.[51] If bishops were the only human beings with the

---

[45] The situation in the provinces may have been somewhat different. In his Hypomnema for his foundation, the Areia monastery, Bishop Leo of Argos acknowledges the canonical rights of bishops but fails to include the *sphragis* among them, cf. Areia-Hypomnema (242.118–243.120 Choras): τὴν ἀναφορὰν μόνην τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐν ταῖς θείαις μυσταγωγίαις τούτοις (sc. τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς ἐσομένοις ἁγιωτάτοις ἀρχιερεῦσι) παραλιμπάνοντες καὶ τὴν τῶν ψυχικῶν σφαλμάτων ἐπιτήρησιν. This is in keeping with Leo's cavalier attitude towards the *sphragis* in his Typikon, see above note 29.

[46] Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 660–661 Gautier), for the Greek text see below note 49.

[47] Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 657–662 Gautier).

[48] The context implies that this dispensation refers to the bishop's celebration of the liturgy, but it is likely to cover the 'ordination' as well.

[49] Cf. Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 660–662 Gautier): ἵνα καὶ ἡ τοῦ κανόνος ἀκρίβεια φυλαχθῇ καὶ ἡ τῆς μονῆς ἐλευθερία μηδὲν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἡγουμένου σφραγῖδος κατασεισθῇ.

[50] It is the Eleousa-Typikon, which dates to between 1085 and 1106. cf. Petit, Monastère 15. This is surprising because this text was composed for a provincial monastery. A possible explanation is the origin of the author: before he became bishop of Stroumitza Manuel had been monk on Mount St. Auxentius near the capital, cf. Eleousa-Typikon 1 (70, 3–4 Petit). However, even Manuel of Stroumitza permits his monks to flaunt the canonical requirement should one of his successors ask for an extortionate fee, cf. Eleousa-Typikon 16 (88, 21–27 Petit). This is a sign that the implementation of the new regime was less swift in the provinces.

[51] In this context it is worth mentioning that the Theodore Psalter contains a prayer of intercession, put into the mouth of John the Baptist who is depicted to the left of the abbot, fol. 191v: ὦ Χ(ριστ)ὲ Σ(ῶτ)ερ ὦ θ(εο)ῦ π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς λόγε / τοῦτόν γ' ὃν εἵλου τῆς ἐμῆς προεστάναι / μον(ῆς) μάλιστα δεξιὸν ποδηγέτην / δεῖξον κράτιστον τῆσδε ποίμν(ης) ποιμέν(α) / τῶν σῶν λογικῶν θρεμμάτ(ων) ἐπιστάτη(ν) / ἄριστον ἡδὺν εὐπρόσιτον σὺν λόγῳ. This prayer has a close parallel in the *euchologia*, cf. Euchologium Barberini, no. 167.4 (176 Parenti – Velkovska): ὁ θεὸς ὁ διὰ παντὸς τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας πρόνοιαν ποιούμενος ... τὸν δοῦλόν σου τοῦτον, <ὃν> ηὐδόκησας καταστῆσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡγούμενον, ἄξιον τῆς σῆς ἀνάδειξον ἀγαθότητος, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀρεταῖς κατακόσμησον διὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἀγαθῶν ἔργων τύπον τοῖς ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν γινόμενον ὥστε αὐτοὺς ζηλωτὰς γενέσθαι τῆς ἀμέμπτου αὐτοῦ πολιτείας. Thus one could argue that in the Theodore Psalter not only the installation with the staff but also the episcopal confirmation itself is transported to the supernatural sphere.

authority to ordain abbots and if appointments by abbots and other members of monastic communities were therefore regarded as invalid, then the concept of direct divine installation was the obvious way out because it permitted monasteries to bypass the bishops and to tap directly into the divine source of all authority on earth. And once the new ritual had been adopted for the installation of abbots it was only a small step to extend it to the installations of other monastic officials who otherwise might have exploited existing problems of legitimacy for their own ends.[52]

The rapid spread of auto-installation suggests that this strategy was initially successful.[53] Yet in the long run it could not stand up to the pressure of the church, which eventually managed to impose its own ceremony of installation on all monasteries. As we have seen, this did not usually mean the suppression of the alternative ritual: indeed, only one text, the Phoberou-Typikon, shows a straightforward replacement.[54] However, in those cases where the two rituals are combined the episcopal *sphragis* almost always takes the first place.[55] Since both rituals had originally followed directly after the election of an abbot, this arrangement is most likely the result of a process of negotiation. Its significance can be gauged through comparison with imperial appointments to ecclesiastical posts such as the office of patriarchal synkellos: here the patriarch confers the *sphragis* only after the candidate has been installed by the emperor.[56] Interestingly, the same sequence is stipulated for the appointment of a new abbot in Michael VIII's Typikon for the monastery of St. Michael on Mount St. Auxentius: after the monks have elected a new leader they ask the emperor to instal him and only then proceed to obtain for him the *sphragis* from the metropolitan of Chalcedon.[57] This leaves no doubt that the first installation after an election was considered to be the crucial stage in the process, and it makes it very likely that the sequence found in the typika reflects a deliberate strategy of the patriarchate. Although no evidence has survived for the early stages of ecclesiastical expansion, one can hypothesise that the lay church was then not in a position to suppress auto-installation and therefore contented itself with insisting that its own ritual take precedence, in the secure knowledge that this would strip the rival ceremony of much of its significance.[58]

---

[52] Cf. Euergetis-Typikon 32 (73, 1015–1018 GAUTIER). For the tendency of monastic officials to treat the monastic property that they administered as their private possessions, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, The monastic communities of Stoudios and St Mamas in the second half of the tenth century, in: The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism (ed. M. MULLETT – A. KIRBY [*Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations* 6, 1]). Belfast 1994, 67–85. If the position of the abbot was weakened, direct obligation to the divine could reinforce the notion of the monastery as an institution and thus indirectly support the authority of the abbot as its leader.

[53] In this context it is worth remembering that Patriarch Nicholas is referred to in the sources as θεοχειροτόνητος and θεοπρόβλητος, see above note 12. Given the contemporary discourse about monastic installations, the adoption of these terms by the lay church is surely no coincidence although it must remain open whether it can be understood as a direct response to the monastic position.

[54] Although this text is an adaptation of the Euergetis-Typikon, the ritual of auto-installation is omitted, cf. Phoberou-Typikon 35 (ed. A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, Noctes Petropolitanae. St. Petersburg, 1913, 1–87, here 52, 16–18). Instead we find an additional reference to patriarchal confirmation, cf. Phoberou-Typikon 35 (53, 15–17 PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS).

[55] Exceptions are the Mamas-Typikon, see above note 30, and its calque, the Elegmoi-Typikon, cf. Elegmoi-Typikon 1 (720 DMITRIEVSKIJ). However, here the reversal may be due to the clumsy adaptation by the abbot of St. Mamas of his model, the Philanthropos-Typikon.

[56] Cf. De cerimoniis II 5 (530, 8–21 REISKIUS).

[57] Auxentius-Typikon 3 (ed. DMITRIEVSKIJ, Opisanie I 769–794, here 774–775).

[58] There are, however, some indications that this view may not have been universally accepted. In the Pantokrator-Typikon the same verb χειροτονεῖν is used first for the conferral of the *sphragis* by the bishop and then in the context of auto-installation, cf. Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 658–660 GAUTIER): εἷς τῶν ... ἀρχιερέων ... χειροτονείτω καθηγούμενον, and Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 660–662 GAUTIER): εἶτα τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ῥάβδον ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς Παντοκράτορος εἰκόνος μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐλαβείας ὑποδέξεται. This last sentence is syntactically ambivalent: the prepositional phrase ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς Παντοκράτορος εἰκόνος can be taken to refer not only to the finite verb but also to the preceding participle, which establishes the notion of 'direct divine installation' through the mediation of an icon. Moreover, the use of the present participle χειροτονούμενος instead of an aorist form (Gautier translates 'celui qui a été ordonné' as if the text read χειροτονηθείς!) insinuates that *sphragis* and auto-installation are two stages in a continuous ritual that only reaches its conclusion once the second part has been performed. This interpretation is confirmed by the concluding sentence where the community is told to accept 'the one who will be promoted …

What are the reasons for the success of the lay church and the ultimate failure of monasteries to uphold their claim to spiritual self-sufficiency? One explanation is suggested by patriarchal and episcopal documents, which are regularly mentioned in twelfth-century typika. These documents, which were issued to founders or restorers of monasteries, not only enforce the bishops' canonical right to be commemorated in the liturgy, to 'seal' new abbots and to oversee the spiritual welfare of the communities but also confirm the 'freedom' of the foundations.[59] The significance of this additional feature is spelt out in a passage in the *Testament* of John the Faster for the Petra monastery:[60]

> We wish that this (sc. monastery) rather be completely uninhabited than in any way come under the control and power of somebody and under the ownership of the *charistikarioi*, for this we have chosen and decided and the most blessed ecumenical patriarch Lord Nicholas has confirmed and corroborated this will and wish of ours through his own *hypomnema*.[61]

The same document then mentioned the right of the patriarchs to seal each new abbot.[62] This suggests that the lay church could demand the acceptance of its supervision as the price for the support that it lent monasteries in their fight against threats to their independence from laypeople.[63]

However, such a trade-off can only offer a partial explanation for the changes that took place in the early twelfth century since it does not account for the fact that the monks themselves lost faith in the validity of their own concept of legitimate authority. That this was indeed the case is apparent from the Kosmosoteira-Typikon, which adopts the ritual of auto-installation from its models but omits the crucial term 'ordained by God'.[64] The most likely reason for this development was an increasing acceptance by the monastic elite of canon law as the only yardstick for proper procedure. Already around the year 1100 the monk Nicon of the Black Mountain wrote a letter to the local magnate Marapas, in which he declared

---

in a manner that signifies promotion by God', cf. Pantokrator-Typikon 24 (69, 665–666 Gautier): τὸν προβληθησόμενον ... θεοπροβλήτως.

[59] Phoberou-Typikon 33 (51.31–34 Papadopoulos-Kerameus).

[60] This important text was recently edited by G. Turco, La diatheke del fondatore del monastero di S. Giovanni Prodromo in Petra e l'Ambr. E 9 Sup. *Aevum* 75/2 (2001) 327–380, text 350–359. John the Faster was a close associate of Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084–1111) and a protégé of Anna Dalassena, cf. Testament of John the Faster (350, 8–13 Turco), and Empress Irene Doukaina, cf. H. Gelzer, Kallistos' Enkomion auf Johannes Nesteutes. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 29 (1886) 59–89, esp. 62. The *terminus post quem* for the text in its present form is the death of Nicholas Grammatikos in 1111 who is referred to as μακαριωτάτῳ in the passage quoted above.

[61] Testament of John the Faster (353, 99–104 Turco): Ταύτην γὰρ (sc. τὴν μονὴν) ἀοίκητον τελείως ... βουλόμεθα ἢ ὅλως ὑπὸ δεσποτεί[αν ἢ ἐξουσίαν τινὸς] γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν τῶν χαριστικαρίων [αὐθεντίαν]· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἡρετισάμεθά τε καὶ ἠθελήσαμεν· ὁ δὲ μακαριώτατος καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρ[χης] κῦρ Νικόλαος ταύτην δὴ τὴν ἡμῶν θέλησίν τε καὶ βούλησιν δι' οἰκείου αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήματος ἐπεσφράγισέ τε καὶ ἐβεβαίωσε. On the phenomenon of charistike, cf. H. Ahrweiler, Charisticariat et autres formes d'attribution de fondations pieuses aux X–XI siècles. *ZRVI* 10 (1967) 1–27, reprinted in eadem, Études sur les structures administratives et sociales de Byzance (*Variorum Reprints CS* 5). London 1971, Nr. 7.

[62] Testament of John the Faster (353, 104–107 Turco): μό[νον] τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου τὴν τῆς ἡγουμενείας σφραγίδα καὶ ἀναφορὰν ἔχοντος καὶ πλεῖον οὐδὲν ὡς δεδήλωται ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι.

[63] This article focuses on change in the monastic sphere but this does not mean that the lay church did not also undergo changes between the late tenth and the late eleventh century. In his law of 996 Basil II expressed his concern that bishops might abuse their canonical rights in order to impose illegal taxes on monasteries, and this concern is mirrored in several rules, cf. above notes 38 and 43. If the lay church managed to limit or suppress such practices among its representatives in the following decades, it would have been easier for monasteries to accept the new *status quo*. Such a scenario would fit in well with the general climate of reform in the later eleventh century but without further research it must remain hypothetical.

[64] Kosmosoteira-Typikon 33 (69, 741–743 Papazoglou): καὶ ἐξιόντα ἵστασθαι εἰς τὸν ἀποκεκληρωμένον τόπον τῷ ἡγουμένῳ καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ ὡς πατέρα ἀσπάζεσθαι (σεβάζεσθαι?). Ἀρκεῖ γοῦν καὶ ταῦτα περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἡγουμένου προκρίσεώς τε καὶ προχειρίσεως. Comparison shows that this passage is a conflation of the versions found in the Evergetis and Kecharitomene rules, cf. Euergetis-Typikon 13 (51, 639–640 Gautier): καὶ ἐξιόντα ἵστασθαι εἰς τὸν ἁρμόδιον τόπον καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων ἀσπάζεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἑξῆς εἶναι ὑμῶν ἡγούμενον θεοχειροτόνητον, and Kecharitomene-Typikon 11 (51, 546–551 Gautier): Εἶτα στήσεται εἰς τὸν ἀποκεκληρωμένον τῇ ἡγουμένῃ τόπον, καὶ πᾶσαι αὐτῇ τὸν θεῖον προσάξουσιν ἀσπασμόν. ... Αὕτη δὲ ὑμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς προεστῶσα, ἣν καὶ ὡς μητέρα σεβάσεσθε καὶ διάθεσιν καὶ ὑπακοὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἕξετε ὡς θεοχειροτόνητον. However, the crucial term θεοχειροτόνητος, which appeared in both these texts, is omitted.

'that monks who have not obtained their ordination as abbots by a bishop are devoid of the Holy Spirit.'[65] And a few decades later the monk Nicholas Kataskepenos inserted into his Life of Cyril of Philea a list of reasons for the deposition of an abbot, among which we find the case 'when an abbot is unsealed by the archpriest of the area, as the divine canons stipulate'.[66] Such statements are indicators of a general marginalisation of the monastic element within the Byzantine religious discourse of the twelfth century, which was exclusively dominated by the church hierarchy and in which individual monks could only engage if they accepted the parameters that had been set by the lay church.[67]

To conclude: in the middle of the eleventh century there was a sudden change from traditional forms of monastic installation, which involved human intermediaries such as abbots or other members of monastic communities, to a new ritual of auto-installation, which was conceived of as an investiture by God himself. The creation of the new ceremony can be interpreted as a response to attempts of the lay church to enforce its own ritual of installation, the so-called episcopal 'seal', in all monasteries regardless of their legal status. This ritual, which was based on the concept of apostolic succession and had the backing of canon and secular law, denied the validity of installations through human beings other than bishops and patriarchs and thus undermined the spiritual self-sufficiency of monasteries. Under these circumstances auto-installation could offer an effective means to rebut the meddling of the lay church because it bypassed human intermediaries and intimated that monastic communities could tap directly into the divine source of all spiritual authority on earth. However, in the long run the defence of spiritual self-sufficency proved unsuccessful and by the early twelfth century episcopal confirmation had been universally implemented. This aim was achieved not through suppression of the new ritual of auto-installation but through prefixing it with the episcopal 'seal', which stripped it of its significance. Possible reasons for this development are the impact of the *charistike*, which weakened monasteries and made them look for ecclesiastical support, and more importantly an increasing reliance on canon law among monks despite its bias in favour of the lay church because it was the only way of engaging in the religious discourse of the time. The creation of the ritual of auto-installation thus marks a pivotal point in Middle Byzantine monasticism when the monastic elites were already confronted with the claims of an increasingly assertive episcopate but were still capable of countering these claims with the creation of an alternative concept of legitimate authority.

---

[65] Taktikon of Nicon of the Black Mountain, titulus 23 (ed. V.N. Beneševič, Taktikon Nikona Černogorca. Grečeskij tekst po rukopisi No. 441 Sinajskago monastyra sv. Ekateriny I [*Zapiski Ist.-Filol. Fakulteta Petrogradskago Universiteta* 139]. Petrograd 1917, 9, 19–26): Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν μάγιστρον καὶ ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀρχόντων τὸν Μαραπάν ... ὅτι οἱ μοναχοὶ μὴ ἔχοντες χειροτονίαν ἡγουμένου ἀπὸ ἐπισκόπου ἐστέρηνται ἁγίου πνεύματος. Nicon had close connections with the patriarchate of Antioch, cf. I. Doens, Nicon de la Montagne Noire. *Byz* 24 (1954) 131–140.

[66] Life of Cyril of Philea 39 (ed. E. Sargologos, La vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote, moine byzantin (+1110) [*Subsidia Hagiographica* 39]. Brussels 1964, 174): ταῦτά εἰσι τὰ ἐκβάλλοντα τὸν ἡγούμενον τῆς ἡγουμενείας ... ἐάν ἐστιν ὁ ἡγούμενος ἀσφράγιστος παρὰ τοῦ τῆς χώρας ἀρχιερέως, καθὼς οἱ θεῖοι κανόνες διαγορεύουσιν. Significantly this is the only reason given by Nicholas where he feels the need to add an explicit reference to canon law. Nicholas was an inhabitant of Emperor Manuel's model monastery of Kataskepe, cf. P. Magdalino, The empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180. Cambridge 1993, 298 and 391.

[67] A similar development can be observed in the debate about fasting in the late eleventh century where canon law also became the yardstick for proper practice and where traditional forms of authority were questioned within monastic settings, which permitted the patriarch and his clergy to act as arbiters, cf. D. Krausmüller, The Athonite monastic tradition during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, in: Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism (ed. A. Bryer – M. Cunningham). Aldershot 1996, 57–65, esp. 64–65. On the growing importance of canon law and on the marginal role of monks in the religious debates of the twelfth century, cf. Magdalino, Empire of Manuel I 35 and 318–320.