

This is an extract from:

Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents:

A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments

edited by John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero

with the assistance of Giles Constable

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

in five volumes as number 35 in the series Dumbarton Oaks Studies

© 2000 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

CHAPTER FOUR

Early Reform Monasteries of the Eleventh Century

“We instruct all in the name of our Lord God the Ruler of All that this holy monastery is to be independent, free of everyone’s control, and self-governing, and not subject to any rights, be they imperial or ecclesiastic or of a private person . . .” (22) *Evergetis* [12]

“I dare to say that [the monastery] was not completed with any other money belonging to someone else or as a result of any wrongdoing or even with forced labor, additional requisitions, and the service of my dependent peasants . . . but from my own rights and personal labors and zealous efforts.” (23) *Pakourianos* [1]

“No man in the world shall have power either to abolish and overthrow the aforesaid godly cenobitic rule of life in our monastery, or to attempt, for any cause or reason whatsoever, to enslave this monastery or any of its dependencies and set a debased stamp on its liberty.” (24) *Christodoulos* [A16]

There are three lengthy documents in this fourth group of Byzantine monastic foundation documents, all of which date from the turbulent last half of the eleventh century. These documents illustrate the early stages of the Byzantine monastic reform movement.

A. Typology of the Documents

Two of the documents in this chapter, (22) *Evergetis* and (23) *Pakourianos*, initiate the series of lengthy, complex founders’ *typika* that will continue throughout the rest of Byzantine history. They are by far the longest documents considered hitherto in our corpus, displaying a sophisticated treatment of the problems of Byzantine monasticism with considerable stylistic polish. Of the two, (23) *Pakourianos*, authored by the Komnenian military commander of the same name, is the better organized document, perhaps a benefit of close modeling on a now lost *typikon* of the Constantinopolitan monastery of *Panagios*. Also, unlike (22) *Evergetis*, it was probably composed nearly all at the same time, while the latter document was likely subject to continual re-editing throughout the last half of the eleventh century.

While (22) *Evergetis* was the more lastingly influential document, (23) *Pakourianos* ironically is a more modern one in terms of its organization. The latter’s use of a table of contents (a first among our documents), its division into chapters with summary headings, and its overall content and pattern of organization anticipate some of the features of twelfth-century *typika* like (30) *Phoberos*, (32) *Mamas*, (27) *Kecharitomene*, (28) *Pantokrator* and (29) *Kosmosoteira* even though all of these documents are textually related to (22) *Evergetis*. (23) *Pakourianos* is also

CHAPTER FOUR

exclusively a founder's *typikon*, while (22) *Evergetis* still shows a certain resemblance to hybrid *typika* like (4) *Stoudios* or (11) *Ath. Rule* with their inclusion of prescriptions for the performance of the canonical hours.

The third document in this chapter, (24) *Christodoulos*, is actually a collection of three shorter texts composed within two years of one another in 1091–93. The first of these, Christodoulos' *Rule* [A], is a highly autobiographical document like (13) *Ath. Typikon* with a relatively brief series of regulations recalling (10) *Eleousa*. Like his predecessor Athanasios the Athonite, Christodoulos had second thoughts about how to arrange for the governance of his foundation, which gave rise to his *Testament* [B] and his *Codicil* [C]. These last-named texts can be interpreted within the genre of the monastic testament as primarily transmissive documents, like (8) *John Xenos*, (14) *Ath. Testament*.

Despite these disparities, the three *typika* considered in this chapter have some important commonalities. All of their authors eagerly provide foundation histories and considerable autobiographical detail. Regardless of whether they relied on a model *typikon* or not, all of these authors speak in their own *typika* with distinctly personalized voices, full of commitment, emotion, and quirky idiosyncrasies. Much more so than their predecessors, then, these texts are literary documents, setting the stage for similar *typika* to come in succeeding centuries. Finally, the authors of these three *typika* all shared a commitment of varying degree to the principles of the monastic reform movement that was then sweeping the empire.

B. Principles of the Early Monastic Reform Movement

No Byzantine source speaks explicitly of an organized monastic reform movement. Instead, we have a number of key documents authored by contemporary reformers like John V the Oxite, Patriarch of Antioch, Leo, Metropolitan of Chalcedon, Nicholas Grammatikos, Patriarch of Constantinople, and others which address specific reformist objectives. Both these objectives and the careers of their promoters interlock in important ways towards the end of the eleventh century. Since many (if not most) of the reformers came from monastic backgrounds, it should not be surprising to find that the majority of the monastic *typika* from this era also reflect their concerns.

1. Institutional Independence and Self-Governance

First among these principles in importance was the assertion of the institutional independence and self-governing status of the monasteries represented by these three *typika*. The precise terminology can be traced back to (13) *Ath. Typikon* [12] in the mid-tenth century (see above, Chapter Two), and quite possibly preserved, however precariously, during the era of the *charistike*, by the monastery of *Panagios*, the superior of which at the beginning of the eleventh century seems to have been a disciple of Athanasios the Athonite.¹ In any event, (23) *Pakourianos* [3], modeled on the lost *typikon* of *Panagios*, asserts institutional independence in 1083, as (24) *Christodoulos* [A16] does a few years later in 1091. The authors of these two documents were anticipated if not actually influenced by (22) *Evergetis* [12], which claims independence and asserts that this status dated back to the monastery's foundation in 1048/49.

¹ For the likely link between Lavra and *Panagios*, see above, (11) *Ath. Rule* Institutional History, B.1.

2. Opposition to the *Charistike*

All of our authors were hostile to the basic premise of the *charistike* and other concessionary programs, namely that the management of ecclesiastical foundations for private profit was not incompatible with and perhaps even beneficial for the religious missions of these institutions. This hostility was characteristic of reformers and like-minded authors of this era. Yet since the *charistike* was both employed and defended by the emperors and the patriarchs until the very end of the century, our authors, unlike their twelfth-century successors or contemporary firebrand reformist agitators like John of Antioch, felt constrained to be discreet. Our authors were more concerned with keeping their own institutions out of future participation in concessionary programs rather than in leading the fight against them throughout the empire. Therefore, the author of (22) *Evergetis*, the core of which at least is earlier than the other two documents in this chapter, warns [12] against any attempt to subordinate the monastery to anyone while diplomatically omitting to mention the *charistike* specifically. The author of (23) *Pakourianos* [3] is similarly circumspect, though his intent is no less clear. The authors of two contemporary documents discussed earlier, (19) *Attaleiates* [8] and (10) *Eleousa* [18], however, are more specific in their condemnation of the *charistike*. On first examination, the author of (24) *Christodoulos* appears to be exceptional in actually appointing a *charistikarios* over his foundation in the *Testament* [B5], but the restrictions he imposes on this official's authority make it clear that a more benign form of internal protectorate (*ephoreia*) was his actual intent.

3. The Exercise of Self-Governance

At this early stage of the monastic reform, it was easier for founders to condemn external attempts to seize control of their foundations than to decide how to provide for the effective exercise of self-governance. Over a century before, Athanasios the Athonite stated his belief in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [20] that a superior chosen internally from among a monastery's own monks was an important safeguard against subordination of his foundation to an outside authority. Later, monastic reformers came to realize that upholding the authority of the superior was essential for reviving monasteries ruined by unscrupulous *charistikarioi*. Yet founders, with some justification, feared that this might lead in time to re-privatization under the auspices of an ambitious superior inclined to put the interests of his own family ahead of his responsibilities to the monastery.

Our authors appreciated the need to provide a means to make their declarations of institutional independence effective. They differed among themselves, however, over the extent to which they were willing to trust the superiors of their foundations. (22) *Evergetis* [14] in effect makes the superior, in consultation with the preeminent monks, the effective ruler of the foundation without precisely saying so. The author of (23) *Pakourianos*, fearing that unscrupulous superiors might attempt to privatize the foundation, orders [5] that the monastery's highest officials should "have no power to regulate anything on their own." Instead the *typikon* itself was to be authoritative and unchangeable. The author of (24) *Christodoulos* originally intended to use [A20] the "more prominent brothers," as a check on the superior's authority, but when later it appeared that his foundation was on the brink of failure, he decided to subordinate [C2] the superior as well as all the other officials of his monastery to the authority of his *charistikarios*.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Reassertion of Control over Admissions

Sobered by a century of imposed candidates, both lay and religious, installed in monasteries by emperors and patriarchs as well as *charistikarioi*, monastic reformers of the eleventh century sought to reassert control over admissions to monasteries under their direction. One practical way to do this, endorsed by (22) *Evergetis* [37] and (24) *Christodoulos* [A26], was to insist on a probationary novitiate and careful examination of applicants who had been tonsured in another monastery.² Another approach, proposed by (22) *Evergetis* [23], was to decline to set a fixed number of positions for monks in the monastery for fear of having to take in candidates who were not sufficiently pious.

5. The Campaign against Administrative Corruption

The ruinous financial depredations of the *charistikarioi* formed an important part of the reformers' case against the *charistike*. Later on in the eleventh century, a series of bitterly controversial government expropriations of ecclesiastical property (see below, E. Historical Context, 2, 6, 11) added to the urgency of developing procedures to protect religious institutions from theft, both internal and external. All three of our authors shared this concern. In (22) *Evergetis*, corrupt or careless administration of financial affairs was prominent among the grounds for removal of the superior [18] as well as the steward [14] and other financial officials [22]. (23) *Pakourianos* [26] also sets strict standards of accountability for officials. (24) *Christodoulos* [A20] cites misappropriation and theft as justifications for the superior's deposition. (22) *Evergetis* [29] requires officials to reverence icons upon bestowal of their keys of office in an attempt to invoke heavenly sanctions against thievery. Assuming their landed endowments to be sacrosanct, both (22) *Evergetis* [19] and (23) *Pakourianos* [33] condemn improper alienations of movable properties as well, the former more vehemently than the latter, however. (24) *Christodoulos* [A21] provides for a system of receipts and audits of accounts to keep officials honest. Such precautions would become more widespread in the twelfth century.

6. Advocacy of Cenobitic Monasticism

Even though historically Byzantium had been home to several coexisting forms of monasticism, the reformers' critique of the *charistike* shows a strong bias towards cenobitic monasticism.³ Perhaps this was because where *charistikarioi* did not destroy monastic life entirely in those institutions under their control, they may have encouraged kelliotic or idiorhythmic arrangements in which they and the remaining monks divided up the assets of foundations into individual shares (cf. (21) *Roidion* [A2]). Be that as it may, our authors in this chapter share the reformers' cenobitic bias, especially the author of (22) *Evergetis*, who goes beyond communal living and eating arrangements to ban [22] servants and personal possessions and even correspondence with family members. On all these matters the legislation of (23) *Pakourianos* [4], [5], [8], [9] was more moderate, though (24) *Christodoulos* [A28] is closer to *Evergetis* in its requirements.

² See also, however, the preferential admissions policy for fellow Georgians adopted by the author of (23) *Pakourianos* [25], in which a novitiate is not mentioned.

³ For the pluralistic character of earlier Byzantine monasticism, see Alexander Kazhdan, "Hermitic, Cenobitic, and Secular Ideals in Byzantine Hagiography of the Ninth through the Twelfth Centuries," *GOTR* 30 (1985), 473–87.

EARLY REFORM MONASTERIES

At this early stage in the reform movement, however, there was still some tolerance for alternative forms of monasticism. (24) *Christodoulos* [A23] permits solitaries subordinated to the cenobitic community, while (22) *Evergetis* was willing to allow [13] the superior (optionally) to live as a solitary. The hostility towards alternative forms of monasticism would intensify, however, in the twelfth century.⁴

7. Restriction of Patronal Privileges

Another important part of the reformers' critique of the *charistike* was the flagrant abuse of patronal privileges by the *charistikarioi*. By the late eleventh century, the unrestrained patronal privilege claimed by Athanasios the Athonite in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [16], viz, "I have absolute dominion, so that not even one person can gainsay my command," seemed incompatible with a foundation claiming to be independent and self-governing. Accordingly, our authors generally make restrained claims to patronal privileges. In (22) *Evergetis* the only trace of these is to be found in the provisions for posthumous commemorative services for the founders. The author of (23) *Pakourianos* claims a lifetime right [5] to appoint superiors and preferential admissions [25] for certain of his relatives in addition to the usual memorial services and charitable donations [21]. In (24) *Christodoulos*, however, the *charistikarios* is forbidden [B5] to introduce his relatives into that foundation, and the founder's nephews are excluded [B8] from any inheritance of patronal privilege. This author's scruples did not prevent him from requiring [B15] the foundation to accept his spiritual son and the latter's children as beneficiaries, foreshadowing similar exemptions from the usual reform principles by high-born benefactors in the twelfth century.

C. Varieties of Reform

1. The Radical Reform Outlook of (22) *Evergetis*

Despite their common indebtedness to the reform movement, our three authors clearly varied in the intensity of their commitment to it. Among them, Timothy Evergetinos, the primary author of (22) *Evergetis*, was certainly the most radical. In (22) *Evergetis* [17] he displays a hostility to aristocratic privileges and a hard-line approach to equality in food, drink and dress [26], even for officials, that are absent from or even contradicted by (23) *Pakourianos* and (24) *Christodoulos*. Our authors also part ways on other, difficult reform issues. The consensus breaker is often (22) *Evergetis*, whose author's fervent reformism leads him to provide [14] that a bad steward should be allowed to become superior if an amicable agreement cannot be reached on an alternative candidate. In this document's discussion of entrance gifts [37], a little of the same fanatic spirit shows through as the author asserts his willingness to give up entrance gifts from applicants in order to preserve monastic equality and thereby prevent claims for special privileges that might otherwise be made by generous donors. Yet the distinction between compulsory gifts (banned) and unconditional, voluntary donations (permitted) made here was to provide a decisive and lasting precedent for later reform institutions.

2. The "Middle and Royal Road" of (23) *Pakourianos*

In his introduction, the author of (23) *Pakourianos* explicitly states that his model rule of the

⁴ For this phenomenon, see (28) *Pantokrator* [27] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [26].

CHAPTER FOUR

Panagios monastery appealed to him as a “middle and most royal road,” an evident euphemism for a lenient disciplinary regime confirmed by his own institution’s prescriptions [10] for the monks’ far-from-rigorist diet. Perhaps *Panagios*, probably an older document than even the earliest recension of (22) *Evergetis*, also took a more tentative, moderate approach to key reform issues, although the presence of a certain substratum of reform sentiments in (23) *Pakourianos* cannot be denied.

3. Reform under a Protector’s Direction in (24) *Christodoulos*

Of our three authors, that of (24) *Christodoulos* seems at first to have the least commitment to the principles of the reform movement, but primarily because of his decision in his *Testament* [B5] to impose a *charistikarios* on his foundation. Even if the restrictions attached to this office make this decision appear to be a less monstrous repudiation of reform principles than the odious title might otherwise imply, it must be admitted that Christodoulos’ emphatic subordination of the superior to the authority of this official further diminishes his reform credentials. Still, considered by itself as it was meant to be in 1091, Christodoulos’ *Rule* [A] is an undoubtedly reform-oriented document. It sides with (22) *Evergetis*, for instance, in ordering [A22] that monks should have no personal possessions except for necessary clothing. The subsequent deterioration in his foundation’s fortunes surely played an important part in motivating Christodoulos to devise a strong leadership for it in the *Testament*, though some reform principles had to be sacrificed. Even in that event, the independent status of the foundation is reaffirmed [B13] in the *Testament*. Ironically, it was the Christodoulouan model, a constitutionally independent foundation with a powerful protector (minus the ideologically negative title of *charistikarios*), which would provide the most popular model for institutional leadership in the twelfth century (see below, Chapters Five and Six).

4. Reform by Precedent in (20) *Black Mountain*

Though Nikon of the Black Mountain was discussed earlier (see Chapter Three), his *typikon* (20) *Black Mountain* deserves mention here as yet a fourth approach to the monastic reform of the late eleventh century. His work illustrates to an exceptional degree a willingness to allow authoritative precedents, be they from scripture, patristic literature, canon law, or even earlier *typika*, to shape his monastic legislation. Though none of our authors were willing to adopt such an extreme approach, all three show this characteristically reform-minded respect for precedents to some degree. (22) *Evergetis*, reflecting perhaps the interests of the founder Paul Evergetinos, author of an immense patristic *florilegium*, relies chiefly on patristic citations—including the Basilian *Ascetic Treatises*—for its guiding precedents. The author of (23) *Pakourianos*, as noted above, forthrightly admits the earlier *typikon* of the *Panagios* monastery as his model, while the author of (24) Christodoulos cites [A18] hagiographic literature of the patristic era, the imperial legislation of Justinian, [A26] the Basilian *Ascetic Treatises*, and canon law.

The reliance on precedent did not exclude another feature of these documents, namely the exaltation of the institution’s own *typikon* as the authoritative guide for the lives of these foundations. The much-copied provision in (22) *Evergetis* [43] for a monthly reading of the *typikon* and the repeated insistence of (23) *Pakourianos* [5], [18], [30] that even the superior cannot change the terms of the *typikon* serve to illustrate the point. The discussion of how to handle a situation in

EARLY REFORM MONASTERIES

which a founder's *typikon* actually contradicted canon law was left for another generation of reformers.

D. Other Concerns of the Authors

1. Preference for Liturgical Duties over Manual Labor

Following a long-standing trend that can be dated back as early as ninth-century Studite monasticism, these authors placed an emphasis on the performance of liturgical duties over manual labor. This can be seen in (22) *Evergetis* even though more monks were assigned [33] to various crafts and administrative functions than were consecrated for service in the church. In (23) *Pakourianos* [6], slightly more than half of the monks were assigned to liturgical functions, not including various officials who must have been responsible for directing them. Only the author of (24) *Christodoulos* attempted [A10] at first to operate his foundation without relying on the labor of married laymen and their families, a position which he was later compelled [A13] to abandon. Even so, he declares [A15] that “uninterrupted hymn singing” was a monk’s *raison d’être*, and though he allows [A22] monks to practice crafts, he was unwilling to permit a commercial trade in their handicrafts.

2. The Evergetian Formulation of Cenobitic Monasticism

As the most radical of our three documents, (22) *Evergetis* strikes its own, ultimately very influential path on many issues, emphasizing a sacramental life with daily liturgy and confession [7] and relatively frequent reception of communion [5]. It alone obliges [14] its superior to rule consultatively rather than in the traditional authoritarian style (cf. (23) *Pakourianos* [15]). It is also the only one of the three documents considered here to permit bathing [28] under certain circumstances, though other institutions would follow (22) *Evergetis*’ example in this regard in the twelfth century. (22) *Evergetis*’ unwillingness to allow [24] monks to have personal servants was much less popular in the next century, particularly among aristocratic founders who took the more indulgent view espoused here by (23) *Pakourianos* [4], which permits them to exalted personages.

3. Safeguarding Moral Purity

All three authors shared a concern to safeguard the moral purity of their monks by keeping them from sexual temptation, but they disagreed in identifying the most obvious threat. The author of (22) *Evergetis* feared women most of all, excluding them from participation in daily charitable distributions [38] and from visiting the foundation on other occasions [39] except for those who simply could not be excluded because of their eminence and nobility. (23) *Pakourianos* [23] does not allow women access to the foundation either, except on the feast of the Dormition. This author worried most about eunuchs and young boys, however, whom he bans [17] from his monastery even though he also sets up [31] a separate school for some of the latter where they could be trained to become priests. Both authors drew from the Studite and subsequent Athonite traditions for these prohibitions, but drew different conclusions as to which sex posed the greater problem. Taking a more extreme position, Christodoulos, as we have seen, tried to ban all married men, their wives, and their children from the island of Patmos where his foundation was located.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Practice of Institutional Philanthropy

All of these authors shared at least an ideological commitment to institutional philanthropy. Both (22) *Evergetis* [38] and (23) *Pakourianos* [10], [21] provide for charitable distributions at the gates of their respective foundations, though since memorial donations were important fund-raising devices, it is important to remember that these were driven chiefly by financial considerations. More strictly altruistic were the infirmary for the sick in (22) *Evergetis* [41] and three similar facilities mentioned in (23) *Pakourianos* [29]. The author of (24) *Christodoulos* [A25] regretfully notes the insufficiency of resources which restrained him from prescribing specific charitable donations or obligations of hospitality.

5. Concern for the Welfare of the Dependent Peasantry

Of the works of the three authors, only (23) *Pakourianos* [1] displays the concern for the well-being of the dependent peasantry that was common to several other founders of this era, e.g., (9) *Galesios* [246] and (19) *Attaleiates* [39]. This concern pre-dated the monastic reform and was championed even by some traditional private benefactors like Lazarus of Galesios and Michael Attaleiates. Its notable absence in (22) *Evergetis* indicates, however, that it had not become a common principle of the reform movement itself.

E. Historical Context

The era during which these three documents were composed was relatively short, yet it was also one of the more tumultuous in the history of the Byzantine church, analogous to the last quarter of the tenth century (for which see above, Chapter Two).⁵

1. Imperial Support for *Evergetis*

(22) *Evergetis* [12] asserts that the famous reform monastery's independent and self-governing status dated from the time of its foundation by Paul Evergetinos in 1048/49, and that it had been confirmed by several emperors. This would indicate that Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55) and one or more of his successors had been supportive of *Evergetis* in the first perilous decades of its existence. Paul Evergetinos predeceased the emperor in 1054 and was succeeded as superior by Timothy, to whom (22) *Evergetis* is formally attributed.

2. Isaac I Komnenos' Confiscation of Ecclesiastical Incomes

Michael Keroullarios (1043–58),⁶ probably the most powerful patriarch of Constantinople in Byzantine times, played an important role in recognizing the insurgency that led to the accession of Emperor Isaac I Komnenos (1057–59) and was rewarded with a promise of non-interference in ecclesiastical affairs. This did not stop that emperor from carrying out an extensive confiscation of

⁵ For ecclesiastical politics under the Komnenoi, see Konstantinos Polyzoides, *Ho Vasileus kai hoi laikoi eis to en genei dioiketikon ergon tes ekklesias epi Alexiou Komnenou (1081–1118)* (Thessaloniki, 1979), and V. Tiftixoglu, "Gruppenbildungen innerhalb des konstantinopolitanischen Klerus während der Komnenenzeit," *BZ* 62 (1969), 25–72. The pre-Komnenian period discussed briefly here still lacks a thorough treatment.

⁶ For this patriarch, see A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1925, 1930).

EARLY REFORM MONASTERIES

ecclesiastical incomes despite substantial opposition.⁷ This experience may well have had an impact on early monastic reformers like Timothy Evergetinos, who also was then leading *Evergetis* as its superior. Soon thereafter, the emperor turned against Michael Keroullarios and was preparing his condemnation by a synod when the patriarch died suddenly in 1059. Isaac Komnenos was unable to ride out the ensuing popular resentment, and on the advice of the influential courtier Michael Psellos (a notable *charistikarios*), sought retirement as a monk in the Studios monastery in Constantinople.

3. *Evergetis*' Preservation from the *Charistike*

Timothy Evergetinos probably completed his work on (22) *Evergetis* during the reign of Emperor Constantine X Doukas (1059–67). Since he claims [3] that he greatly increased the size of the foundation during his tenure as superior, keeping *Evergetis* out of the *charistike* must be counted as one of his great achievements, seeing that influential courtiers like Michael Psellos and apparently even Michael Attaleiates, author of (19) *Attaleiates*, were at this time avidly seeking out grants under that program.⁸

4. Patrons' Pursuit of Immunities from Taxation

The calamitous defeat of the next emperor, Romanos IV Diogenes (1068–71), by the Seljuk Turks at Mantzikert in 1071 had a devastating impact on the fortunes of the Byzantine Empire. During the course of the next decade, the Turks overran most of the empire's Anatolian dominions. This was also a decade of dynastic instability that prevented the re-establishment of firm imperial rule. Michael Psellos' pupil Michael VII Doukas (1071–78) and Michael Attaleiates' patron Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81) were the ineffective rulers during this troubled decade. Pressed for revenues from a severely geographically diminished tax base, the imperial government increasingly resorted to a huge number of arbitrary exactions in cash, specie, commodities, and labor services. These posed potential threats to all landowners, and made it especially difficult for patrons to calculate adequate support for religious foundations. Therefore, Attaleiates made sure to obtain imperial chrysobulls from these emperors, establishing or confirming tax immunities for his foundation, that are preserved in (19) *Attaleiates* [INV 10], [INV 11].

5. Dissemination of Reform Ideology

Despite (or perhaps because of?) the political instability of the 1070s, certain reform ideas began to stir Byzantium's patronal classes and even the imperial bureaucracy. As we have seen (19) *Attaleiates* [14], dated to 1077, provides provisionally for the Rhaidestos foundation to become independent and self-governing (like *Evergetis*) in the event of the decease of the founder's family line. Also, the chrysobull of Nikephoros III, dated to 1079, condemns the theft of property used to

⁷ For these, see Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* (Bonn, 1853), pp. 60–62; Michael Psellos, *Chronographia* 7.60, ed. Émile Renaud (Paris, 1926–28); and John Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum* 18.5, ed. L. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1868–75), along with the critical discussion of these sources by H. Ahrweiler, "Charisticariat et autres formes d'attribution de fondations pieuses aux X^e–XI^e siècles," *ZRVI* 10 (1967), pp. 20–21.

⁸ For Psellos' role as a *charistikarios*, see P. Lemerle, "Un aspect du rôle des monastères à Byzance: les monastères donnés à des laïcs, les charistikaies," *CRAI* (1967), 22; for Attaleiates, see (19) *Attaleiates* [19].

CHAPTER FOUR

endow a religious foundation as “sacrilege” [INV 11], implicitly rejecting the legitimacy of Isaac Komnenos’ confiscations twenty years earlier. The same key word appears in (22) *Evergetis* [19] in a discussion of the inalienability of immovable properties.

6. Alexios I Komnenos’ Ecclesiastical Requisitions

The ascent of Isaac’s nephew Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) as emperor re-established his family’s claim to the imperial throne on a more permanent basis. Pressed to raise money to pay for the hiring of mercenaries to turn back an attack on the Empire’s western frontier by the Norman prince Robert Guiscard, Alexios’ mother Anna Dalassena and his brother the *sebastokrator* Isaac asked Patriarch Eustratios Garidas (1081–84) to convene a synod to authorize the confiscation of consecrated vessels and works of art in certain patriarchal (i.e., public) churches in Constantinople.⁹ Typically for the period, both supporters and opponents of the proposal used citations from canon law to justify their positions on the requisitions.

7. Birth of the Chalcedonian Reform Party

The opposition of Leo, metropolitan of Chalcedon, to these requisitions touched off a bitter and ultimately decisive controversy on the consecrated status of ecclesiastical property.¹⁰ Leo’s “Chalcedonian” party of reformers included influential supporters from among the ranks of both the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the military leadership. During 1082–84, Leo and his supporters skillfully kept the emperor on the defensive, obliging him to issue a chrysobull (1082) forswearing future requisitions of this sort and to announce plans to make repayments to the foundations concerned on the basis of losses documented from examination of their inventories.

8. The Beginning of Patriarchal Reform Activity

Even the Patriarch Eustratios, whose deposition the Chalcedonians demanded, tried to show his reform sympathies in a different way by seeking in 1084 the repeal of certain grants of patriarchal monasteries under the *charistike*. Thus were linked two of the most emotionally charged elements of the reform program, the establishment of the inalienability of ecclesiastical property and the abolition of the *charistike*.

9. Context of (23) *Pakourianos*’ Composition

It was in the midst of the expropriation controversy that Gregory Pakourianos, one of Alexios Komnenos’ generals, composed (23) *Pakourianos* in 1083 for his monastery at Bačkovo on his Balkan estates. Although, as noted above, this document is modeled on the older, now lost *typikon* of the *Panagios* monastery, it was written for an independent and self-governing foundation

⁹ For the requisitions, see Anna Komnena, *Alexiad* 4–6, ed. Bernard Leib (Paris, 1967); A. Glavinias, *He epi Alexiou Komnenou (1081–1118) peri hieron skeuon kai keimelion kai hagian eikonon eris (1081–1095)* (Thessaloniki, 1972), provides a full discussion of the controversy.

¹⁰ For Leo of Chalcedon, see V. Grumel, “L’affaire de Léon de Chalcedoine. Le chrysobulle d’Alexis I^{er} sur les objets sacrés,” *EB* 2 (1944), 126–33, “L’affaire de Léon de Chalcedoine. Le décret ou ‘semeioma’ d’Alexis I^{er} Comnène (1086),” *EO* 39 (1941–42), 333–41, and “Documents athonites concernant l’affaire de Léon le Chalcedonien,” in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. 3, ST (Vatican City, 1946), pp. 116–35; Pelopidas Stephanou, “Le procès de Léon de Chalcedoine,” *OCP* (1943), 5–64; and my own *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, D.C., 1987), pp. 192–99.

[3] and reflects many moderate reform sentiments, e.g., the warning [33] against alienation of the foundation's movable properties.

10. Trial and Condemnation of Leo of Chalcedon

The abdication of Patriarch Eustratios in 1084 under pressure from the reformers led to the elevation of Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084–1111), in the course of whose long tenure of office the patriarchate was to join forces with the reform party. But at first Leo of Chalcedon refused to be reconciled unless the former patriarch Eustratios was formally condemned. The emperor had Leo put on trial before the patriarchal synod late in 1085.¹¹ On the day of the final session in January 1086, Leo made his fateful statement that he considered all alienations of ecclesiastical property, regardless of circumstances, to be cases of impiety, except for those transferred from one sacred employment to another (thereby permitting the continued use of *epidosis* but not the *charistike*). The emperor immediately objected to this “novel” doctrine as implicitly condemning all those who had approved of or benefited from alienations of ecclesiastical property in the past. Leo was condemned for insubordination and, in February or March 1086, deposed.

11. New Requisitions of Ecclesiastical Property

A new catastrophe, the Patzinak invasions of the empire's Balkan territories in 1086, took the life of the author of (23) *Pakourianos*. Alexios Komnenos resorted to a new requisition of ecclesiastical property including not only precious objects this time but also landed property. The deposed metropolitan Leo objected, but the emperor got the patriarchal synod to banish him to Sozopolis, where he remained in exile for the next eight years.

12. Reform Activities of Patriarch Nicholas Grammatikos

Meanwhile, Patriarch Nicholas Grammatikos began his own campaign to reform the *charistike*, starting with a requirement in 1086 that no more grants be accepted for registry without the attachment of a written inventory of the landed properties of the foundations being awarded to the *charistikarioi*.¹² This requirement was made retroactive in 1087, but enforcement proved difficult. In 1089, the patriarch's synod ruled in favor of Niketas, metropolitan of Athens, when that reform-minded prelate sought support for reversing grants made to *charistikarioi* who had abused the foundations turned over to their care.¹³

13. Imperial and Patriarchal Patronage of Christodoulos

Like Nicholas Grammatikos, Alexios Komnenos was anxious to show his sympathies for

¹¹ A record of the trial is preserved in the *Semeioma*, ed. I. Sakkélion, “Décret d'Alexis Comnène portant déposition de Léon, Métropolitain de Chalcédoine,” *BCH* 2 (1878), 102–28. See especially pp. 123–24.

¹² For the patriarchal reform program, see Jean Darrouzès, “Dossier sur le charisticariat,” in *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger* (Heidelberg, 1966), 150–65, and my own *Private Religious Foundations*, pp. 199–207.

¹³ Venance Grumel, *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1: *Les registres de 381 à 715* (Chalcedon, 1932); 2nd ed. (Paris, 1972), no. 952; ed. Th. Uspensky, “Mneniya i postanovleniya konstantinopolskikh pomestnikh soborov XI i XII vv. o razdache tserkovnikh imuschestv (charistikarii),” *IRAİK* 5 (1900), 1–48, doc. 2, pp. 30–37.

CHAPTER FOUR

monastic reform even while rejecting the far-reaching demands of the Chalcedonian reform party. The monk Christodoulos, appointed as *protos* of the confederation of monasteries at Latros by Patriarch Kosmas I (1075–81) in 1076, abandoned his post three years later as the Seljuk Turks threatened the area. Nicholas Grammatikos finally accepted Christodoulos' resignation in 1087. A few years earlier in 1085, Alexios Komnenos had recognized the independent and self-governing status of Christodoulos' new monastic foundation on Kos. Later, when Christodoulos became disenchanted with this location, according to (24) *Christodoulos* [A9] the emperor tried to persuade him to attempt the reform of another monastery. When Christodoulos rejected this assignment, Alexios nevertheless granted him the island of Patmos in 1088 for the establishment of yet another monastic foundation. The emperor recognized the Patmos foundation's independent status too in his chrysobull of donation. The *Rule* [A] portion of (24) *Christodoulos* was drawn up to regulate the life of this foundation in May 1091.

14. John of Antioch's Alliance with the Reform Party

In the early months of 1091, however, the Patzinaks made common cause with Tzachas, the Seljuk emir of Smyrna, and for a third time Alexios Komnenos was forced to consider another requisition of ecclesiastical property. This time, John the Oxite, patriarch of Antioch, registered his objection in a tract and a memorandum to the emperor.¹⁴ John, who had been raised to the patriarchate circa 1089, also composed his famous tract *De monasteriis* about this time. This document, the most scathing indictment of the *charistike* to survive, is our principal source of (admittedly hostile) information on that embattled institution which so shaped Byzantine ecclesiastical history from the late tenth century through John's own times in the late eleventh century.¹⁵

15. Influence of *Evergetis* on the Reform Movement

The role, if any, of *Evergetis* in the bitter ecclesiastical reform controversies of the 1080s cannot be determined with certainty. John of Antioch's *De monasteriis* shows an indebtedness to the *Evergetis*' library of ascetic literature, however, which suggests that the institution played at least a useful supportive role. The possibility of a return influence of the ongoing reform upon *Evergetis* itself is also intriguing. The possibility exists that many of the most ideologically charged passages in (22) *Evergetis*, e.g., the terminology of "sacrilege" in the discussion [19] of the inalienability of the foundation's properties, were introduced into that document during a re-edition at this time. Also, both *De monasteriis* and (22) *Evergetis* [19], refer (the former actually, the latter hypothetically) to an earthquake, which might be the noteworthy one that occurred on December 6, perhaps in the year 1090.¹⁶ If so, this may confirm that (22) *Evergetis* was being revised at this

¹⁴ John of Antioch, *Logos eis ton basilea kyr Alexion ton Komnenon* and *Symboule pros ton basilea*, ed. Paul Gautier, "Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis I^{er} Comnène," *REB* 28 (1970), 5–55; cf. commentary by Grumel, "Documents athonites," pp. 132–34.

¹⁵ John of Antioch, *Oratio de monasteriis laicis non tradendis*, ed. Paul Gautier, "Réquisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat," *REB* 33 (1975), 77–132. For this reformer, see V. Grumel, "Les patriarches grecs d'Antioche du nom de Jean (XI^e et XII^e siècles)," *EO* 32 (1933), 279–99, esp. 286–98, and Paul Gautier, "Jean V l'Oxite patriarche d'Antioche, notice biographique," *REB* 22 (1964), 128–57.

¹⁶ See John of Antioch, *De monasteriis*, 18, lines 588–90, with V. Grumel, *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), p. 480 (for dating to 1090), and Gautier, "Réquisitoire," *REB* 33 (1975), pp. 80–86 (full discussion of dating).

EARLY REFORM MONASTERIES

critical time and updated to reflect contemporary concerns like the alienation of ecclesiastical property.

16. Context of (24) *Christodoulos*' Composition

As noted above, the *Rule* [A] portion of (24) *Christodoulos* dates from the middle of this ideologically and politically troubled period. The pressure on Byzantium eased considerably when Alexios Komnenos, assisted by Cuman allies, crushed the Patzinaks at the battle of Levunion in April 1091. After Tzachas of Smyrna attacked Patmos, however, Christodoulos got discouraged and abandoned the island for Euboea around May 1092. The emperor's success in inciting a rivalry between Abul Kasim, the Seljuk emir of Nicaea, against Tzachas eventually relieved some pressure on Byzantium's remaining possessions in Asia Minor, though as the *Testament* [B] and *Codicil* [C] of (24) *Christodoulos* indicate, the security of Aegean islands like Patmos remained precarious as these texts were being composed in 1093.