Elga Kanaeva*

Shepherd, Physician and Intercessor**

The Specialization of Different Types of Authority in the Church in the Context of Practices of Confession in Byzantium (iii–x centuries)

Abstract: The article deals with the problem of the proper language to describe the processes of evolution of penitential practices in Byzantium in the iii–x centuries. The currently existing categorical apparatus describes these processes using the logic of power relations between one who says and one who hears confession, and appeals to the terms "charisma" and "office." These tools give a specific perspective on a set of facts, seeing them as a testimony of a deep and irreconcilable conflict between actors in this field, and fails to describe the situation when no conflict may be discerned in the sources. In this article, we first show that "power-oriented" language is not typical for the authors of the period in question. We then propose our own model for describing the role-play relationship, centering around practices of repentance. Following C. Rapp, we suggest the concept of "authority" as the basis of this model, which we identify in three types: pastoral, therapeutic and intercessory. These types differ both in the type of interaction between the parties participating in confession and in their functionality within the framework of the phenomenon of repentance. This typology is accompanied by a description. The most notable personalities and examples of penitential interaction in the iii–x century are classified according to these types.

Keywords: Confession, Penitence, Authority, Ecclesiology, Church Institutions, Church History, Sacramentology.

DEFINITION, PROBLEM, AND THE HISTORY OF APPROACHES

The question of who has the right to hear confession in the history of the Church may be posed not only from the perspective of sacramentology

*Elga Kanaeva, PhD in Theology, Senior Lecturer at the St. Tikhon's Orthodox University for the Humanities (Moscow, Russia); Fellow Assistant at the Ecclesiastical Institutions Research Laboratory (Moscow, Russia), kanaeva.elga@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000–0001–8909–8371.

but also from that of ecclesiology. Hence, it becomes a question of the bases of power lie and the nature of authority in the Church. In this article, we address the following questions: Were categories of "power" typical for Byzantine discourse on repentance and confession before the 10th century? How can different views of the nature and source of authority of a person hearing confession be classified?

First of all, we define what is understood by penitential discipline in the Ancient Church. In this article, confession is examined as the interaction of two subjects: subject S(inner), considered to have sinned; and subject A(ssistant), who is held to be competent, in one way or another, to remove the consequences of this sin. This approach simultaneously limits and broadens the topic being researched. On the one hand, we do not examine the processes of repentance taking place in the soul of the penitent but focus on the interaction between members of the Church, that is, we look at the phenomenon of repentance from a sociological, rather than from a psychological perspective. On the other hand, this definition allows us to analyze the very different historical practices of confession as a single phenomenon: public confession, secret confession, the revelation of thoughts, the imposition of *epitimia*, and different types of liturgical and ritual practice.

The initiative in this interaction may belong both to S, when he chooses to approach A, or to A, when he uses instruments of exhortation (νουθεσία) and rebuke (ἔλεγχος) in order to influence S. The question of who plays the leading role in this interaction is not entirely simple. Repentance may be successfully accomplished both with an active S and a passive A (a situation with an unworthy priest and a sincerely penitent sinner is usually resolved in favor of the sinner in patristics), and with a passive S and an active A (sin may be effaced from the soul of an impenitent sinner through the active intercession of a saint). However, the second type of situation is much more marginal and problematic for analysis, so that the priority of the activity of S over the activity of A for the accomplishment of penance may be considered as mainstream in the Eastern Church. Both S and A may be collective subjects, if for example, what is being discussed is public confession (collective A), or the admonition of a group of sinners (collective S). Christian penance involves several aspects, and the requirement of the penitent may be highlighted in each of them: reconciliation with the Church, the healing of the soul, and the forgiveness of guilt.

The relationship and interaction between S and A may be regarded as a power relationship and power relations give rise to conflicts and competition.

Relations of penance have been analyzed from this standpoint in polemic between Protestant and Catholic theologians. At the turn of the 20th century, the question of confession was posed in categories of "charisma" and "duty." In 1898, the author of a work which continues to exert an influence on contemporary discourse, *Enthusiasm and confession in Greek monasticism* (Holl, 1898), Holl, asserts that, as a result of the growth of his charismatic authority following the end of the era of persecution, "the monk became the opponent of the priest on the territory of pastoral care" (ibid.: 311) and gradually monopolized this area (a process which reached its conclusion in the era of iconoclasm, when the hierarchy recognized the right of monastics to exercise the power to bind and to loosen).[1] This situation, from the point of view of the researcher, persisted right up until the middle of the 13th century, and in spite of the protests of Byzantine canonists in the 7th century,[2] only changed when Byzantine theology adopted Western developments in sacramentology.

Although Holl's study provoked a flurry of publications both supporting and criticizing his thesis, the first step towards formulating a coherent answer to it was undertaken only in 1979 by the Catholic researcher Rev. Robert J. Barringer, CSB (at the time the General Superior of the Order of Saint Basil the Great). In his dissertation *Ecclesiastical Penance in Hagiography to 983*, on the basis of more than 900 hagiographical sources in Greek (saints' lives, homilies, eulogies, apocryphal acts, and travel notes), Barringer attempts to construct an alternative history of confession. In contrast to Holl, he postulates the following theses: in the hagiographical corpus, there is no evidence of any conflict between the church hierarchy and monastics in the question of confession up until the beginning of the 10th century; church penance coexisted with monastic penance during the entire history of Byzantium; monastic penance did not have a sacramental character, and at least until the 9th century was not connected with the power to bind and to loose (Barringer, 1979: 199–201). Barringer's theses have been subjected to criticism (Parrinello, 2004: 349). However, the more recent *New History of Penance*, with the exception of one article by Claudia Rapp,

---

[1]Holl, 1898: 319–321. This conclusion is based on an incorrect attribution to Patr. Nicephorus the Confessor (806–815) of one *eratapokrisis* which was actually the work of Theodore the Studite.

[2]Ibid.: 324–328. This conclusion is also largely based on an incorrect attribution: the *eratapokriseis* involved are not the work of Patriarch Nikephoros II (1260–1261), but of Chartophylax Nikephoros, who wrote them at the end of the 11th century.

is wholly devoted to the history of penance in the West, and Holl's ideas are not discussed in it.[3]

If Holl depicts the entire history of confession as the history of a struggle for power, then Barringer, who did not discover any sort of conflict in his sources, attributes all power to the hierarchy. Nonetheless, a description of these processes in categories of power enables him not to explain, but only to state the absence of any tension between hierarchy and monasticism. Did Christian authors truly see the situation in this way though?

"POWER" RHETORIC SURROUNDING CONFESSION
AND THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS

In New Testament Scripture, the term ἐξουσία "power" is used only in a few contexts (in order of number of occurrences): 1) the power to cast out evil spirits and heal illnesses (Mt. 10:1, Mk. 3:15, Lk. 9:1, among others), referring to Christ and to the disciples; 2) in connection with the remission of sins (Mt. 9:6, Mk. 2:10, Lk. 5:24), where this power refers to Christ only, and not to the disciples; 3) Christ's authority as a teacher (Mt. 7:29, Lk. 4:32); 4) the right to become sons of God (Jn. 1:12); and 5) the power of the apostles to edify (οἰκοδομέω) (2 Cor 13:10).

We have analyzed the digitized corpus of Greek texts (the TLG database) for the frequency of occurrence of the term ἐξουσία "power" in the context of different methods of expressing the idea of confession and absolution ("λύω + δέομαι", "αφίημι + κρατέω", "λογισμοὺς δέχομαι (ἀναδέχομαι) διδόναι", "συγχορέσις", "ἐξομολογέομαι/ὁμολογέομαι/ἐξομολόγεσις/ὁμολόγεσις", "ἐξαγορεῦω/ἐξαγόρευσις") throughout the whole Byzantine period of the history of the Church. We have refrained from an analysis of the occurrence of the term "ἀρχὴ" in these contexts because it is not connected with repentance in the New Testament.

Our analysis showed that, apart from a few isolated occurrences, discourse on confession centering around concepts of "power" is a feature of the Greek literature of the Antiochian tradition in the 3rd to 5th centuries (especially in the last quarter of the 4th century), and a common Byzantine way of expressing thought in the 10th to 15th centuries. There are also some

---

[3]A New History of Penance, 2008. Discussion of these issues in the Russian-speaking community took its own course. The researchers of Church history and canon law N. S. Suvorov, N. A. Zaozersky, P. V. Gidulyanov, S. I. Smirnov and A. I. Almazov, studying the same material, reached opposite conclusions; see Yachmenik, 2021.

occurrences in the 6th and 9th centuries, but only in the work of individual authors: St. Barsanuphius the Great and St. Theodore the Studite.

The expression "the power to bind and to loose" (ἐξουσία τοῦ δεσμεύειν καὶ λύειν) occurs for the first time in *Pseudo-Clementines*, a Syriac literary monument (Irmscher et al., 1969); of interest to us is a section of the *Letter to Jacob* most likely composed in the 3rd century by a Judeo-Christian author of unorthodox views. This document relates that Peter, when ordaining Clement as Bishop of Rome, passed on to him the power bestowed on him by Christ to bind and to loose, which, however, refers more to the inviolability of his decisions than to the field of penance.[4]

At the end of the 4th century, the conceptualisation of a bishop's position with regard to absolution was also localized in Antioch and found its expression in three texts written in the same short period: the third homily on the priesthood of St. John Chrysostom (374), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (c. 380), and the homily of Severian of Gabala (a Pseudo-Chrysostom) on the Ascension (402).

The most "power-oriented" formulation belongs to St. John Chrysostom (St. Chrysostom, 1886; trans. Stephens, 1889 with corrections):

> They who rule on earth have indeed power to bind, but only the body: whereas this binding lays hold of the soul and penetrates the heavens; and what priests do here below God ratifies above, and the Master confirms the sentence of his servants. For indeed what is it but all manner of heavenly power which He has given them when He says, Whose sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose sins ye retain they are retained? (John 20:23) What power could be greater than this? The Father has committed all judgment to the Son? (John 5:22) But I see it all put into the hands of these men by the Son. For they have been conducted to this dignity as if they were already translated to Heaven, and had transcended human nature, and were released from the passions to which we are liable.

Severian of Gabala places the power to bind and to loose in a broader context, adding to Chrysostom's "all heavenly power" also all earthly power (Bishop & Rambault, 2017: 196):

> the Lord gave all power to the apostles in order that they should truly have power over the whole *oecumene* (because rulers should have the power of life and death).

In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the bishop's power to judge, remit sins, his power to bind and to loose, and what that implies are also mentioned

---

[4]Ch.2.p.4: διὸ αὐτῷ μεταδίδωμι τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ δεσμεύειν καὶ λύειν, ἵνα περὶ παντὸς οὗ ἂν χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ γῆς ἔσται δεδογματισμένον ἐν οὐρανοῖς. δήσει γὰρ ὃ δεῖ δεθῆναι καὶ λύσει ὃ δεῖ λυθῆναι, ὡς τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰδὼς κανόνα.

a number of times.[5] For example 2.11: "so sit in the Church when thou speakest, as having authority to judge offenders. For to you, O bishops, it is said: 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Wallis, 1886: Book 2, Ch. 11)." The expression "the power to bind and to loose" may also be found in another Antiochian author: Evagrius Scholasticus. However, in his work it means the power of a priest to release someone from a vow (Bidez & Parmentier, 1898: 6.13).

Outside the Antiochian tradition, there is also the more general statement by St. Basil the Great that every Christian has the power to remit sins against himself, but it is conditioned by the penitence of the sinner (PG 31. 1092B). St. Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46. 308–316) in *Against Those who do not Tolerate Punishments* deals with this topic indirectly and using terms of "obedience" and the "keys of the Kingdom". St. Isidore of Pelusium of the 5th century, like St. Basil, talks of the limitations of this power (this case is examined below in more detail).

In the 6th century only a single author — Saint Barsanufius the Great — uses categories of power while speaking on the absolution of sins. He calls the power to remit sin the most perfect of gifts (Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, I.1, 1997: Ep. 10), and from the point of view of his disciples, he himself possesses this authority (he does not reject, but indirectly affirms this thesis. Barsanuphius was not ordained) (Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, II.1, 2000a: Ep. 353; Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, II.2, 2000b: Ep. 569). He also agrees with St. Basil that apostolic authority, conditioned by the attitude of the sinner, differs from Christ's unconditional power to absolve sins (Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, II.1, 2000a: Ep. 388).

After St. Barsanuphius, discourse on power practically disappears from the available sources up until the second half of the 10th century, when it reappears in connection with a series of events in the theological, political, and social life of the Church and the Empire, and persists until the end of the Byzantine period in the History of the Church.

THE ABSENCE OF CONFLICT SURROUNDING CONFESSION

How may this uneven distribution of sources and the almost complete disappearance of categories of power with regard to confession for more than half a millennium be interpreted? It seems promising to view this situation from the perspective of critical discourse analysis (by Fairclough's method).

---

[5]Metzger, 1985: 2.11, 2.18, 8.5 et al.

According to this approach, discourse is situated in dialectic interaction with social practices, simultaneously constituting and being constituted by them (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 61–62). Our assumption is that, having been formulated in Antioch as a theological concept, the idea that hearing confession was connected with a position of "power" was not considered at the level of the social reality of the Church across the whole Empire. If, as Foucault asserts, pastoral authority arises in discourse in a situation of conflict, antagonism, or behavioral rebellion (Foucault, 2004: 198–201), then the absence of this category must also signify the absence of any deep conflict. The fact that both the production and consumption of theological, historical, and hagiographical literature devoted to saintly bishops and monks did not require the constant articulation, discussion, and replication of a power-oriented model of interaction must bear witness to the absence of any tension surrounding the practices of confession in the Byzantine Church. Here, our observations confirm the conclusions of Barringer that the conflict between "charisma" and "duty," which Holl considers pivotal for the history of penance, does not find any real expression in the discourse of the first millennium (Barringer, 1979: 199–201; Holl, 1898: 311–312). We are not affirming here a complete absence of any tension between the episcopacy and monasticism in the theological or social realms, but only as regards the practices of confession.

Nevertheless, Barringer connects the absence of conflict he discovered with the fact that the non-hierarchical charismatic element in the Church, represented by monasticism, had no part in "the power to bind and to loose", whereas the episcopate possessed an undivided monopoly on it. This contradicts numerous examples given by Barringer himself, but once again attempts to answer the main question about the categories of power which, it seems, were foreign to the authors of the period. Let us consider a few examples.

In the *History of the Monks in Egypt* (end of the 4th century?), monastic penance already existed in an established ritual form, including prostration before an *abba* "holy father," a request for forgiveness, and the naming of the sin. In a story of which Saint John of Likopolis is the hero, this form is even parodied by demons, demonstrating its sustainability (see Barringer, 1979: 44–45). It is clear from a series of stories from the same text that serious sins could be freely pardoned within the monastic community. One of the practices which developed at this time was also a ritual of *anadoche* in confession, when a spiritual father takes upon himself both the guilt for a sin and the struggle with a passion, and the penitent is completely liberated

from them. Such practices are described in the *Ancient Paterikon* (PG 65. 256 BC) and in letters of Saint Barsanuphius the Great (Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza 1.2, 1998: Epp 72, 73),[6] while the theory is investigated by Saint Mark the Ascetic (6th century) (Durand, 2000: 78–88) and Saint John of the Ladder (7th century) (PG 28. 1189). This ritual also finds expression in the *Canons of John the Faster*. Incidences of lay people approaching monastics for the forgiveness of sins are less frequent, but they do occur in sources before the 7th century: *The Spiritual Meadow, The Lausiac History,* and *The Religious History.*[7]

In order to make sense of this tangled knot, Barringer (though himself inconsistent) proposes a productive approach: abstaining from judgment on the issue of the "sacramentality" of penitential practices (Barringer, 1979: 12). The first Eastern lists of the Church Sacraments, conveyed through the table of contents of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* within the Areopagite corpus (5th century), and that of Saint Theodore the Studite (PG 99. 1524. Ep. 2. 165) do not include the Sacrament of Penance, and it is found for the first time in the work of Job the Sinner, a Greek author of the 8th century from latinized Cyprus, though the wording is still ambiguous.[8]

The monastic practices of confession, carried out inside and outside monastic communities, could offer those who needed it prayerful intercession ("προστασία"), assurance of forgiveness ("πληροφορία"), and guidance on subsequent purification of the soul. Without any question, the effect of these practices was regarded as different from the effect of confession to a priest or bishop, although the introduction of a theory from sacramental theology here only confuses the issue: if confession is a Sacrament, then any performance of it by persons not in holy orders ought to be considered as the usurpation of a position of power, an attitude which we do not observe in sources up until the middle of the 10th century. On the other hand, the objective nature of the Church Sacraments ought to presuppose a greater reality of effect from confession performed by a cleric than from confession performed by a monastic. Both priestly and monastic prayers for penitents have an equally intercessory character, while saintly monks can directly guarantee divine forgiveness of a sinner (see footnote 8, the last

---

[6]The whole process is traced in Parrinello, 2004

[7]Examples: The Spiritual Meadow, 78 (PG 87.3. 2933); The Lausiac History, 18.19 (Bartelink, 1974: 88–90); The Religious History, 26.11–18 (Canivet & Leroy-Molinghen, 1979: 180–199).

[8]"anointing of the sick, or penance" (εὐχέλαιον [...] ἤτοι μετάνοια). The process is traced in Avvakumov, 2005.

two examples). In Barberini's Euchologion (no later than the beginning of 9th century), there are only two prayers connected with penance, and in both the power to remit sins is attributed to Christ alone, which is entirely in agreement with New Testament teaching.[9]

This, of course, does not signify that forgiveness of sins through grace did not take place in the Ancient Church, but that confession in the thought of the key authors of the era may have been considered in the same category not as the Eucharist and Baptism, but as other church gifts (for example, power over impure spirits and the healing of bodily infirmities) or practices (for example, almsgiving, weeping, the forgiveness of offences).

Examples collected by Smirnov (Smirnov, 1906: 8–10, 23–28) and Suvorov also testify to this. Saint Isidore of Pelusium, when admonishing the priest Zosima, who out of avarice had absolved the sin of perjury in return for a certain sum, formulates the following theory. He points out that the ability to remit sins is given by Christ through the breath of the Spirit (Jn. 20:22–23) and can be accomplished only in Him and through Him. Consequently, an unworthy priest, who has alienated the Spirit, is deprived of this possibility:

> [The Lord] said with his own lips: "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained." (Jn. 20:23). Thus, if through the Spirit of God they have received this power, then those who alienate the Spirit from themselves do not, of course, possess this power; only those possess it who know through the Holy Spirit who is worthy of absolution and who of condemnation.[10]

---

[9]Evkhologiy Barberini gr. 336, 2011: Prayer 168: "ρξη´ Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ τῇ πόρνῃ διὰ δακρύων ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν δωρησάμενος, καὶ τὸν τελώνην τὰ οἰκεῖα ἐπιγνόντα πταίσματα δικαιώσας, πρόσδεξαι καὶ τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν τοῦ δούλου σου τοῦδε, καὶ εἴ τι πεπλημμέληται αὐτῷ ἑκούσιον ἢ ἀκούσιον ἁμάρτημα, ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ ἢ κατὰ διάνοιαν, ὡς ἀγαθὸς πάριδε· σὺ γὰρ μόνος ἔχεις ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας".

[10]Isidore of Pelusium book 3, ep. 260 (PG 78. 944A): "διὰ δὲ ἑαυτοῦ· "Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον· ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφέωνται· καὶ ὧν ἂν κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται." Εἰ τοίνυν διὰ τὸ θεῖον Πνεῦμα ταύτην εἰλήφασι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, οἱ δι' ὧν ἁμαρτάνουσι, τοῦτο ἀπελαύνοντες, ταύτην δηλονότι τὴν ἐξουσίαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι οἱ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος εἰδότες, τίνες μέν εἰσιν ἀφέσεως, τίνες δὲ κατακρίσεως ἄξιοι". Same epistle (941C): "Λειτουργοὶ γάρ εἰσιν, οὐ κοινωνοί· πρέσβεις, οὐ κριταί· μεσῖται, οὐ βασιλεῖς. Οἱ γὰρ καὶ περὶ οἰκείων ἁμαρτημάτων, ὡς ἔφη ὁ Ἀπόστολος, θυσίας προσφέροντες, οὐκ ἂν δήπου ἐξ αὐθεντίας καὶ τοῖς ἀμετανοήτοις, εἰ καὶ πλούσιοι εἶεν, δύναιντ' ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας." See also Dionisius the Areopagite on the Church hierarchy 7–3–7: "Thus, the Hierarchs have discriminating powers, as interpreters of the Divine Awards, not as though the All-Wise Deity, to put it mildly, were slavishly following their irrational impulses, but, as though they, as expounders of God, were separating, by the motion of the Divine Spirit, those who have already been judged by God, according to due. For 'receive,' he says, 'the Holy Spirit, whose faults ye

Nonetheless, the ability of the same presbyter Zosima (whose vice is denounced in many epistles of St. Isidore, in which he is even called "unholily ordained to the priesthood")[11] to perform Baptism and the Eucharist is not only not refuted, but even positively affirmed:

> One who receives is not harmed, though the one who performs might seem unworthy. The most pure Sacraments do not suffer any pollution, although the priest surpass all people in depravity.[12]

Suvorov has collected a number of examples of how, right up until the 10th century, church authors see in confession only one of many methods of achieving the forgiveness of sins, placing it on the same level as these others (Suvorov, 1903). Origen in *On Leviticus 2* lists seven such methods: baptism, martyrdom, almsgiving, the forgiveness of offences, the conversion of a sinner from error, the superabundance of love for God, repentance with tears, and confession before a priest (PG 12. 417–418). Chrysostom in *On Penitence* names five: confession of sin before God, weeping for sin, humility, almsgiving, and prayer (PG 49. 285). St. Maximus the Confessor gives four, and the author of the manuscript cod. bibl. reg. Monac. № 498 of the 10th century, published by Suvorov himself, has ten (non-judgment, forgiveness, humility, weeping combined with cessation of a sin, prayer — with others and with members of the clergy, almsgiving and acts of mercy, illnesses and trials, instruction of someone in error, boldness before God, bearing witness to Christ before a tyrant).

The above analysis presents the following picture. Up until the 10th century power-oriented language for describing penance, although it evolved in the Antiochian tradition, was not significant in general Eastern discourse. This is confirmed by our analysis of lexis in the sources of this period and by Barringer's observations on the absence of any conflict between the mediators of confession (hierarchs and monks) on this territory. Notwithstanding, Barringer's hypothesis that this absence of conflict may be explained by the undivided monopoly of the clergy in questions of penance

may have remitted, they are remitted; whose ye may have retained, they are retained.' And to him who was illuminated with the Divine revelations of the most Holy Father, the Oracles say, 'Whatsoever thou shalt have bound upon the earth, shall be bound in the heavens; and whatsoever thou shalt have loosed on earth, shall be loosed in the heavens,' inasmuch as he, and every Hierarch like him, according to the revelations of the Father's awards through him, receives those dear to God, and rejects those without God, as announcing and interpreting the Divine Will." (Heil & Ritter, 1991: 128–129; Dionysius the Areopagite, Parker, 1897: 157).

[11]Book 1, ep. 111 (PG 78. 257). "Ἔλαβες ἱερωσύνην ἀνιέρως, ἀνίερε".

[12]Baptism: book 1 ep. 579 (PG 78. 1645). Eucharist: book 2 ep. 340 (PG 78. 1000).

appears flawed to us for two reasons: a) the presence of developed institutions of monastic confession which were also used by the laity; b) the absence of a fixed sacramental status for many forms of penance and confession in this period.

Since the power model cannot sufficiently adequately describe the interaction arising around confession, the constructions used to build our explanatory model are in need of elaboration. We propose employing the concept of authority as a more complex building block. To use Marey's definition, by authority we understand "socially acknowledged knowledge," as different from power as "socially acknowledge force." (Marey, 2017: 14) The Greek ἐξουσία corresponds well to the notion of "force," because most often it is used precisely in a context of action (with infinitives and other verb forms),[13] while authority (there is no direct analogue in Greek) to a large degree denotes competencies belonging to its bearer.

A model on the basis of authority for describing the structure of the position of bishop as the head of a community was constructed by Rapp in her 2005 work *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*. She distinguishes three types of authority: "spiritual," "ascetic," and "pragmatic" (Rapp, 2005: 16–22). She avoids the terms "charisma" and "duty," which have acquired strong confessional connotations and lead to confusing associations with the theory of Max Weber. As far as penance is concerned, this model yields the following results: Christian martyrs and confessors already possessed the spiritual authority to participate in the power to bind and to loose in the pre-Constantine era; this then created serious tension when it came into conflict with the pragmatic authority of bishops; the ascetic authority of monastics could coexist alongside the spiritual authority possessed by bishops owing to their apostolic succession (ibid.: 86–98).

While retaining the concept of "authority" as a building block for our model, we must nonetheless reclassify its types. Rapp's model was created to describe the figure of a bishop, while for confession, the circle of bearers of this authority widens. What is more, we are tracing the development of our subject in a different chronological framework, going beyond the limits of Late Antiquity. As a working model for this, we propose a typology of "shepherdly" and "therapeutic" types of authority, together with the additional, though to a degree separate, category of "intercessory" authority. In this model, we see an opportunity to balance the somewhat confessionally skewed conclusions of Holl and Barringer.

---

[13]See LSJ: 599; A Patristic Greek Lexicon, 1961: 501–502.

A resolution of Patriarch Nektarius of Constantinople (381–397) to abolish the office of "presbyter over the penitent," to which, as Sozomen relates, "almost all the bishops" gave their support,[14] and to allow

> everyone, in accordance with the voice of their conscience and guided by their own boldness, to partake of the Holy Mysteries,

officially placed the initiative for participating in practices of confession with ordinary Christians. The choice of one of the many paths of penance thus became a spiritual need on the part of a lay person or monk, and not a demand from above. At least until the end of the 10th century, the confession even of serious transgressions was not obligatory for lay people (Barringer, 1979: 193–195). Obligations of a penitential nature connected with Communion were not borne by the Christians of Constantinople until at least the 12th century, when the existence of practices of confession before communion in the Alexandrian Church provoked discussions in Constantinople (see Treyger, 2021) Only in the 14th century, does St. Gregory Palamas explicitly recommend lay people to confess before Communion (Chrestou, 1986: Or. 56).

A situation of a choice by lay people for their own practices of penance, without any systematic control from "above," provoked not a struggle for power between ascetic and hierarchical elements in the Church, but an ever-greater specialization of the three types of authority addressed to resolve certain issues.

EXPLANATORY MODEL

By "shepherdly", we term the type of authority which is connected with the relationship of a leader to a group of people, with the tasks pertaining to him of managing and looking after this group. A leader of this type recognizes his otherness (shepherd — flock). Such a type of authority is possessed in a pure form by a bishop and an abbot. On a theological level, legitimation from God through the apostles is often ascribed to it.

We refrain here from directly using the term "pastor" In the New Testament, the pastoral metaphor acquires a more complicated character, because a shepherd may leave his whole flock in order to search for one lost sheep. The paradoxicality inherent in pastorship of the "sacrifice of one for all and all for one" (Foucault, 2004: 132–133) is a problem which goes beyond

---

[14]Sozomen 7.16 (Bidez & Hansen, 1960: 322–323); Socrates of Constantinople 5.19 (Maraval & Périchon, 2006: 206–208).

the scope of this article,[15] therefore at this stage of analysis it is temporarily excluded in order to be able to return to it at the stage of synthesis. Rapp finds herself in a similar situation when trying to delimit spiritual and ascetic authority, which in Orthodox ascetics cannot exist in one without the other.

"Therapeutic" authority is connected with the personal relationship between a leader and his referent. Such a leader may stand in principle on the same level as the penitent; they are identical in nature — their relationship is those of partners — or in which one party surpasses the other in terms of experience or knowledge but is open to the possibility of a reversal of their roles. This type of authority is accompanied by vocabulary connected with humility and feelings of brotherhood. In its purest form it finds expression in the monk-anchorite, and on a theological level in many cases it may be attributed to God through the prophets.

"Intercessory" authority may be exercised outside direct communication between a leader and their referent (or group). A clear case of an intercessor is a saint who does not perform pastoral action: he prays, interceding for the penitent.

Returning to the different aspects of penitence mentioned at the beginning, we may identify connections between these and types of authority. Sheperdly authority, as we show below, is connected to the aspect of reconciliation, and therapeutical authority with healing. The forgiveness of guilt, as shown above, according to Byzantine tradition is accomplished by God alone. Nonetheless, participation in this power can be possessed by recognized saints: people who have in the highest degree achieved a likeness to God.

SHEPHERDLY AUTHORITY

An appeal for the forgiveness of guilt and reconciliation with the Church in a pure form, without any appeal for the healing of the soul, may be seen in a complicated situation which arose in Carthage around the question of the reconciliation of the lapsed in the middle of the 3rd century. In the absence of their bishop, those who had lapsed from the Church, "not seeking for healing in patience and true therapy in satisfaction" (*De Lapsi*, Hartel, 1992: 247–248) began to try to achieve reconciliation by means of written testimonies given out by martyrs, "such that daily, without any verification or testing of each one, thousands of testimonies were given out, contrary to Gospel law" (*Ep. 20*, ibid.: 528). The Carthage martyrs were not the only

---

[15]In another article in this review, Nikolai Antonov shows some approaches to this paradox of St. Gregory of Nazianzus.

ones who claimed to be able to free whole groups of people from guilt: the martyrs of Lyon and Vienne also "released all and bound none" (*Ecclesistical History* by Eusebius 5.2.5, Bardy, 1955: 25). Their imitation of Christ in sufferings made them participants in His power, which the Hieromartyr Cyprian not only does not refute, but even confirms (*De Lapsi*, Hartel, 1992: 249–250). But this power is effective only in the heavenly Church. Tensions arose at the moment when those of the lapsed who had received testimonies from martyrs tried to enter the earthly Church, bypassing Her bishop. As a shepherd of the earthly Church, St. Cyprian considers the admission of lapsed members inadvisable until a series of conditions have been met (public penance, the end of persecutions and a unification of the Church with those in chains, and the decision of a council on this matter) (*Ep. 16*, ibid.: 518–520). In refusing reconciliation with the Church to all the lapsed, even those who had made sincere penance (*Ep. 33*, ibid.: 567), he was concerned for the Church as a whole, it would appear, while disregarding the interests of individuals in order to avoid temptation.[16]

However, Cyprian would not be a great saint of the Orthodox Church if, even in the absence of an appeal for healing of the soul, he had not attempted to act as a physician. First of all, he rejects the mass approach to the remission of guilt which had been employed by the martyrs, and on his own initiative tried to exercise individual care for those who asked him for help (*Ep. 33*, ibid.: 567–568):

> work out your desires, and, whomever you may be who have today sent me this letter, write your names on a scroll and send the scroll with all the names to me separately. For I must first of all know to whom to write a reply.[17]

[16] Already on the occasion of those returning from schism he says (*Letter to Cornelius on Fortunatus and Felicissimus, or against Heretics*) "while we, meanwhile, by whom account is to be given to the Lord, are anxiously weighing and carefully examining who ought to be received and admitted into the Church. For some are either hindered by their crimes to such a degree, or they are so obstinately and firmly opposed by their brethren, that they cannot be received at all except with offense and risk to a great many, For neither must some putridities be so collected and brought together, that the parts which are sound and whole should be injured; nor is that pastor serviceable or wise who so mingles the diseased and affected sheep with his flock as to contaminate the whole flock with the infection of the clinging evil" (*Ep. 59*, Hartel, 1992: 684–685; transl. Wallis, 1886: Ep. 54).

[17] And also to the confessors: "But you ought also to bring back and amend that matter according to your diligence, in such a way as to designate those by name to whom you desire that peace should be granted. For I hear that certificates are so given to some as that it is said, Let such a one be received to communion along with his friends, which was never in any case done by the martyrs so that a vague and blind petition should by and by heap reproach upon us. For it opens a wide door to say, Such a one with his friends; and twenty or thirty or

Secondly, he considers excommunication from the Church itself as medicine for the lapsed, which will lead to their slow, but certain recovery, while a hasty reconciliation will only destroy them.[18] By acting in this way, he claims to possess therapeutic authority too, even if it is not demanded by his flock.

The function of a supervisor (σκοπός) over the flock is also performed by Saint Theodore the Sanctified, a disciple of and successor as abbot to St. Pachomius the Great (see Barringer, 1979: 42–43). The penitential discipline of which Theodore was the leader in his own monastery included three key elements traditional to episcopal practice with sinners: rebuke, instruction, and prayer. Theodore's authority for the administration of confession in his community is also recognized by the ruling bishop of the region, who refers a monk seeking a just judgment from him to the judgment of his abbot.

Saint Sabbas the Sanctified (6th century *vita* written by Cyril of Scythopolis) manifests his shepherdly authority in an episode with the monk Jacob, who had mutilated himself in a fit of excessive zeal (Schwartz, 1939: 131–132). Initially banishing the latter from the monastery, Sabbas, following the intercession of St. Theodosius, permits him to live in the monastery under the conditions of *epitimia*: he should not meet or have any contact with any of the other monastics. Only after a revelation to Sabbas in a vision that Jacob's sin is forgiven does the abbot admit him to the community of the brethren.

Another St. Theodore, this time the abbot of the Studion Monastery, enforced his shepherdly authority by obliging all the monks to confess to him personally or, as a necessity arising from the growth in numbers under

---

more, may be presented to us, who may be asserted to be neighbours and connections, and freedmen and servants, of the man who receives the certificate. And for this reason I beg you that you will designate by name in the certificate those whom you yourselves see, whom you have known, whose penitence you see to be very near to full satisfaction, and so direct to us letters in conformity with faith and discipline" (*Ep. 15*, Hartel, 1992: 516; transl. Wallis, 1886: Ep. 10).

[18]"Far be it from the Roman Church to slacken her vigour with so profane a facility, and to loosen the nerves of her severity by overthrowing the majesty of faith; so that, when the wrecks of your ruined brethren are still not only lying, but are falling around, remedies of a too hasty kind, and certainly not likely to avail, should be afforded for communion; and by a false mercy, new wounds should be impressed on the old wounds of their transgression; so that even repentance should be snatched from these wretched beings, to their greater overthrow. For where can the medicine of indulgence profit, if even the physician himself, by intercepting repentance, makes easy way for new dangers, if he only hides the wound, and does not suffer the necessary remedy of time to close the scar? This is not to cure, but, if we wish to speak the truth, to slay" (*Ep. 30*, Hartel, 1992: 551; transl. Wallis, 1886: Ep. 30).

his care, to specially appointed confessors. In St. Theodore's view, those who sought other confessors for themselves placed themselves outside his flock, and such a phenomenon was strictly forbidden by the abbot (see PG 99. 956–957). This resolution spread both to monastic rules derived from the Studite rule (those of Evergetis, St. Athanasius, for example),[19] and appeared in monastic rules not in any way directly related to it. For example, the *Typikon* of St. Nilus of Cyprus (13th century) refuses admission to his monastery to all those who wish to confess to someone other than to the abbot (Tsiknopoullos, 1969: Ch. 54). Confession thus becomes a tool for maintaining the integrity of the community.

THERAPEUTIC AUTHORITY

Therapeutic authority is to a large degree a property of hermit monks, who only attain the ability to heal others through personal struggle with the passions. St. Anthony the Great is already, to the mind of the author of his *Vita* St. Athanasius, "like a physician given by God to Egypt" (Ch. 87, Bartelink, 2004: 358). From the 3rd to the 6th centuries, this therapy was understood mostly as the healing of physical wounds or the casting out of demons, but from the 6th century the therapeutic metaphor is already applied to spiritual advice, the confession of sins, and the imposing of *epitimias.* In one of his *Vitae*, Cyril of Scythopolis characterizes his hero in the following way (Schwartz, 1939: 17):

> the great Euthymius was a physician who looked after souls and comforted all, and nobody from among the brethren eschewed to confess his thoughts to him.

John Moschos tells of an *epitimia* imposed by a monk on a lay petitioner for therapeutic purposes (PG 87.3. 2933).

In the *History of the Monks in Egypt* (4th century), the figure of St. John of Likopolis deserves special attention. He is repeatedly called a prophet in the text — in the sense of foreknowledge of the secret workings of the human conscience. In another place, it is said that he practiced the healing of souls. John never exalts himself above his interlocutor or separates himself from him. Addressing a female petitioner, he says: "Why have you desired to see me? Am I a prophet or a righteous man? I am a sinful man and just like you."

A clear parallel with the therapeutic authority of St. Anthony the Great is drawn around 446 by Callinicus, the author of the *Vita of St. Hypatius of Constantinople.* Borrowing from his source lexically and compositionally,

---

[19]For a very detailed review of this process see Krausmüller, 2016.

the author demonstrates his hero to be doctor of souls and bodies for all those who came to him possessed by passions, demons, and sins (Ch. 44, Bartelink, 1971: 262–270).

The theme of the healing of sins becomes an established element of the *Vitae* of ascetics and can be encountered in a fully developed form, for example, in the 8th–9th century *Vita* of St. Stephen the Sabaite and St. Nicetas of Medikion (Barringer, 1979: 129–147).

The same theme may also be found in the *vitae* of monks of cenobitic monasteries and saintly bishops (for example in the *vita* of St. Gregory of Agrigento (8th century)).

A connection between "shepherdly" and "therapeutic" authority is given in the works of St. Theodore the Studite. As abbot, he considers himself a shepherd and even co-shepherd with the patriarch,[20] though remaining subordinate to him, and he takes on the role of physician. This role already extends not just to his flock but to everyone who approaches him with an appeal for spiritual healing. From his correspondence with the monk Theodore, we learn that the Holy Patriarch Nikephoros, on hearing

> that heresy is on the ascendent, and circumstances press in on us from all sides, delegated to all those who so desired to cure whatever illnesses might occur, each according to their ability (*Ep. 477*, Fatouros, 1992b: 689).

Polemicizing with the monk Theodore, who condemned this action, the Studite abbot provides the following basis for his position (*Ep. 477*, ibid.: 690):

> And what exactly would you like, o most honorable one? Not that in these times of the rule of heresy and the destruction of the divine creation there should nowhere be seen a physician, no therapeutic measures should be taken, no guidance offered to the blind, no healing to the ill, that the injuries of the wounded should not be bound, the crippled not be put right, the weak not fortified, the errant not turned back, and that none of those who desire to do so should resist any illness, as far as they are able? In physical doctors we see great diligence and many means of therapy: one undertakes to heal this one, another to treat another, *and even those in the status of servants are not forbidden from practicing this to the degree of their acquisition of medical knowledge, higher or lower.* There are people who examine

---

[20]Here, for example, is how he responds to the Holy Patriarch Nicephorus's accusation of creating a schism: "Truly, what evil is greater than separation from the Church, and depriving a sheep of its arch-shepherd or co-shepherd? For to us too, sinners and unworthy though we are, belongs anointing from God and the name of Shepherd" (*Ep. 25*, Fatouros, 1992a: 68; see also *Ep. 453*, Fatouros, 1992b: 642).

patients every day, and the houses where they are received are sometimes full to the brim, and nobody condemns this diligence nor accuses those conscientiously practicing the medical arts, but both senior and chief physicians, and those of middle rank, and those of lower status perform this philanthropic work.

In the context of a pandemic of heresy, when a large section of the episcopate had fallen away from Orthodoxy, duties of spiritual therapy pass over to those who, even with a lower church rank, have the ability to perform them. St. Theodore imposed on those who came to him for healing *epitimia* which could include complete abdication from the priesthood, or temporary excommunication until the *epitimia* was completed (*Ep. 446*, Fatouros, 1992b: 629–630). Although St. Theodore held priestly office, he considered that it was "not unusual even for a simple monk to impose *epitimia*" (*Ep. 549*, ibid.: 838).

The therapeutic metaphor also dominates in one of the last sources to be written in the period in question: the *Exhortation to Confession* of Anthony the Studite, a future Patriarch of Constantinople (974–983). In this text, the practice of the monastic revelation of thoughts (ἐξαγόρευσις) is justified based on gospel texts connected with the apostolic gift "to bind and to loose", and it is shown that confession is an effective remedy for spiritual infirmities (Delouis & Leroy, 2004: 35–37). Nevertheless Anthony, as the abbot of the monastery, does not see any significant difference between himself and his brethren, painting the image of a hospital, in which all are at once both patients and healers: "after all doctors, when they fall ill, have recourse to other doctors" (ibid.: 37). He calls on the brotherhood to rebuke each other fraternally, and he repents before them that he has himself not yet mastered the lessons of penitence (ibid.: 47–49).

INTERCESSORY AUTHORITY

According to church teaching, all Christians to some degree participate in holiness and are also called to pray for one another. However, the prayer and intercession before God of people with outstanding spiritual gifts is obviously regarded as possessing greater force ("The prayer of a righteous man availeth much" James 5:16).

The path of holiness is open to any member of the Church independent of their hierarchical position, however people who have chosen repentance and purification as their way of life have greater opportunity to achieve this. Monasticism, as the "*paideia* of repentance" (Torrance, 2012: 178–179) nourished athletes of spiritual endeavors. The *Lausiac History*, the *History*

of the Monks in Egypt, and particularly the *Religious History* of Theodoret of Cyrus are full of incidences of the effective prayerful intercession of monastics for the penitent. That notwithstanding, prayerful intercession in the case of truly extraordinary holiness, from the point of view of the authors, does not act simply as very strong prayer. If an "ordinary" righteous man in his mediation between God and man is situated closer to man and constantly draws attention to this, then a great saint has acquired a likeness to Christ to the maximum possible degree. Through this likeness, he obtains a genuine, and for others unattainable, right to remit sins according to the image of Christ.

St. Barsanuphius the Great, answering a request to pray for a world in chaos, states that there are a multitude of intercessors, but none of them achieve their aim due to the world's many sins.

> There are three men perfect before God, who have surpassed the measure of mankind and received the power to loose and to bind, to remit sins and to retain them. They stand between destruction and the world, so that God does not suddenly annihilate the whole world, and by their prayers He commutes punishment into mercy; to them it has been said that this wrath will abide for a short time (Barsanuphe & Jean de Gaza, II.2, 2000b: Ep. 569).

"The binding and loosing" of such people is perceived as undeniably effective. Such power to completely remove guilt was enjoyed by martyrs and confessors, as we have seen above. Within the same logic are the exploits of Abba Jeremiah, whose stone is preserved in the Sahara with an inscription in Coptic:

> here is the place where our lord and father Abba Jeremiah made prostrations, until he had purged the sins of the people of the whole world. May his blessing be upon us. Amen. Amen. Amen.

The inscription supposedly dates from the period from 500 to 850 CE (Rapp, 2005: 82).

Those most worried precisely by condemnation for their sins at the Last Judgment were the people most likely to seek confession from precisely this sort of person, as is evidenced by instances from the literature. For example, is an incident which took place between a baptized Arab who had broken his vows and St. Simeon Stylites, described by Theodoret of Cyrus around 444 in the *Religious History* (Canivet & Leroy-Molinghen, 1979: 199):

> The Barbarian [...] hastily set off to see the saint, revealed to him his secret guilt, confessed his breach of vows in the presence of all and, calling on God for

mercy, asked the holy elder to grant him release from the bonds of the sin he had committed through his intercession.

In this case, it is not so much the state of his soul or the possibility of being part of a church community which concerns the sinner, as the effacement of the guilt for the transgression itself.

DISCUSSION

The proposed model of three types of authority (the shepherd, the physician, and the intercessor) in the question of the person hearing confession is not without flaw. Firstly, not many sources survive enabling us to fill out the details of this model. Secondly, the image of an ideal Christian pastor is unquestionably situated at the intersection of all three types of authority. In hagiographical sources, they are regularly encountered superimposed upon one another, complicating the analysis.

The main task of this schematic model was to provide an apparatus for describing the notions of Byzantine authors of the 3rd to 10th centuries on the authority of the person hearing confession. In putting forward this model, we have attempted to avoid, on the one hand, imposing on authors of the period categories of power, charisma, and duty which were, to our mind, alien to them, and on the other the categories of "spiritual," "ascetic," and "pragmatic" authority which have proved themselves so ineffective when applied to material of this period. We are unable to think of a concrete example (or even imagine one) of a representative of purely "ascetic" authority. Without possessing spiritual authority, such a figure would inevitably turn out to be a false prophet. Purely spiritual authority, perhaps, could be represented by an unworthy clergyman, though in relation to confession (in contrast, for example, to that of the Eucharist), such a personage would not be authoritative.[21]

Although it is also not easy to give concrete examples of a "pure physician," a "pure shepherd," and a "pure intercessor," such examples are at least imaginable. The physician as a pure type is the figure of the anchorite who has not acquired extraordinary spiritual gifts and deals only with the sinner who comes to him for help, and not with the Church as a whole. The shepherd as a pure type is the bishop/church administrator or abbot who places the spiritual interests of his flock above the spiritual interests

---

[21]Rapp calls the authority of the martyr "purely spiritual", which does not appear to correspond to the whole rhetoric of competition which has developed around the exploits of the martyrs and confessors (Rapp, 2005: 85).

of individuals. Finally, the saint is the hermit or confessor who intercedes for the whole of humanity, without engaging closely in pastoral work.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

The suggested model permits us to discuss the evolution of the views of the Byzantines on confession without having recourse to the rhetoric of conflict or struggle for power. It shows how different ministries in the Church were thought of as complementing, and not excluding one another. With the help of the model, the gradual growth in the significance of the role of monastics in the matter of the hearing of confession from the 3rd to 10th centuries may be explained. With the cessation of persecutions and the reform of penitential discipline under Patriarch Nektarius, the need for reconciliation with the Church sharply declined, while the monastic ideals of unceasing repentance simultaneously developed.[22] Since the practices of confession in the Church developed from a demand for authority from below, reconciliatory, in the main episcopal penance, although it never disappeared completely, made room for therapeutic confession, which was in mainly, though not exclusively, monastic.

The proposed schema also provides the opportunity to see the complexity of the position of abbot, who, where confession is concerned, finds himself in the same position with regard to monks as a bishop with regard to lay people. We believe that this model can also be applied to the period from the 10th to the 15th century, where the ambiguity of the positions of some authors on confession leads to a genuine conflict in the Church.

<div align="center">ABBREVIATIONS</div>

LSJ   Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, et al. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

PG 12   Origenes. 1862. *Ex Origene selecta in Psalmos* [in Greek]. In *Origenis opera omnia*, ed. by J.-P. Migne, 1031–1686. Patrologia Graeca 12. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 28   Athanasius of Alexandria. 1887. *S. P. N. Athanasii opera omnia quae exstant* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 28. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 31   Basilius Magnus. 1857. *S. P. N. Basilii opera omnia quae exstant* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Bk. 3. Patrologia Graeca 31. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

---

[22]Compare St. Mark the Ascetic: "Neither for the lowly, nor for the great is there an end to repentance before death itself" (Durand, 1999: 248).

PG 46   Gregorius Nyssenus. 1863. *S. P. N. Gregorii episcopi Nyssensis ope-ra omnia quae exstant* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 46. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 49   Johannes Chrysostomus. 1862. *S. P. N. Joannis Chrysostomi opera omnia quae exstant* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 49. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 65   Migne, J.-P., ed. 1864. *S. Proclus, S. Atticus, S. Flavianus CP, Seve-rianus Gabalitanus, Theophilus Alexandrinus; Alii* [in Greek]. Pa-trologia Graeca 65. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 78   Isidorus Pelusiota. 1864. *S. Isidori, Pelusiotae, epistolarum libri quin-que* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 78. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 87.3   Oecumenius. 1863. *Procopii Gazaei, opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia, S. Sophronii Hierosolymitani, Joannis Moschi, Alexandri Monachi scripte vel scriptorum fragmenta quae supersunt* [in An-cient Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Bk. 3. Patrologia Graeca 87. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

PG 99   Saint Theodore (Studites). 1860. *S. P. N. Theodori Studitae opera om-nia* [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 99. Paris: Garnier Fratres.

REFERENCES

Avvakumov, Y. P. 2005. "Sacramental Ritual in Middle and Later Byzantine Theology: Ninth–Fifteenth Centuries." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, ed. by H. Boersma and M. Levering, 249–269. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardy, G. 1955. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique* [in French]. 3 vols. Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Barringer, R. J. 1979. "Ecclesiastical Penance in the Church of Constantinople: A Study of the Hagiographical Evidence to 983 A. D." PhD diss., University of Ox-ford.

Barsanuphe and Jean de Gaza. 1997. *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza: Correspon-dance* [in French]. Ed. by F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah. Vol. 1, bk. 1. Sources chrétiennes 426. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

———— . 1998. *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza: Correspondance* [in French]. Ed. by F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah. Vol. 1, bk. 2. Sources chrétiennes 427. Pa-ris: Éditions du Cerf.

———— . 2000a. *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza: Correspondance* [in French]. Ed. by F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah. Vol. 2, bk. 1. Sources chrétiennes 450. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

———— . 2000b. *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza: Correspondance* [in French]. Ed. by F. Neyt and P. de Angelis-Noah. Vol. 2, bk. 2. Sources chrétiennes 451. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Bartelink, G. J. M. 1971. *Callinicos. Vie d'Hypatios* [in French]. Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

——— . 1974. *Palladio. La storia Lausiaca* [in French]. Verona: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.

——— . 2004. *Athanase d'Alexandrie, Vie d'Antoine* [in French]. Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Bidez, J., and G. C. Hansen. 1960. *Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte* [in German]. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 50. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Bidez, J., and L. Parmentier. 1898. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*. London: Methuen.

Bishop, R. W., and N. Rambault. 2017. "Severian of Gabala, In ascension et in principium Actorum (CPG 4187)." *Sacris erudiri*, no. 56, 184–227.

Canivet, P., and A. Leroy-Molinghen. 1979. *Théodoret de Cyr. L'histoire des moines de Syrie* [in French]. 2 vols. Sources chrétiennes 257. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Chrestou, P. K. 1986. *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα* [in Greek]. Vol. 11. Ἕλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας 79. Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατερικαὶ Ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς.

Delouis, O., and J. Leroy. 2004. "Quelques inédits attribués à Antoine III Stoudite" [in French]. *Revue des études byzantines*, no. 62, 33–69.

Dionysius the Areopagite. 1897. *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works*. Trans. from the Ancient Greek by J. Parker. London, Oxford: James Parker and Co.

Durand, G.-M. de. 1999. *Traités I* [in French]. Sources chrétiennes 445. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

——— . 2000. *Traités II* [in French]. Sources chrétiennes 445. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Fatouros, G. 1992a. *Theodori Studitae Epistulae* [in Latin]. Vol. 1 of *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*. 2 vols. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 31. Berlin: De Gruyter.

——— . 1992b. *Theodori Studitae Epistulae* [in Latin]. Vol. 2 of *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*. 2 vols. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 31. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Firey, A., ed. 2008. *A New History of Penance*. Vol. 14. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Foucault, M. 2004. *Sécurité, territoire, population. Cours au Collège de France (1977–78)* [in French]. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Hartel, G. 1992. *S. Thasci Caecilii Cypriani Opera Omina* [in Latin]. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 3. Vindobonae: Gerold.

Heil, G., and A. M. Ritter. 1991. *Corpus Dionysiacum II: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae* [in Latin]. Patristische Texte und Studien 36. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Holl, K. 1898. *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim Griechischen Mönchtum: Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen* [in German]. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Irmscher, J., F. Paschke, and B. Rehm. 1969. *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homi-lien* [in German]. 2nd ed. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 42. Ber-lin: Akademie-Verlag.

Jorgensen, M., and L. Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Krausmüller, D. 2016. "Monks Who Are not Priests Do not Have the Power to Bind and to Loose: The Debate About Confession in Eleventh-and Twelfth-Century Byzantium." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 109 (2): 739–767.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Atthe Clarendon Press.

Maraval, P., and P. Périchon. 2006. *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique (Livres IV–VI)* [in French]. Sources chrétiennes 505. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Marey, A. V. 2017. *Avtoritet, ili Podchineniye bez nasiliya [Authority or Obedi-ence without Violence]* [in Russian]. Moskva [Moscow]: Izd-vo Yevropeyskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge.

Metzger, B. M. 1985. *Les constitutions apostoliques* [in French]. Sources chréti-ennes 320. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Parenti, S., and Ye. Velkovska, eds. 2011. *Yevkhologiy Barberini gr. 336 [L'eucologio Barberini gr. 336]* [in Russian]. Trans. from the Italian by S. Golovanov. Omsk: Go-lovanov.

Parrinello, R. M. 2004. "Dalla confessione carismatica alla confessione istituzionale: per una storia del rito monastico dell' 'anadochos'" [in Italian]. *Rivista di storia del Cristianesimo*, no. 1, 333–365.

Rapp, C. 2005. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leader-ship in an Age of Transition*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schwartz, E. 1939. *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* [in German]. Texte und Untersuchun-gen 49.2. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Smirnov, S. I. 1906. "Kto sovershal tainstvo pokayaniya v Drevney Tserkvi? [Who Performed the Sacrament of Penance in the Ancient Church?]" [in Russian]. *Bogoslovskiy vestnik [Theological Bulletin]* 2 (5): 1–33.

Suvorov, N. S. 1903. "K" istorii nravstvennago ucheniya v" vostochnoy tserkvi [On the History of Moral Teaching in the Eastern Church]" [in Russian]. *Vizantiyskiy vremennik [The Byzantine Chronicle]* 10 (1–2): 31–62.

Torrance, A. 2012. *Repentance in Late Antiquity: Eastern Asceticism and the Framing of the Christian Life c. 400–650 CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Treyger, A. 2021. "Poslaniye patriarkha Aleksandriyskogo Marka III igumenu Geor-giyu Damiyett·skomu [The Letter of Patriarch Mark III of Alexandria to Abbot George of Damietta]: izdaniye arabskogo teksta, russkiy perevod, vstupitel'naya stat'ya i kommentarii [Arabic Text Edition, Russian Translation, Introductory Article and Comments]" [in Russian]. *Bibliya i khristianskaya drevnost' [The Bible and Christian Antiquity]*, no. 1, 26–69.

Tsiknopoullos, I. 1969. *Kypriaka typika* [in Greek]. Πηγαὶ καὶ Μελέται τῆς Κυπριακῆς Ἱστορίας 2. Λευκωσία: Κέντρον Ἐπιστημονικῶν Ἐρευνῶν Κύπρου.

Wallis, R. E. 1886. *From Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Ed. by A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Vol. 5. Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Yachmenik, V. A. 2021. "Kontseptsiya sobornosti i problema tserkovnogo avtoriteta v russkom bogoslovii kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka [The Concept of Sobornost' and the Problem of Church Authority in Russian Theology late 19th – Early 20th Centuries]" [in Russian]. *Voprosy teologii [Questions of Theology]* 3 (4): 537–552.

Эльга Канаева
к. теологии, старший преподаватель
Православный Свято-тихоновский гуманитарный университет (Москва)
лаборант Лаборатории исследований церковных институций (Москва);
ORCID: 0000–0001–8909–8371

Пастух, врач и ходатай

специализация различных видов авторитета в исповедальных практиках в Византии (III–X вв.)

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается проблема выбора языка для описания эволюции исповедальных практик в Византии в III–X веках. Существующий на данный момент категориальный аппарат представляет эти процессы в логике отношений власти между принимающим и приносящим исповедь, использует язык харизмы и должности. Эти инструменты дают определенную перспективу рассмотрения набора фактов, оценивают их как свидетельство глубокого и непримиримого конфликта между субъектами в этой области и не описывают ситуацию, когда конфликт не зафиксирован в источниках. В статье мы показываем сначала, что властный язык описания не свойственен самим авторам изучаемой эпохи, а затем предлагаем свою модель, описывающую ролевое взаимоотношение вокруг практик покаяния. Вслед за К. Рапп мы предлагаем использовать понятие «авторитет» как базовое. Мы выделяем три его вида: пастушеский, врачебный и ходатайствующий. Они различаются как по типу взаимодействия в покаянных практиках, так и по своей функциональности в рамках феномена покаяния. Типологию сопровождает описание. Наиболее яркие персоналии и ситуации покаянных практик за III–X век, насколько это возможно, распределяются по этим видам.

Ключевые слова: исповедь, покаяние, авторитет, экклезиология, церковные институты, церковная история, сакраментология.