

DIRK KRAUSMÜLLER – OLGA GRINCHENKO

The Tenth-Century Stoudios-Typikon and its Impact on Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Byzantine Monasticism

Abstract: The topic of this article is a now lost monastic rule, which was written at the Constantinopolitan monastery of Stoudios in the late tenth century. This rule is the first typikon that bears all the hallmarks of monastic reform: rejection of entrance fees, prohibition of clandestine eating and the requirement to confess to the abbot and to obey him in all things. The article seeks to determine the structure of the text through comparison of later adaptations for Russian and Southern Italian monasteries, and it attempts to assess its impact on Constantinopolitan monasticism through analysis of borrowings in the Pantokrator-Typikon, the Kecharitomene-Typikon and the Mamas-Typikon.

What distinguishes Byzantine monasticism of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries from earlier periods is the production of normative texts, the so-called typika. These texts first became accessible to scholars at the beginning of the twentieth century through the publications of Alexej Dmitrievskij and Louis Petit but it is only in the last forty years that they have been studied in depth. The ground for this more sustained engagement was laid by Paul Gautier who in the 1970s and 1980s prepared critical editions and French translations of several important rules. More recently John Thomas and Angela Hero have made the texts available to English-speaking scholars through their ambitious project *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*. This multi-volume publication not only contains translations of the surviving Greek texts but also extensive commentaries and general introductions in which John Thomas has attempted to reconstruct the development of Middle Byzantine monasticism. In these introductions Thomas accords a crucial role to the Evergetis-Typikon, which dates to the second half of the eleventh century. He argues that the Evergetis-Typikon was the first text that reflected a self-conscious reform agenda and that this agenda was later disseminated when lay and monastic founders used the Evergetis-Typikon as the model for their own rules. As long as one focuses exclusively on the texts contained in the *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents* this narrative is convincing because earlier rules deal almost exclusively with technical questions and lack the lengthy exhortations and explanations that characterise the Evergetis-Typikon. However, the picture changes radically when one extends the discussion to texts that have been lost in their original and are only known to us from later adaptations or from translations into other languages. One example of such a text is the Panagios-Typikon, which provided the model for the Greek and Georgian rules of Petritzos-Bačkov. Through study of these rules and of the Lives of Athanasius the Athonite it can be shown that the Panagios-Typikon was composed in the first quarter of the eleventh century and that it already had a stridently coenobitic agenda. This article focuses on another lost early rule, written at the famous Constantinopolitan monastery of Stoudios, which also bears the hallmarks of monastic reform: rejection of entrance fees, prohibition of clandestine eating, and the requirement to confess to the abbot and to obey him in all things. It seeks to determine the structure of this rule through comparison of later adaptations for Russian and Southern Italian monasteries, and it attempts to assess its impact on Constantinopolitan monasticism through analysis of borrowings in the Pantokrator-Typikon, the Kecharitomene-Typikon and the Mamas-Typikon.

THE STRUCTURE AND CHARACTER OF THE LOST STODIOS-TYPIKON

As is well known the Stoudios monastery played a crucial role in the genesis of monastic rules as a distinct literary genre. One of the earliest extant examples of such rules is the Stoudios-Hypotyposis.¹ This brief text, which was written around the year 900, describes various aspects of communal worship and sets out how communal meals should be organised. In the second half of the tenth and in the early eleventh century the Stoudios-Hypotyposis not only found its way to Southern Italy but also served as the model for two further texts, the Lavra-Hypotyposis and the Iviron-Hypotyposis.² However, at the Stoudios monastery itself the Hypotyposis was later superseded by another much more voluminous rule, which we will call Stoudios-Typikon in order to distinguish it from the earlier text. Unfortunately, the Stoudios-Typikon is lost. However, its content and structure can be reconstructed from four later texts: the rule, which Patriarch Alexius I (1025–1043) drew up for a monastery that he had founded in Constantinople;³ the rule, which the Calabrian abbot Bartholomew of Simeri gave to the Nea Hodegetria or Patirion monastery shortly after the year 1100;⁴ and the rules of the Soter and Trigona monasteries, which Bartholomew's disciple Luke composed in the 1030s.⁵ Of these texts only the Soter-Typikon and the as yet unedited Patirion-Typikon are extant in the Greek original.⁶ By contrast, the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius has only survived in a Church Slavonic translation and the Trigona-Typikon is only preserved in a late Italian rendering.⁷

In the introduction to his edition of the Church Slavonic version Pentkovskij undertook a detailed comparison of the four extant rules, which permitted him to conclude that identical passages appear in two, three or even four of the texts.⁸ This leaves no doubt that their authors drew on the same material. Moreover, some of the stipulations are explicitly characterised as traditions instituted by Theodore of Stoudios, which suggests that this material is of Stoudite provenance.⁹ Such provenance is in

¹ The Stoudios-Hypotyposis is extant in two recensions, ed. MIGNE, *PG* 99, 1704–1720, and A. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Opisanie liturgiĳeskikh rukopisej*, I. *Typika*. Kiev 1895, 224–238.

² Lavra-Hypotyposis, ed. Ph. MEYER, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster*. Leipzig 1894, 138–139, and DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Opisanie I* 254–255; Iviron-Hypotyposis, trans. K. KEKELIDZE, *Liturgiĳeskie gruzinskije pamjatniki v oteĳestvennykh knigokhraniliščah*, II. *Typika*. Tiflis 1908, 228–313. The two texts have been dated to the years 963 and 1038–1042 respectively; the latter text is dependent on the former but contains additional material, in particular in the section about the refectory, cf. A. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Tipikon patriarha Aleksija Studita v Bizantii i na Rusi*. Moscow 2001, 153–154. For Southern Italy cf. E. MORINI, *Monachesimo greco in Calabria. Aspetti organizzativi e linee di spiritualità*. Bologna 1996, 93.

³ On Alexius I cf. J. P. THOMAS, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*. Washington, D.C. 1987, 168. For a brief summary of recent research, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *The abbots of Evergetis as opponents of 'monastic reform': a re-appraisal of the monastic discourse in eleventh- and twelfth-century Constantinople*. *REB* 69 (2011) 111–134, esp. 111–115.

⁴ The monastery of Nea Hodegetria at Patirion was founded in 1101–1105, cf. E. MORINI, *Gerarchia e koinonia. Organizzazione della vita monacale in un inedito paleo-calabrese*, in: *Macro- e microstrutture economiche nella società bizantina (XIII–XV secolo)*, in: XVIII Congresso Internazionale di studi bizantini. Mosca, 8–15 agosto 1991. Testi e documenti preliminari, a cura di A. CARILE. Bologna 1991, 31–51, with references to older secondary literature.

⁵ For the Soter monastery in Messina, cf. F. GIUNTA, *Il monachesimo basiliano nella Sicilia normanna*, in: *Basilio di Cesarea. La sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*, II. Messina 1983, 709–731.

⁶ Soter-Typikon, ed. M. ARRANZ, *Le typikon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensis gr. 115, A. D. 1131. Introduction, texte critique et notes (OCA 185)*. Rome 1969. The Patirion-Typikon is extant in the *Codex Jenensis graecus G.B. q. 6a*. Extensive excerpts can be found in PENTKOVSKIJ, *Tipikon* 66–79.

⁷ The Church Slavonic translation has recently been critically edited by PENTKOVSKIJ, *Tipikon* 233–420. The text has yet not been translated into a Western European language. There only exists an unfortunately rather imprecise translation into Russian by Hieromonk Feodosij (KOROTKOV), *Pervonaĳal'nyj obščezitelnyj ustav russkikh monastyrej (Disziplinarnaja ĳast Aleksievkogo Studijskogo ustava po rukopisi Sinodal'nogo obranija GIM, No 330/380/ XII v.)*. Leningrad 1986. For the Trigona-Typikon, cf. S. MERCATI, *Sul Tipico del monastero di S. Bartolomeo di Trigona tradotto in italo-calabrese in trascrizione greca da Francesco Vucisano*. *ASCL* 8 (1938) 197–223, esp. 221–223; cf. also K. DOURAMANI, *Il typikon del monastero di S. Bartolomeo di Trigona*. Rome 2003.

⁸ Cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Tipikon* 49–120. Without Pentkovskij's ground-breaking work this article could not have been written.

⁹ Cf. e.g. Alexius-Typikon 368, 6–9 (PENTKOVSKIJ): 'And from here we follow the laws of our unforgettable father Theodore'; and Patirion-Typikon 78–79 (PENTKOVSKIJ): τοῦ ὁσίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Στουδίτου περὶ χειροτονίας ἡγουμένου.

any case highly likely in the case of Patriarch Alexius who had previously been abbot of Stoudios; and for Bartholomew of Simeri a Stoudite connection can also be assumed because his biographer tells us that the saint visited Constantinople where he obtained many objects.¹⁰ As Pentkovskij has pointed out, these objects could well have included texts from the Stoudios monastery.¹¹

One of the stipulations where reference is made to Theodore of Stoudios concerns the election and installation of the abbot. Here we will only quote the last part, which describes the qualities expected in a new abbot, because it alone appears both in the Patirion-Typikon and in the Soter-Typikon:

<p>Alexius: Futhermore, we want the one who has achieved the most in the monastic way of life to be hegumenos here, <i>for the benefit of those who lag behind these (monastic rules) and whose example has become customary.</i> Then the monastery will become better and will thrive and will bring forth great benefits. <i>These are our testimonies; and the reward will be multiplied for every patriarch who takes good care of us.</i> And everything will be well through the power of the Creator of all and through the mercy of the Mother of God, our Lady, pure Ever-Virgin, who is honored here.¹²</p>	<p>Patirion: Πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἡσκημένον ἄριστα τοὺς τῆς μονῆς τύπους βουλόμεθα εἶναι τὸν ἐνταῦθα ἡγουμενεύσοντα. Οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον ὀδεύσειεν ἡ μονή, οὕτως ἀνθήσειεν, οὕτω καρποὺς ὠραίους ἐνέγκειεν, καὶ πάντα ἔξει καλῶς δυνάμει μὲν τοῦ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργοῦ καὶ συνοχέως Θεοῦ, εὐμενεῖα δὲ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα τιμωμένου ἁγίου Προδρόμου καὶ ἀντιλήπτορος καὶ βοηθοῦ ἡμῶν.¹³</p>	<p>Soter: Πρὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἡσκημένον ἄριστα δεῖ εἶναι τοὺς τῆς μονῆς τύπους βουλόμεθα τὸν ἐνταῦθα ἡγουμενεύσοντα. Οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον ὀδεύσειεν ἡ μονή, οὕτως ἀνθήσειεν, οὕτω καρποὺς ὠραίους ἐνέγκοιεν, καὶ πάντα ἔξει καλῶς δυνάμει μὲν τοῦ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ συνοχέως Θεοῦ, εὐμενεῖα δὲ τῆς πανασπίλου αὐτοῦ Μητρὸς.¹⁴</p>
--	--	---

The two Southern Italian rules have a virtually identical text, which suggests that they are directly derived from the same model. In the case of the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius comparison is less straightforward because we no longer have the Greek original. However, even the Church Slavonic translation is quite close to the Southern Italian versions. Thus we can conclude that the translation is a faithful rendering of its model and that the author of this model, Patriarch Alexius, adapted the same source as the authors of the typika for the Patirion and Soter monasteries. This does not mean that the three versions are in all respects identical because the Church Slavonic rule contains two passages that are not found in the other texts. Without in-depth study of all extant texts it is impossible to decide, which of the adaptations is closest to the wording of the original Stoudite stipulation. As such

¹⁰ Cf. M. RE, Sul viaggio di Bartolomeo da Simeri a Costantinopoli. *RSDN* n.s. 34 (1997) 71–76.

¹¹ Cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Typikon* 88.

¹² Alexius-Typikon 394, 18–24 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

¹³ Patirion-Typikon 79 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

¹⁴ Soter-Typikon AP–9 (289, 24–29 ARRANZ).

a study is beyond the scope of this article we will only briefly consider the concluding paragraph. Here the version of the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius reflects the new foundation's status as a patriarchal monastery and the founder's choice of Mary as patron saint. In like fashion the Soter-Typikon makes mention of Christ the Saviour and of his mother.¹⁵ In contrast the Patirion-Typikon contains a reference to John the Baptist, despite the fact that the Patirion monastery was dedicated to the Virgin Hodegetria. As is well known John the Baptist was the Stoudite patron saint. This suggests that the author of the Patirion-Typikon had before himself a text that had originally been intended for use in the Stoudios monastery, which he then transcribed in a rather mechanical fashion.¹⁶

The chapter regulating the election and installation of the abbot on which we have focused so far is only one of a great many overlaps between the four extant texts, which are undoubtedly also of Stoudite provenance.¹⁷ However, this identical content is presented in quite different ways. The Southern Italian typika are rather loosely structured and the Stoudite passages are arranged in seemingly random fashion. By contrast, the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius integrates the identifiable Stoudite material into a coherent framework. Here the typikon proper follows a guide to the liturgy throughout the year, the so-called synaxarium.¹⁸ The typikon itself then has a tripartite structure: the first part deals with the ritual observed during communal meals in the refectory and specifies what foods should be eaten on ordinary days and during the Lenten periods;¹⁹ the second part focuses on the relationship between abbot and community and the organisational structure of the monastery;²⁰ and the last part concerns itself with communal worship and the behaviour of monks during church services.²¹

In his edition of the Church Slavonic translation Pentkovskij has suggested that at Stoudios the three parts existed as independent texts, which were only combined by Patriarch Alexius when he wrote the rule for his own foundation.²² However, comparison of the extant versions reveals that this hypothesis cannot be upheld and that there was indeed an original Stoudios-Typikon, which had the same structure as Patriarch Alexius' rule.²³ Such comparison must start with the title of the whole text:

<p>Alexius: The regulations concerning eating and drinking for monks and concerning any other order, as well as the conduct in the church and every other place.²⁴</p>	<p>Patirion: Τυπικὸν σὺν θεῷ διαλαμβάνον περὶ τε βρώσεως καὶ πόσεως τῶν μοναχῶν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης τάξεως καὶ ἀγωγῆς αὐτῶν ἐν τε ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ πανταχοῦ.²⁵</p>
---	---

¹⁵ The model for the Soter-Typikon does not need to come from a monastery dedicated to Mary, cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, Tipikon 51. Since the monastery was dedicated to Christ the 'slot' for a patron saint was empty and the obvious figure to fill it was Christ's mother.

¹⁶ This point was made by PENTKOVSKIJ, Tipikon 79–80.

¹⁷ For a list and detailed discussion of these overlaps, cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, Tipikon 49–120.

¹⁸ Alexius-Typikon 233–368 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

¹⁹ Alexius-Typikon 368–380 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

²⁰ Alexius-Typikon 380–397 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

²¹ Alexius-Typikon 397–420 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

²² Cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, Tipikon 426: 'the ktetorikon section of the TAS ... was a complex work of compilation, for whose creation various Stoudite texts were used.'

²³ This does not exclude the possibility that the different sections were originally separate texts. However, it seems unlikely that they were originally composed by Theodore of Stoudios as Pentkovskij argues, cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, Tipikon 423. That they are attributed to Theodore does not constitute proof. The so-called Didaskalia Chronike (*PG* 99, 1694–1701), which also goes under the name of Theodore, is clearly a later text since it reflects the fasting practice of the eleventh century, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, The Athonite monastic tradition during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, in: Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism, ed. A. Bryer – M. Cunningham. Aldershot 1996, 57–65.

²⁴ Alexius-Typikon (368, 9–10 PENTKOVSKIJ).

²⁵ Patirion-Typikon (64 PENTKOVSKIJ).

The similarity between the two passages shows clearly that they must go back to the Stoudios-Typikon. Thus one can argue that this typikon also began with a section about the refectory and then dealt with other topics. This hypothesis is confirmed through analysis of the passage, which in the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius effects the transition from the section about the refectory to the section about monastic discipline:

<p>Alexius: Monastic rules for those who live in a community and who promised to live together. Commandment about the life of the God-fearing monks and about all sorts of eating, discipline, and other things, which were relevant to prescribe to those who practice such a way of living together. It is fitting to offer other various useful things and kind advice in the present books; and the first one is regarding the fitting obedience to the hegoumenos from the monks.²⁶</p>	<p>Patirion: Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ μοναχικὰ παραγγέλματα τοῖς ἐν κοινοβίῳ ζῶσιν ἀναγκαιότατα. Ὁ μὲν περὶ τε τῆς τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων μοναχῶν διαίτης λόγος καὶ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἐστιατόριον εὐταξίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα εἰκὸς ἦν παραδοῦναι τὸν τὴν τοιαύτην πραγματείαν τάττοντα ἤδη εἴρηται. Δεῖ δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ ἐτέρας ὠφελιμωτέρας καὶ χαριεστέρας παραινέσεως τῇ παρουσίᾳ βίβλων προσθεῖναι καὶ πρῶτόν γε περὶ τῆς ὀφειλομένης τῷ καθηγουμένῳ παρὰ τῶν μοναχῶν ὑποταγῆς.²⁷</p>
--	---

The fact that this transition appears not only in the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius but also in the Patirion-Typikon leaves no doubt that already in the Stoudios-Typikon the ‘monastic precepts’ (μοναχικὰ παραγγέλματα) with their emphasis on the office of the abbot and on community life were preceded by the section about the refectory and monastic diet.

To make the case that in the Stoudios-Typikon the ‘monastic precepts’ were in turn succeeded by instructions concerning church services we need to turn to the Soter-Typikon. In the manuscript the synaxarion of the monastery is followed by several folios containing material from the disciplinary typikon, which have counterparts in the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius.²⁸ This part of the manuscript starts abruptly in the middle of the stipulation about the installation of abbots after which follows a chapter about the care for the infirm.²⁹ The subsequent chapters, under the general heading ‘about psalm-singing and the position of the brothers in the holy church’ (περὶ τῆς ψαλμοδίας καὶ στάσεως τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ), deal with the organisation of church services, beginning with instructions on how to wake up monks for nocturnal worship.³⁰ Significantly, the same sequence is found in the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius where the chapters about the installation of abbots and about the infirm conclude the section containing the ‘monastic precepts’ and where the instructions about waking up constitute the first chapter of the last, liturgical section of the text. Thus one can argue that both the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius and the Soter-Typikon reflect the disposition of the original Stoudios-Typikon where the ‘monastic precepts’ were followed by a section dealing with church services.

This interpretation is not undermined by the fact that in the Patirion-Typikon where it is preserved in its entirety the chapter about the installation of the abbot precedes the ‘monastic precepts’ because the author of the original Stoudite text inserted elaborate introductions that indicate the place of

²⁶ Alexius-Typikon (380, 35–40 PENTKOVSKIJ).

²⁷ Patirion-Typikon (66–68 PENTKOVSKIJ).

²⁸ Soter-Typikon 289–298 (ARRANZ).

²⁹ Soter-Typikon AP–9 (280, 18 ARRANZ).

³⁰ Soter-Typikon AP–11 (290 [apparatus criticus] ARRANZ).

individual chapters within the ‘monastic precepts’. This is already evident from the text quoted above, which gives not only the heading of the whole section but also mentions the first topic, the obedience due to the abbot. Similar introductions precede the two chapters about the installation of the abbot and the care for the infirm:

<p>Alexius: Come on and tell us about the election of hegoumenos, and if we then give a speech about him, let no one be surprised now, as everything founded by power is preserved through order, and he himself who arranged everything through his word brought everything to life after creating heaven and earth, and made man king for them.³¹</p>	<p>Patirion: Ἄγε δὴ καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἡγουμένου προχειρίσεως ῥητέον ἡμῖν. Εἰ δὲ ἐν ὑστέρω τὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ποιούμεθα, θαυμάζετω μηδεὶς. Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος τὸ πᾶν οὐσιώσας, μετὰ τὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν παντοδαπῶν ζώων παραγωγὴν τε καὶ γένεσιν, τὸν βασιλέα τούτων, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἔκτισεν.³²</p>
<p>Alexius: This is the final word for us, that he who for beautiful walls makes a good roof, which is for those who need kindness.³³</p>	<p>Soter: Τελευταῖος ὁ μου ἔστω λόγος, ὡς ἂν εἴ τις ὠραίοις τοίχοις ἐπιπρέπων κάλλιστος ὄροφος, ὁ περὶ τῆς εἰς τοὺς νόσφ κατεχομένους ἐπιμελείας.³⁴</p>

These two passages show clearly that the installation of the abbot and the care for the infirm were the last chapters of the ‘monastic precepts’. Thus we can conclude that the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius preserves the disposition of the original Stoudios-Typikon where a liturgical rule or *synaxarion* was followed by a disciplinary rule consisting of three parts: stipulations concerning the refectory and monastic diet, ‘monastic precepts’, and regulations about church services.³⁵

It is evident that the structure of the Stoudios-Typikon is rather counter-intuitive. One would have expected the stipulations about the church services to follow directly after the *synaxarion* and not to be relegated to the very end of the text. This more ‘logical’ pattern is indeed found in the Evergetis-Typikon, which dates to the second half of the eleventh century.³⁶ However, the disposition of the Stoudios-Typikon may have been more common than it now seems. Here we need to consider another early rule, the Panagios-Typikon, which was composed in Constantinople in the first quarter

³¹ Alexius-Typikon 392, 42–393, 4 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

³² Patirion-Typikon 76–77 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

³³ Alexius-Typikon 394, 26–27 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

³⁴ Soter-Typikon AP–10 (290, 2–4 ARRANZ).

³⁵ It is possible that the Soter-Typikon originally had the same structure. As we have said the manuscript contains the liturgical typikon of the monastery and then after a lacuna starts in the middle of the penultimate chapter of the ‘monastic precepts’. Arranz, the editor of the text, already suggested that originally the manuscript, which is written by the same hand, contained a complete founder’s rule, cf. ARRANZ, Typikon 289, apparatus criticus: ‘Continuation d’un texte incomplète. Faisait-il partie d’un autre livre: du TYPYKON FUNDATIONIS? En tout cas format et écriture sont identiques à ceux des 32 cahiers précédents.’ It seems very likely that the Soter-Typikon contained the entire ‘monastic precepts’ since they are also found in the Patirion-Typikon. Since stipulations about the refectory are found in the related Trigona-Typikon and the title of the disciplinary rule is preserved in the Patirion-Typikon one can hypothesise that the synaxarium was also followed by instructions about refectory and diet. In this case it would have resembled the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius very closely indeed.

³⁶ Evergetis-Typikon, ed. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis. *REB* 40 (1982) 1–101, esp. 33–45. On the Evergetis monastery, cf. now R. H. JORDAN – R. MORRIS, The Hypotyposis of the Monastery of Theotokos Evergetis, Constantinople (11th–12th Centuries). Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Farnham–Burlington 2012.

of the eleventh century.³⁷ This text is lost but careful analysis of surviving Greek and Georgian adaptations for Gregory Pakourianos' monastic foundation at Petritzos-Bačkovovo shows that it also began with a section about the refectory.³⁸ It is possible that the counter-intuitive structure of the typika of Panagios and Stoudios is a consequence of the development from shorter to extended rules. As we have said before, the earlier Stoudios-Hypotyposis has a bipartite structure: it deals first with liturgical practice throughout the year and then with the organisation of communal meals. Thus one can argue that in the earliest extended typika the first part was replaced with a full-scale synaxarion and that those original stipulations, which could not be accommodated there, were appended at the end. However, a final conclusion can only be reached after detailed comparison of all extant texts.

The Stoudios-Typikon whose structure we have attempted to reconstruct is not just longer than the earlier Hypotyposis but also has a completely different character. Like the Hypotyposis it regulates communal activities in church and refectory. However, this technical information is now interspersed with exhortations and explanations.³⁹ Such an approach has close parallels in the Panagios-Typikon, which also serves as a vehicle for a particular monastic ideology.⁴⁰ Significantly the two texts have the same *terminus ante quem*, the year 1025, when the long reign of Emperor Basil II came to an end: Vita A of Athanasius the Athonite, which draws heavily on the Panagios-Typikon, refers to Basil as the ruling monarch;⁴¹ and the Stoudios-Typikon must already have been in existence when the dying emperor appointed the Stoudite abbot Alexius patriarch of Constantinople because otherwise Alexius would hardly have used it as a template for his own text. Comparison reveals that the authors of the two texts share the same concerns: they forbid monks to have private meals in their cells, reject the custom of asking for an entrance fee, and emphasise the central role of the abbot as the highest monastic official and as confessor of all other monks without whose permission nothing should be done.⁴² Significantly, these are features that recur in the Evergetis-Typikon, which was written several decades later.⁴³ John Thomas who undertook a study of this latter text has made the case for a monastic reform movement, which originated in the Evergetis monastery and which constituted a response to contemporary abuses such as the *charistike*.⁴⁴ It is evident that this hypothesis can no longer be

³⁷ On the foundation of the Panagios monastery, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, The lost first Life of Athanasius the Athonite and its author Anthony, abbot of the Constantinopolitan monastery of Ta Panagiou, in: Founders and Refounders of Byzantine Monasteries. Papers of the fifth Belfast Byzantine International Colloquium, Portaferry, September 1999, ed. M. Mullett. Belfast 2007, 63–86.

³⁸ Petritziotissa-Typikon, ed. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos. *REB* 42 (1984) 5–145, text on 19–133. For a reconstruction of the original Panagios-Typikon, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, On Contents and Structure of the Panagios-Typikon: A Contribution to the Early History of 'Extended' Monastic Rules, forthcoming in *BZ*.

³⁹ Cf. e.g. the exhortation not to move and scratch oneself during church services, complete with references to the admirable practice of the Fathers, which is found both in the Alexius-Typikon and in the Soter-Typikon, discussed in PENTKOVSKIJ, Typikon 54.

⁴⁰ Edition and French translation by P. GAUTIER, Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos. *REB* 42 (1984), 5–145, text on 19–133.

⁴¹ For the date of Vita A, cf. P. LEMERLE, La vie ancienne de saint Athanase l'Athonite composée au début du XIe siècle par Athanase de Lavra, in: Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963, I. Chevetogne 1963, 60–100, esp. 89, note 89. For the relationship between Vita A and the Panagios Typikon, cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Panagios Typikon.

⁴² Prohibition of private meals, cf. Alexius-Typikon 382 (PENTKOVSKIJ); prohibition of entrance fees, cf. Alexius-Typikon 390 (PENTKOVSKIJ); command to confess to the abbot and to do nothing without the knowledge and permission of the abbot, cf. Alexius-Typikon 383–385 (PENTKOVSKIJ). For the corresponding passages in the Panagios-Typikon, as reflected in the Petritziotissa-Typikon 49, 75, 77 (GAUTIER).

⁴³ Evergetis-Typikon 65, 57, 73 (GAUTIER).

⁴⁴ The case for an Evergetine reform movement was made by J. P. THOMAS, Documentary evidence from the Byzantine monastic typika for the history of the Evergetine Reform Movement, in: The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism, ed. M. Mullett – A. Kirby. Belfast 1994, 246–273. It was then further elaborated in Thomas' introduction to Chapter Four: Early Reform Monasteries of the Eleventh Century, in: Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation

upheld and that the reform movement must have started considerably earlier. This raises the question: which text should be regarded as the first ‘reform’ typikon? The Panagios-Typikon was written after the year 1000 when Anthony, the favourite disciple of Athanasius the Athonite, left Lavra in order to found his own monastery in the capital.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, the Stoudios-Typikon has no such clear *terminus post quem*. It postdates the Stoudios-Hypotyposis and therefore must have been composed after the year 900.⁴⁶ However, a date after the middle of the tenth century seems more likely because in 963 Athanasius the Athonite still used the older Stoudios-Hypotyposis as the model for his own rule.⁴⁷ The striking similarities between the rules of Panagios and Stoudios may provide us with a further clue. Despite the absence of exact textual parallels it seems inconceivable that the author of one of the texts was not aware of the other text. If this hypothesis is accepted it can be argued that it was Anthony who took his inspiration from the Stoudios-Typikon. As we have already seen, at Lavra the older Stoudios-Hypotyposis still held sway. Moreover, the other writings of Athanasius the Athonite are much less ideologically charged than the Panagios-Typikon.⁴⁸ This suggests that Anthony only encountered the new reform discourse after he had arrived in Constantinople and founded the Panagios monastery. According to this interpretation the Stoudios-Typikon would already have existed around the year 1000, which establishes the second half of the tenth century as the most likely date of its composition. At this point one could raise the objection that there may have existed other now lost ‘reform’ typika on which Anthony could have drawn. However, here we need to consider that the only evidence for a monastic reform discourse before the eleventh century comes from the Stoudios monastery: it is found in the Ascetic Chapters of Symeon the Stoudite, the spiritual father of Symeon the New Theologian, and in two Stoudite hagiographical texts, the Life of Blaise of Amorion from the first half of the tenth century and the somewhat later Vita C of Theodore of Stoudios.⁴⁹ Thus one can put forward the hypothesis that the Stoudite elite initiated the discourse of monastic reform and then invented a new literary genre, the ‘extended’ *typikon*, in which this discourse could find its expression.

THE STOUDIOS-TYPIKON AND LATER CONSTANTINOPOLITAN RULES

So far the discussion has focused on two trajectories of Stoudite influence on later monasticism. One of these trajectories led from the Stoudios-Typikon via the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius to the Church Slavonic rule of the monastery of the Caves at Kiev;⁵⁰ and the other led from the Stoudios-Typikon directly to the rule of Bartholomew of Simeri for the Patirion monastery and then to the rules of Bartholomew’s disciple Luke for the Soter monastery at Messina and for the monastic confederation

of the Surviving Founders’ Typika and Testaments, ed. J. THOMAS – A. CONSTANTINIDES-HERO – G. CONSTABLE. Washington, D.C. 2000, II 441–448, and in particular in his introduction to the translation of the Evergetis-Typikon, in: *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents II* 458.

⁴⁵ The date of the death of Athanasius the Athonite was established by P. KARLIN-HAYTER in her review of ‘Actes de Lavra, I’ in *Byz* 43 (1972) 291–293. The Panagios monastery was founded after that date, cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, *The lost first Life of Athanasius the Athonite* 63–86.

⁴⁶ Cf. above note 1.

⁴⁷ Cf. above note 2.

⁴⁸ Cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Abbots of Evergetis* 120.

⁴⁹ For a discussion, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Vitae B, C and A of Theodore the Stoudite: their Interrelation, Dates, Authors and Significance for the History of the Stoudios Monastery the Tenth Century*, forthcoming in *AnBoll*; and D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *From Competition to Conformity: Saints’ Lives, Typika and the Byzantine Monastic Discourse of the Eleventh Century*, forthcoming in: *Byzantium in the 11th Century*. 45th Spring Symposium in Byzantine Studies, ed. M. Lauxtermann.

⁵⁰ Cf. C. FARRIMOND, *Founders and refounders: the application of the Typikon of Alexios the Stoudite at the Kievan Caves monastery*, in: *Founders and refounders of Byzantine monasteries*, ed. M. Mullett. Belfast 2007, 273–314.

that Luke had established.⁵¹ Both Rus' and Southern Italy had in common that they were situated on the periphery of the Byzantine world. However, this does not mean that the Stoudios-Typikon did not also have an impact on the Byzantine heartland and on the capital Constantinople itself. One Constantinopolitan rule that is clearly reliant on the Stoudios-Typikon is the Pantokrator-Typikon, which was commissioned in 1136 by Emperor John II Komnenos.⁵² As Pentkovskij was able to show the regulations about communal worship and communal meals in this text have counterparts in the corresponding sections of the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius.⁵³ In addition, one can identify material from the 'monastic precepts'. However, this does not mean that the Pantokrator-Typikon is a mere copy of the older text. Not only do the passages of Stoudite provenance often appear in abbreviated form;⁵⁴ one also finds many passages, such as the chapter about the selection and installation of the abbot, that are not indebted to the Stoudite tradition at all.⁵⁵ Moreover, in the Pantokrator-Typikon the sections are arranged in a different order from the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius: the stipulations about communal worship in the church are found not at the end of the text but rather at the beginning, preceding the stipulations about communal meals and the 'monastic precepts'. As a consequence this section now follows directly after the liturgical synaxarion. As we have already mentioned before this sequence is also found in the Evergetis-Typikon. This suggests that in the Pantokrator-Typikon the Stoudite material is rearranged so as to reflect contemporary trends. Such modifications are, of course, commonplace in Byzantine rules: as we have seen the Patirion-Typikon also reshuffled the stipulations that it adopted from the Stoudios-Typikon. However, there is one significant difference between the two texts. In the Patirion *Typikon* the elaborate transitions of the Stoudite model are preserved, with the result that they now appear in inappropriate places. By contrast, in the Pantokrator-Typikon these transitions are either altogether omitted or replaced with much shorter phrases such as 'it is time also to speak about the common table of the brothers' (καὶρὸς δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς κοινῆς τραπέζης τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαλαβεῖν).⁵⁶ The freedom with which the Pantokrator-Typikon makes use of Stoudite material can be seen most clearly in the treatment of the stipulations about the care for the ill. The previous analysis has shown that in the Stoudios-Typikon these stipulations were the last topic in the 'monastic precepts', following the chapter about the installation of the abbot. In the Pantokrator-Typikon, on the other hand, they appear in the section about monastic diet where they are inserted between the first and the second meal, a practice for which there are several contemporary parallels.⁵⁷ In order to accommodate the stipulations in their new context the introductory paragraph is completely reworked:

⁵¹ Cf. ARRANZ, *Typikon xix–xxv*. The Trigona-Typikon is the rule that Luke imposed on the monastic confederation whose leader he was.

⁵² Pantokrator-Typikon, ed. P. GAUTIER, *Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator*. *REB* 32 (1974) 1–144.

⁵³ PENTKOVSKIJ, *Tipikon* 89–104. By contrast, the Pantokrator-Typikon is not indebted to the Evergetis-Typikon, cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Abbots of Evergetis* 111–115. The Diataxis of Attaleiates contains no borrowings from the Stoudios-Typikon and is therefore not considered in this article. For other adaptations of the Evergetis-Typikon, cf. also D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Liturgical Innovation in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Constantinople: Hours and Inter-Hours in the Evergetis Typikon, its 'Daughters' and its 'Grand-Daughters'*. *REB* 71 (2013) 149–172.

⁵⁴ See the discussion in the following paragraphs.

⁵⁵ Pantokrator-Typikon (67–69, 619–684 GAUTIER). In a recent article it was argued that the arrangements reflect liturgical innovations of the second half of the eleventh century, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Decoding Monastic Ritual: Auto-Installation and the Struggle for the spiritual Autonomy of Byzantine Monasteries in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. *JÖB* 58 (2008) 75–86.

⁵⁶ Pantokrator-Typikon 47, 291 (GAUTIER).

⁵⁷ *Kecharitomene-Typikon*, ed. P. GAUTIER, *Le typikon de la Théotokos Kécharitôméné*. *REB* 43 (1985) 5–165, esp. 91–93.

<p>Soter: Τελευταῖος ὁ μου ἔστω λόγος, ὡς ἂν εἴ τις ὠραίοις τοίχοις ἐπιπρέπων κάλλιστος ὄροφος, ὁ περὶ τῆς εἰς τοὺς νόσφ κατεχομένου ἐπιμελείας. Δεῖ τοίνυν τὸν καθηγούμενον σπεύδειν ὅπως ἰατρὸς οἰκεῖος ἢ τῇ μονῇ.⁵⁸</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Εἰ δέ τις ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον νοσεῖ ὡς κληνῆρης εἶναι καὶ μὴ βαδίζειν δύνασθαι (sc. πρὸς τὴν τράπεζαν), γινέσθω ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ αὐτοῦ ἢ προσήκουσα ἐπιμέλεια, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν νοσοῦντων ἐπιμελείσθω ὁ καθηγούμενος ἰατρὸν ἔχων παραβάλλονα τῇ μονῇ.⁵⁹</p>
---	--

Moreover, in the following section the overlaps with the Stoudios-Typikon are confined to the mention of ‘plasters’ (ἔμπλαστρα) and ‘salves’ (ἔλαια) and one would not know that the older text provided the inspiration were it not for a number of direct borrowings in the concluding paragraph:

<p>Alexius: ... and then the hegoumenos frequently visits him (sc. the sick one) and takes care of him, so that no one in need is deprived of bread, or good wine, or anything else.⁶⁰</p>	<p>Soter: ... τοῦ καθηγουμένου μὲν συνεχέστερον ὡς αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν ἰατρὸν) φοιτῶντος, καὶ προαιρουμένου μηδενὸς τῶν δεόντων αὐτὸν ἔστερησθαι μὴ ἄρτου καθαρῶ, μὴ οἴνου καλλίστου, μὴ ἑτέρου τινός.⁶¹</p>	<p>Pantokrator: ... αὐτὸς (sc. ὁ καθηγούμενος) δὲ παραβαλλέτω συχνότερον ἐπισκεπτόμενος τοὺς δεομένους ἐπιμελείας καὶ προνοούμενος τούτων ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς χρειώδεσιν, ἄρτω καθαρῶ, οἴνω καλλίστῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς δυναμένοις τοὺς ἐν νόσοις παρηγορεῖν.⁶²</p>
--	---	---

Thanks to Pentkovskij’s research the dependence of the Pantokrator-Typikon on the Stoudios-Typikon is well established. However, further study reveals that other twelfth-century rules also contain Stoudite material. At this point we need to turn our attention to the Mamas-Typikon, which dates to the year 1158.⁶³ As is well known the Mamas-Typikon belongs to a group of rules that are dependent on the Evergetis-Typikon. Many chapters from this earlier text reappear in it, which are either copied word for word or reproduced with varying degrees of modification.⁶⁴ However, this does not mean that all passages can be traced back to the Evergetis-Typikon. One example is a stipulation about the blessing of the abbot in a chapter about the refectory whose first part is almost entirely comprised of Evergetine material.⁶⁵ Comparison shows that it has close parallels in the texts that we have been discussing so far:

⁵⁸ Soter-Typikon AP-10 (290, 2–5 ARRANZ).

⁵⁹ Pantokrator-Typikon 53, 379–382 (GAUTIER).

⁶⁰ Alexius-Typikon 394, 40–43 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁶¹ Soter-Typikon AP-10 (290, 16–18 ARRANZ).

⁶² Pantokrator-Typikon 53, 383–386 (GAUTIER).

⁶³ Mamas-Typikon, ed. S. EUSTRATIADIS, Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος, *Hell* 1 (1928) 245–314.

⁶⁴ Cf. JORDAN – MORRIS, Hypotyposis of the Monastery of Theotokos Evergetis 140–141.

⁶⁵ Mamas-Typikon 17 (273, 18–274, 1 EUSTRATIADIS); cf. Evergetis-Typikon 9 (33–35, 325–357 GAUTIER).

<p>Evergetis: ... εἰ δυνατόν, ἐν λόγοις τισὶ καὶ συντετμημένοις τοῖς ῥήμασιν.⁶⁶</p>	<p>Mamas: ... εἰ δυνατόν, ἐν λόγοις τισὶ καὶ συντετμημένοις τοῖς ῥήμασιν. Ὅτε δέ γε οὐ πάρεισιν ὁ καθηγούμενος τυχὸν δι' ἀσθένειαν σώματος παρεμποδίσασαν, ἢ καὶ τινα ἐτέραν αἰτίαν, ὁ οἰκονόμος ἀντ' αὐτοῦ πληρώσει τὰ ὀφειλόμενα παρ' ἐκείνου γίνεσθαι, καὶ τούτου δὲ μὴ παρόντος, ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης πληρώσει τὰ ὀφειλόμενα.⁶⁷</p>	<p>Alexius: Nobody shall take a blessing from anyone when the hegoumenos is present. When he himself cannot come due to illness, either bodily weakness or any other reason, then it is malice to blame him, or talk about his departure. Instead of him the oikonomos should knock and give a blessing over the drinks, if he is honoured with the rank of a priest. If he is not, then he does the knocking, and then orders the protopop or the priest who celebrated the service, from whom it is fitting to bless the drinks. And if the oikonomos is not present, then the senior priest should do everything, or it also can be done by a priest who celebrated the service, as if he was hegoumenos.⁶⁸</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Οὐδείς μέντοι παρ' ἑτέρου εὐλογίαν αἰτήσσει, παρόντος τοῦ καθηγουμεμένου. Τούτου δὲ ἀπόντος, ὁ οἰκονόμος ἀντ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κροῦσμα καὶ τὴν τῶν κρασοβολίων εὐλογίαν ποιεῖτω, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἱερεὺς εἴη, κρουέτω μὲν αὐτὸς τὸ ξύλον, ἐπιτρεπέτω δὲ τῷ πρωτοπαπᾶ ἢ τῷ λειτουργήσαντι ἱερεῖ, καὶ ποιεῖτω τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ πόματος. Ἀπόντος δὲ τοῦ οἰκονόμου, αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ἱερέων πρῶτος ἢ ὁ λειτουργήσας ἱερεὺς ποιεῖτω τὰ παρὰ τοῦ καθηγουμεμένου γίνεσθαι ὀφειλόμενα.⁶⁹</p>
--	--	---	--

⁶⁶ Evergetis-Typikon 9 (35, 356–357 GAUTIER).

⁶⁷ Mamas-Typikon 17 (273, 38–275, 5 GAUTIER).

⁶⁸ Alexius-Typikon 369, 34–42 (PENTKOVSKIJ). For a parallel in the Trigona-Typikon, cf. PENTKOVSKIJ, Typikon 83–84: Νότα κομε σε ακκαδισσι και λο αββατε νον φοσσε πρεσεντε, περ εσσο λο εκκλησιαρχα ετ λο σοναρι ετ λα ββενεδιτζιονε φαρρα σε σαρρα σατζερδοτο, ετ σε νον, λο εκκλησιαρχα σονερα ετ λο σατζερδοτο κη τζελεβρο φαρρα λα ββενεδιτζιονε.

⁶⁹ Pantokrator-Typikon 51, 339–345 (GAUTIER).

The similarities are so striking that they can only be explained through dependence on the same source. However, this does not necessarily mean that the author of the Mamas-Typikon borrowed directly from the Stoudios-Typikon. As is well known the Mamas-Typikon is closely related to another rule, the Kecharitomene-Typikon, which Empress Irene Doukaina had drawn up between the years 1110 and 1116. Both texts contain passages from the Evergetis-Typikon but not all borrowings that appear in one text are also found in the other. Moreover, the Mamas-Typikon and the Kecharitomene-Typikon have passages in common, which are not found in the Evergetis-Typikon, and lastly each of the two texts contains elements that are specific to it.⁷⁰ The stipulation about the blessing of the abbot, for example, only appears in the Mamas-Typikon. However, the immediately following passage in the Mamas-Typikon has a counterpart in the Kecharitomene-Typikon, which is in fact almost identical since it differs only in the use of feminine forms, which is necessitated by the fact that the latter text was destined for a convent. This passage is not found in the Evergetis-Typikon but comparison shows that it, too, has a close counterpart in the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius whose text it reproduces more faithfully than the Pantokrator-Typikon. Moreover, the Kecharitomene-Typikon then contains another such passage, which is not found in the Mamas-Typikon, before the two texts dovetail again with the introduction of a new topic:

<p>Alexius: After the monks stand up from their meal, if there is a second meal and they are offered one, then they eat bread and other food just as during the first meal, and the cellarer, the butler, the chief of taskmasters and other workers should eat.</p> <p>But it is not fitting for anyone, as we said earlier, having stood up to take something with them from what is offered: neither bread, nor anything else; but no one from the monks can</p>	<p>Mamas (Kecharitomene): Τοῖνον μετὰ τὸ τοὺς μοναχοὺς (τὰς μοναχὰς) ἀναστῆναι τῆς τραπέζης, ἐστίασις δευτέρα γινέσθω (γενέσθω), ἄρτων τε παρατιθεμένων καὶ βρωμάτων ὅσα ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ παρατέθειται τραπέζῃ, καὶ ἐστίασθωσαν (ἐστίαθωσαν) οἱ διακονήσαντες (αἱ διακονήσασαι).⁷¹</p> <p>Kecharitomene (only): Μὴ ἐξέστω δέ – ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐστίασει τυπωθῆναι διέλαθεν – ἀνισταμένη τῆς τραπέζης αἴρειν τι μεθ’ ἐαυτῆς ἐκ τῶν παρακειμένων μήτε ἄρτον μηθ’ ἕτερόν τι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τῶν μοναχῶν τις αἰτεῖτω μεθ’ ἐαυτῆς λαβεῖν ἢ μαγειρείαν ἢ ὄσπριον ἢ ἄλλο τι, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ πᾶσαι ἐστίαθωσαν.⁷²</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀναστῆναι τοὺς μοναχοὺς τῆς τραπέζης</p> <p>ἐστίαθωσαν οἱ διακονήσαντες.</p> <p>Μηδενὶ δὲ ἐξέστω ἄρτον ἢ ἕτερόν τι τῶν παρακειμένων λαβεῖν εἰς τὸ κελλίον αὐτοῦ.</p>
---	---	---

⁷⁰ Cf. JORDAN – MORRIS, Hypotyposis of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis 139–140, 142, with references to earlier secondary literature.

⁷¹ Mamas-Typikon 17 (274, 5–7 EUSTRATIADIS); Kecharitomene-Typikon 43 (93, 1314–1316 GAUTIER).

⁷² Kecharitomene-Typikon 43 (94, 1317–1320 GAUTIER).

<p>ask to take to their cell any hot food, nor porridge, nor can they keep there anything else, but should eat in public.</p> <p>If somebody is unable to attend the common meal due to some illness or because he was sent on an important errand by the hegoumenos, and he gets delayed⁷³</p>	<p>Mamas (Kecharitomene): Ἡ δὲ τροφή ὑμῶν ἔσται ἐν τῇ λιτῇ ἡμέρᾳ (ἐν ταῖς λιταῖς ἡμέραις) κατὰ τὸ ἄριστον⁷⁴</p>	<p>Εἰ δέ τινες τῶν εἰς διακονίας ἀποστελλομένων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐμβραδύνησαν⁷⁵</p>
---	---	---

Thus we have a sequence of three passages of Stoudite provenance, inserted into an Evergetine framework, of which the first is only found in the Mamas-Typikon and the third is only found in the Kecharitomene-Typikon whereas the second appears in both texts. This suggests that the authors of these two rules borrowed independently and selectively from the same model, which contained all three Stoudite passages. There can be no doubt that this common model is to be identified with the now lost Philanthropos-Typikon, which had been drawn up for another foundation of Empress Irene Doukaina. Since the Philanthropos monastery possessed copies of the Evergetis-Synaxarion and of the Katecheseis of Paul of Evergetis we can be certain that its disciplinary rule was based on the Evergetis-Typikon.⁷⁶ When Empress Irene Doukaina then proceeded to establish the Kecharitomene convent, nothing would have been more natural than to make use of the Philanthropos-Typikon, in particular since there the original Evergetis-Typikon had already been modified in order to reflect Irene's specific concerns.⁷⁷ Furthermore, the author of the Mamas-Typikon had been steward in the Philanthropos monastery before he was head-hunted by the lay re-founder of the Mamas monastery. In the proem he declares proudly that he had been raised in the Philanthropos monastery and that he had served there for many years.⁷⁸ Therefore one can assume that he used the rule of his old institution as a model, in particular since this was common practice at the time: when founders invited monks from other communities they did so because they wished to emulate the particular way of life of these communities.⁷⁹

⁷³ Alexius-Typikon 371, 4–22 (PENTKOVKIJ).

⁷⁴ Mamas-Typikon 17 (274, 8 EUSTRATIADES); Kecharitomene-Typikon 44 (93, 1322 GAUTIER).

⁷⁵ Pantokrator-Typikon 51, 372–375 (GAUTIER).

⁷⁶ JORDAN – MORRIS, Hypotyposis 30, note 46. For the synaxarium cf. A. M. PENTKOVSKIJ, Bogosluzhebnyi sinaksar' Konstantinopol'skogo monastyria Khrista Chelovekoliubsta. *Bogoslovskij Vestnik* 4 (2004) 177–208; for the katecheseis, cf. B. CROSTINI, Towards a Study of the Scriptorium of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis: Preliminary Remarks, in: *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, ed. M. Mullett – A. Kirby. Belfast 1994, 176–197, esp. 191.

⁷⁷ This does, of course, not mean that the author of the Kecharitomene-Typikon may not also have made use of the original Evergetis-Typikon. However, this issue does not affect the discussion of our passage.

⁷⁸ Mamas-Typikon, proem (259, 3–6 EUSTRATIADES).

⁷⁹ JORDAN – MORRIS, Hypotyposis of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis 140, question that the Philanthropos-Typikon was the common source for the Mamas-Typikon and the Kecharitomene-Typikon. They point out that the texts have different structures and that individual passages are often differently phrased. However, there is no reason to think that either the Kecharitomene-Typikon or the Mamas-Typikon followed their model in all respects closely. The differences can be easily explained when we assume that the authors of the two extant texts made change independently from one another.

Thus we can conclude that around the year 1110 the author of the Philanthropos-Typikon inserted Stoudite material into his text and that some of this material was then transferred into the later adaptations for the Kecharitomene convent and the Mamas monastery. There can be no doubt that the main inspiration of the author of the Philanthropos-Typikon was the Evergetis-Typikon and that his text can therefore be classified as a ‘daughter’ of Evergetis. However, one should not overemphasise this link because the author clearly did not feel beholden to the Evergetine tradition. Instead he drew freely from the Stoudite tradition and quite possibly also from other older rules that have not survived, in order to supplement or replace passages in the Evergetis-Typikon, which he felt to be either incomplete or inappropriate.⁸⁰ Indeed, he used the same approach when he adapted the Stoudite material. Comparison shows that he omitted the descriptions of the complex ritual observed in the Stoudios refectory and only borrowed passages that dealt with disciplinary and organisational issues arising during mealtimes. The ‘pick-and-mix’ approach of the author of the Philanthropos-Typikon should caution us against seeing Constantinopolitan monasticism around the year 1100 exclusively through the Evergetine lens. Significantly it was at that time that Bartholomew of Simeri visited the capital and obtained a copy of the Stoudios-Typikon. Moreover, only a few decades later considerable amounts of Stoudite material were reproduced in the Pantokrator-Typikon. This suggests that in the first half of the twelfth century the Stoudite tradition had not yet lost its lustre.

A LOST INTERMEDIATE SOURCE

Our findings so far raise the question: where did the authors of the Philanthropos and Pantokrator rules find the Stoudite passages that they incorporated into their texts? The most straightforward explanation would be that they drew directly on the Stoudios-Typikon. After all, this was the case in Southern Italy where the rule that Bartholomew had brought home from Constantinople served as the model for the *typika* of the Patirion, Trigona and Soter monasteries. However, at this point we need to remember that the Constantinopolitan *typika* are much less close to the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius than the three Southern Italian texts. This raises the possibility that their authors drew on an intermediate source, which was in turn based on the Stoudios-Typikon. In what follows we will make the case for the existence of such an intermediate source. Our argument will be based on a sequence of Stoudite passages that is found both in the Pantokrator-Typikon and in the Mamas-Typikon.⁸¹ In the Pantokrator-Typikon these passages follow the chapters about Lent and Lenten fare, which are inspired by the Stoudios-Typikon, whereas in the Mamas-Typikon they are preceded by an exhortation to the monastic officials, which is borrowed wholesale from the Evergetis-Typikon.⁸² In the Pantokrator-Typikon the passages include stipulations about the proper interaction with the abbot, the use of baths, the admission of new members, the issue of down-payments, and the prohibition of visits by women, whereas in the Mamas-Typikon only the first two stipulations are found.⁸³

We will start the discussion with the description of how monks should interact with the abbot. When one compares the versions of the Mamas-Typikon and the Pantokrator-Typikon with the rule for the Patirion monastery, it is immediately evident that they are derived from the same source:

⁸⁰ Significantly, we find neither a reference to the blessing of the abbot nor the arrangements for the serving monks in the Evergetis-Typikon.

⁸¹ These passages have no counterpart in the Kecharitomene-Typikon, which will therefore not be considered here.

⁸² Pantokrator-Typikon 57–59, 463–497 (GAUTIER); Mamas-Typikon 23 (279, 34–280, 28 EUSTRATIADIS).

⁸³ Pantokrator-Typikon 59–61, 498–534 (GAUTIER); Mamas-Typikon 24 (280, 30–281, 7 EUSTRATIADIS); prohibition of entrance fee in Alexius-Typikon 391–392 (PENTKOVSKIJ); for the rule about visits of women cf. the discussion below.

<p>Patirion: Ὅσακις οὖν τις τῶν μοναχῶν ἢ παρὰ τοῦ καθηγουμένου προσκληθεῖς ἢ οἴκοθεν κινηθεῖς ὡς αὐτὸν ἀφίκοιτο, ... πρῶτον αὐτῷ μετάνοιαν βαλέτω χάμαι, εἴθ' οὕτως, τὰς χεῖρας δήσας καὶ εὐλαβῶς στὰς ἀναμενέτω.⁸⁴</p>	<p>Mamas: Κὰν προσκληθῆ παρ' αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ καθηγουμένου) ἢ καὶ οἴκοθεν αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπέλθοι ... προσκύνησιν βαθεῖαν πρότερον ποιείτω καὶ οὕτω συνδεσμῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἰστάσθω.⁸⁵</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Καὶ ὁ προσκληθεῖς δὲ καὶ ὁ οἴκοθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικόμενος ... βαλλέτω μετάνοιαν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας συνδεσμείωσαν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ καθηγουμένου ἰστάμενοι.⁸⁶</p>
---	---	---

However, the Mamas and Pantokrator rules resemble each other more closely than they resemble the direct adaptations of the Stoudios-Typikon. This becomes evident when we turn to the concluding paragraph:

<p>Alexius: Let silence and great peace, as well as solidarity with one another and obedience to the brethren prosper forever and reside in the monastery.⁸⁷</p>	<p>Patirion: Ἦσυχία δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη πολλὴ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ὁμόνοια καὶ ὑποταγὴ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀνθείτω τε ἀεὶ καὶ πολιτευέσθω ἐν τῇ μονῇ.⁸⁸</p>	<p>Pantokrator: ... βραβεύουσης ἐν ἅπασι τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς ὑπακοῆς.⁸⁹</p>	<p>Mamas: ... εἰρήνης οὐσης πανταχοῦ καὶ ὁμονοίας τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους βραβεύουσης.⁹⁰</p>
---	--	--	--

Comparison with the Church Slavonic translation of the rule of Patriarch Alexius reveals that the passage in the Patirion-Typikon is a faithful copy of the Stoudite original. By contrast, the versions in the Pantokrator and Mamas rules are considerably modified. Of particular significance is the genitive participle βραβεύουσης, which takes the place of the finite verbs ἀνθείτω and πολιτευέσθω in the Stoudios-Typikon. Its appearance in both the Pantokrator-Typikon and the Mamas-Typikon leaves no doubt that the two later texts are related to each other. Since the Mamas-Typikon is based on the Philanthropos-Typikon, which dates to the beginning of the twelfth century, one could argue that the Pantokrator-Typikon borrows from this older text, in particular since it was drawn up for the mother of the founder of the Pantokrator monastery. In support of this argument one could point out that in the Pantokrator-Typikon the Stoudite material is often more abbreviated than it is in the Mamas-Typikon. For example, the latter text retains the prepositional phrase πρὸς ἀλλήλους whereas the former text omits it. However, this interpretation runs into considerable difficulties because the Pantokrator-Typikon contains much more Stoudite material than the Philanthropos-Typikon, which was overwhelmingly based on the Evergetis-Typikon. Thus one would have to assume that the author of the Pantokrator-Typikon borrowed some passages directly from the Stoudios-Typikon whereas he took

⁸⁴ Patirion-Typikon 68 (PENTKOVSKIJ); identical text in Alexius-Typikon 381, 23–36 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁸⁵ Mamas-Typikon 24 (281, 1–6 EUSTRATIADES).

⁸⁶ Pantokrator-Typikon 59, 509–511 (GAUTIER).

⁸⁷ Alexius-Typikon 381, 23–36 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁸⁸ Patirion-Typikon 68 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁸⁹ Pantokrator-Typikon 59, 512 (GAUTIER).

⁹⁰ Mamas-Typikon 24 (281, 7 EUSTRATIADES).

others from the Philanthropos-Typikon.⁹¹ It is evident that this scenario is highly unlikely. Therefore one must accept the existence of an intermediate source whose author had already refashioned the original Stoudite text. This source was then adapted extensively in the Pantokrator-Typikon and more selectively in the Philanthropos-Typikon. There can be no doubt that it was a full-scale *typikon* because both later texts contain material from all three sections of the original Stoudios-Typikon.

Our findings so far raise the question: how far-reaching are the modifications that the author of the intermediary source introduced into his Stoudite model? In order to find an answer we need to turn to the passages that in the two texts immediately precede the stipulation about the honour due to the abbot on which we have focused so far. As we shall see these passages are also of Stoudite provenance. Since the interrelation of the texts is quite complex we will start with a comparison of the rules of Patirion and Mamas and only in a second step extend the discussion to the Pantokrator-Typikon:

<p>Patirion:</p> <p>Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ μοναχικὰ παραγγέλματα τοῖς ἐν κοινοβίῳ ζώσιν ἀναγκαιότατα.</p> <p>Ὁ μὲν περὶ τε τῆς τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων μοναχῶν διαίτης λόγος καὶ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἐστιατόριον εὐταξίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα εἰκὸς ἦν παραδοῦναι τὸν τὴν τοιαύτην πραγματείαν τάττοντα ἤδη εἴρηται.</p> <p>Δεῖ δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ ἐτέρας ὠφελιμώτερας καὶ χαριεστέρας παραινέσεως τῇ παρουσίῃ βίβλῳ προσθεῖναι καὶ πρῶτόν γε <u>περὶ τῆς ὀφειλομένης τῷ καθηγουμένῳ παρὰ τῶν μοναχῶν ὑποταγῆς.</u></p> <p>Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα παρὰ τῶν ἀρχομένων <u>αἰδῶ</u> τε καὶ εὐνοίαν ἀπανταχοῦ μὲν χρησιμώτατόν τε χρῆμα ὀρῶμεν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ ἐν τοῖς κοινοβίοις, εἰσηγούμεθα τοῖς τῆσδε τῆς εὐαγεστάτης μονῆς μοναχοῖς μὴ ἐν παρέργῳ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀρετὴν τίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ πολλοῦ ταύτην ποιεῖσθαι <u>τῷ τῆς οἰκουμένης φωστῆρι καὶ διδασκάλῳ Παύλῳ πειθομένοις νομοθετοῦντι καὶ λέγοντι· πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπέικετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες.</u></p> <p>Μὴ δὴ οὖν τις ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ καθηγουμένου πραττέτω τι, ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσι ταῖς ἐκείνου ἐπέσθω προστάξεσιν.⁹²</p>	<p>Mamas:</p> <p><u>Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν προεστῶτα αἰδοῦς καὶ ὑποχωρήσεως ἢ τοι ὑποπτώσεως.</u></p> <p>Ὅτε δὲ μέλλει τις – ἀναγκαῖα γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα τοῖς ἐν κοινοβίῳ ζῶσι τὰ παραγγέλματα – τῆς μονῆς ὅλως ἐξιέναι, ἢ διακονίας τινὸς χάριν ἢ δι' οἰκείας ἔνεκεν χρείας, μὴ πρότερον τῆς μονῆς ἐξιέτω, πρὶν ἂν εὐχὴν λάβοι παρὰ τοῦ καθηγουμένου.</p> <p>Ἦσαύτως μῆτε εἰς λουτρὸν ἀπιέτω χωρὶς μετανοίας, μῆτε μὴν τὰς τρίχας ἀποκειρέσθω ἢ φλεβοτομείσθω.</p> <p>Καὶ ὁ μέλλων δὲ σημᾶναι καὶ οἱ λαχόντες ἰεουργῆσαι καὶ οἱ ψάλται καὶ οἱ κανονάρχαι καὶ πάντες ἀπλῶς πρὸ τοῦ ἔργου εὐχὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβανέτωσαν.</p> <p><u>Δεῖ γὰρ τὸν πειθαρχεῖν τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς βουλόμενον διατάγμασι</u></p> <p>μηδέν τι τὸ σύνολον ἄνευ τοῦ καθηγουμένου πράττειν, ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσι ταῖς ἐκείνου ἔπεσθαι προσταγαῖς.⁹³</p>
---	---

Comparison with the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius has already shown that the Patirion-Typikon represents in this instance the text of the Stoudios-Typikon. At the same time it is evident that the passage

⁹¹ If this hypothesis were correct the author of the Pantokrator-Typikon would have had to avoid adopting any of the much more plentiful Evergetine material found in the Philanthropos-Typikon. As noted earlier the Pantokrator-Typikon does not contain any literal borrowings from the Evergetis-Typikon. The parallels that John Thomas has highlighted are of a very general nature and do not prove dependence, cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Abbots of Evergetis 115–116*.

⁹² Patirion-Typikon 66–67 (PENTKOVSKI).

⁹³ Mamas-Typikon 24 (260, 30–261, 1 EUSTRATIADIS).

in the Mamas-Typikon, too, is ultimately derived from the Stoudios-Typikon. Not only does it share many elements with its counterpart in the Patirion-Typikon; it is also followed by the same stipulation about how to interact with the abbot that we have discussed before. However, this does not mean that the redactor of the text preserved in the Mamas-Typikon left the original text unchanged. In the Patirion-Typikon, and thus also in the Stoudios-Typikon, the passage introduces the second section of the text, with the overall title ‘monastic precepts’, a transition that refers back to the previous section, and with a subtitle announcing the first topic in this section, the respect due to the abbot. By contrast, the Mamas-Typikon has integrated the overall title into the text and instead moved the subtitle to the beginning. Moreover, the reference back to the previous section is omitted.

When we turn to the second part of the passage under discussion we encounter similar changes. In the Patirion-Typikon the subtitle is followed by a general statement about the need to obey one’s superiors, a reference to the teachings of Paul, and an exhortation not to do anything without the permission of the abbot. In the Mamas-Typikon the general statement is left out, the reference to Paul is considerably shortened, and only the last part is quoted in full. This suggests that the author responsible for the version in the Mamas *Typikon* pared down the text of his model. This impression is further strengthened when we consider the immediately following passages in the two texts. There the Patirion-Typikon sets out an elaborate comparison between monks and soldiers, which we have not quoted, before giving the instructions about the proper interaction between monks and abbots that we have discussed before.⁹⁴ In the Mamas-Typikon, on the other hand, these instructions follow immediately after the exhortation not to do anything without the permission of the abbot.

However, by far the most striking innovation is the insertion of additional material. As we have seen above, the Mamas-Typikon contains three different stipulations, which are not found at this point in the Patirion-Typikon: monks should not to leave the monastery on official or private business, they should not go to a bathhouse or to the barber, and they should not perform services without the knowledge and permission of the abbot. Comparison reveals that these stipulations are also borrowed from the Stoudios-Typikon. However, there they appear in different contexts. In the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius the injunction not to leave the monastery is found in a later chapter of the ‘monastic precepts’ whereas the stipulation about the organisation of the services appears in the third, liturgical section of the text.⁹⁵ This second stipulation is also part of the liturgical section in the Soter-Typikon, which leaves no doubt that this was its original place in the Stoudios-Typikon:

<p>Alexius: It should be known, that when a paramonar wants to sound or to make a prayer for the holy liturgy, <u>first he should receive <a blessing> from the hegoumenos.</u>⁹⁶</p>	<p>Soter: Ὅσακις δὲ ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης μέλλει σημᾶναι, ἢ ὁ πρεσβύτερος τὴν θεῖαν ἐκτελέσαι λειτουργίαν, <u>εὐχὴν πρότερον παρὰ τοῦ καθηγουμένου ὀφείλει λαμβάνειν.</u>⁹⁷</p>	<p>Mamas: Καὶ ὁ μέλλων δὲ σημᾶναι καὶ οἱ λαχόντες ἱερουργῆσαι καὶ οἱ ψάλται καὶ οἱ κανον- άρχαι καὶ πάντες ἀπλῶς <u>πρὸ τοῦ ἔργου εὐχὴν παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαμβανέτωσαν.</u>⁹⁸</p>
---	--	--

⁹⁴ Patirion-Typikon (67–68 PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁹⁵ In the Patirion-Typikon the stipulation follows immediately after the passage about proper interaction with the abbot, cf. Patirion-Typikon 68 (PENTKOVSKIJ). In the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius it is found in the latter part of the later chapter about monastic clothing. There it is followed by a regulation about visits to bathhouses, cf. Alexius-Typikon 385, 24–35 (PENTKOVSKIJ), which provides another parallel for the Mamas-Typikon.

⁹⁶ Alexius-Typikon 409, 44–410, 3 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

⁹⁷ Soter-Typikon AP–36 (297, 22–25 ARRANZ).

⁹⁸ Mamas-Typikon 24 (280, 35–38 EUSTRATIADES).

This shows clearly that the author responsible for the version in the Mamas-Typikon went systematically through the entire text of his model and picked out stipulations that had one element in common: the blessing of the abbot, which had to be obtained before any kind of activity was embarked on. In a second step he then combined these stipulations and inserted them into the introductory passage of the ‘monastic precepts’ before the reference to Paul and the exhortation not to do anything without the permission of the abbot. As a consequence these last two passages take on a new function. Whereas in the Stoudios-Typikon they play a rather subordinate role in a lengthy introductory paragraph, in the Mamas-Typikon they become the general conclusion of a series of specific rules. All this confirms the impression that the author of the version reflected in the Mamas-Typikon reworked his model in quite a sophisticated manner and that he did not slavishly cling to the original text. In this respect he differs markedly from the authors of the Southern Italian rules who also rearranged the material they found in their model but left the old transitions in place, with the result that these transitions are meaningless in the new contexts.

The passages under discussion are not included in the Kecharitomene-Typikon. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the modified framework found in the Mamas-Typikon was also found of the lost Philanthropos-Typikon. In order to establish whether the modifications had already been made by the author of the lost intermediary source, which served as model for the Philanthropos-Typikon, we need to extend our discussion to the Pantokrator-Typikon. Comparison shows that the Mamas and Pantokrator rules address similar issues: leaving the monastery for baths or other errands, and embarking on services for the community. Even more significant is the fact that in the latter case there exist counterparts in known adaptations of the Stoudios-Typikon:

<p>Alexius: When somebody wants to leave the monastery due to some service or their own urgent need, then first he does not leave until he receives a prayer from the hegoumenos and a seal, receiving that which a guest-master will know that the leave of the monk was ordered by the hegoumenos, otherwise he should not accept him.⁹⁹</p>	<p>Mamas: Ὅτε δὲ μέλλει τις ... τῆς μονῆς ὄλωσ ἐξιέναι, ἢ διακο- νίας τινὸς χάριν ἢ δι’ οἰκειίας ἔνεκεν χρείας, μὴ πρότερον τῆς μονῆς ἐξιέτω, πρὶν ἂν εὐχὴν λάβῃ παρὰ τοῦ καθηγουμένου.¹⁰⁰</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Πάντες δὲ οἱ διακονίας τινὸς ἄψασθαι μέλλοντες ἢ ἐντὸς τῆς μονῆς ἢ ἐκτὸς πρότερον παρὰ τοῦ καθη- γουμένου εὐχὴν λαμβανέτω- σαν.¹⁰¹</p>
---	--	---

The fact that an almost identical passage is found in the Patirion-Typikon leaves no doubt that the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius faithfully reproduces its Stoudite model.¹⁰² The versions in the Mamas and Pantokrator rules are considerably shortened: there we find no reference to the ‘seal’ of the abbot. At the same time, however, we can observe that the Mamas-Typikon preserves a fuller text. It retains the detail that monks may go out on their own business, which is omitted in Pantokrator-Typikon.

⁹⁹ Alexius-Typikon 385, 20–23 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

¹⁰⁰ Mamas-Typikon 24 (280, 31–34 EUSTRATIADIS).

¹⁰¹ Pantokrator-Typikon 59, 498–506 (GAUTIER).

¹⁰² Patirion-Typikon 68 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

Moreover, it alone has the second Stoudite stipulation, that monks should not start the services without the permission of the abbot. There can be no doubt that this fuller version reflects the text of the common model because in the Stoudios-Typikon the second stipulation ended with arrangements for the times when the abbot was not present. This conclusion is missing in the Mamas-Typikon but it has a counterpart in the Pantokrator-Typikon where it now follows directly the stipulation about monks who need to leave the monastery:

<p>Alexius: And if the hegoumenos is absent, then from the steward, and if he is absent as well, then from the senior priest.¹⁰³</p>	<p>Soter: Εἰ δὲ ἀπολιμπάνοιτο ὁ καθηγούμενος, παρὰ τοῦ πρωτοεκκλησιάρχου (sic).¹⁰⁴</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Εἰ δὲ ἀποδημεῖ ὁ καθηγούμενος, ὁ οἰκονόμος τοῦτο ποιεῖτω· ἀμφοτέρων δὲ λειπόντων ὁ πρῶτος τῶν ἱερέων ἀναπληροῦτω τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν.¹⁰⁵</p>
---	---	---

The passages discussed so far show that here, too, the authors of the Philanthropos and Pantokrator rules drew on a common source whose redactor had already modified the original Stoudite text, and that each of them then introduced further modifications. In the case of the Pantokrator-Typikon these further modifications are considerable because there the overall framework that we have found in the Mamas-Typikon is entirely absent. Instead the individual stipulations simply follow one another without any articulating features, a pattern that then continues in the subsequent passage where we find the instructions about proper interaction with the abbot, which we have discussed earlier, and the regulations about new entrants that have no counterpart in the Mamas-Typikon. There can be no doubt that this is a secondary change, motivated by the wish of the author to integrate the material of its source into a new context. As we have said before, in the Pantokrator-Typikon the immediately preceding passage deals with Lent and Lenten fare. This topic is continued in the stipulations about leaving the monastery because they are now linked to the Lenten periods.¹⁰⁶ Therefore we can conclude that it is the Mamas-Typikon, and not the Pantokrator-Typikon, which reflects the text of the lost intermediate source and that the author of this source had indeed embarked on a sophisticated reorganisation of the Stoudite material.

So far we have focused on Stoudite elements in the intermediate source. However, this does not mean that this now lost text did not also contain non-Stoudite material. As we have mentioned before, in the Pantokrator-Typikon the series of borrowings from the ‘monastic precepts’ does not end with the instructions about how to interact with the abbot. Instead we find several more passages dealing with the treatment of newcomers, entrance fees, and the prohibition to let women enter the monastery. The first two passages are not found in the Mamas-Typikon. By contrast, the last one does have a counterpart there. Although the author of the Mamas-Typikon adopts the prohibition of visits by females from the Evergetis-Typikon he inserts a non-Evergetine passage, which has clear parallels in the Pantokrator-Typikon:

¹⁰³ Alexius-Typikon 409, 44–410, 3 (PENTKOVSKIJ).

¹⁰⁴ Soter-Typikon AP-36 (297, 22–25 ARRANZ). In the Soter-Typikon the steward is consistently replaced with the ecclesiarch.

¹⁰⁵ Pantokrator-Typikon 59, 498–506 (GAUTIER).

¹⁰⁶ Pantokrator-Typikon 59, 498–506 (GAUTIER).

<p>Evergetis: Καὶ τὴν μονὴν δὲ ἄβατόν τε καὶ παντελῶς ἀδιόδευτον γυναιξὶν ἐβουλόμεθα μὲν εἶναι καὶ ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, ἡ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν περιφάνεια καὶ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ταύτας ἀποπέμπεσθαι ῥαδίως οὐκ εἶασεν ἡμᾶς τοῦτο δὴ καὶ προτρέψασθαι.</p> <p>Διὰ τοι ταῦτα εἰσιέτωσαν μὲν ὅσαι βίῳ καὶ ἀρετῇ, εὐγενεΐα τε καὶ περιφανείᾳ διαβόητοι, σπανίως δὲ ἄγαν καὶ ἐπιτετηρημένως.¹⁰⁷</p>	<p>Mamas: Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐστὶ, τὸ γυναιξὶν ἄβατον εἶναι καθάπαξ τὴν μονήν,</p> <p>εἰ μήπου σπανίως ταφῆς ἔνεκεν ἢ μνημοσύνων τῶν καθ' αἷμα προσφκειομένων μαραρίτη αὐθέντη ἡμῶν καὶ νέφ δομήτορι ἢ καὶ ἐτέρων τινῶν μεγιστάνων ἴσως μετὰ ταῦτα ταφησομένων.</p> <p>Εἰσιέτωσαν μέντοι καὶ χάριν προσκυνήσεως ὅσαι βίῳ καὶ ἀρετῇ, εὐγενεΐα τε καὶ περιφανείᾳ διαβόητοι, σπανίως δὲ ἄγαν καὶ ἐπιτετηρημένως.¹⁰⁸</p>	<p>Pantokrator: Γυναῖκας εἰς τὴν μονὴν οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται· ἄβατος δὲ αὐταῖς ἔσται ἡ μονή, κἄν τινες τῶν περιφανῶν εἶεν καὶ βίῳ σεμνῶ κεκόσμηται καὶ τῇ ἐκ γένους λαμπρότητι·</p> <p>εἰ δὲ τινες ἴσως ἔνεκεν ταφῆς τῶν ὠκειωμένων αὐταῖς ἢ μνημοσύνων χάριν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχουσιν εἰσελθεῖν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πύλης τῆς μονῆς εἰσελεύσονται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πύλης τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἐλεούσης.¹⁰⁹</p>
--	---	---

This overlap has no counterpart in the other adaptations of the Stoudios-Typikon. In the Trigona-Typikon both entrance of females into the monastery and burial of laypeople in the graveyard of the monks is categorically ruled out.¹¹⁰ The Typikon of Patriarch Alexius, which reproduces the former of these passages, makes an exception for the empress.¹¹¹ However, this exception is not only phrased differently but most likely also a secondary modification.¹¹² At this point one might consider the possibility that in this case the Mamas-Typikon and the Pantokrator-Typikon are dependent on another otherwise unknown *typikon*. However, this seems highly unlikely since all other overlaps between the two texts can be traced back to the intermediate source. Thus we can conclude that the author of the intermediate source had already added this stipulation to his text because he found it impossible to resist the pressure exerted by laypeople.

¹⁰⁷ Evergetis-Typikon 39 (83, 1194–1200 GAUTIER).

¹⁰⁸ Mamas-Typikon 27 (282, 34–283, 5 EUSTRATIADIS).

¹⁰⁹ Pantokrator-Typikon 61, 530–534 (GAUTIER).

¹¹⁰ MERCATI, *Tipico* 223: Βολεμο ανκορα και τοταλμεντι α λο σαντο μοναστεριο νον ιντρι δοννα αλκονα, κομε ορδιαννο ετ λετζι ετ σαντι κονοσι. Κομανδαμο ανκορα και νον σια νεσσιουνο στρανερο σεπουλτο α λο κοιμητεριο δε λι μονατζι, τζοε ιντρο λο κλαυστρο δε λο μοναστεριο, και νον φοσσε μονακο.

¹¹¹ Alexius-Typikon 388, 15–17 (PENTKOVSKI): ‘We do not want women to be allowed into the holy monastery at all times, just as the law and rules command, and [they should not] be permitted inside because of any reason or excuse, and in this way [the monastery] remains honourable.’

¹¹² Alexius-Typikon 388, 25–27 (PENTKOVSKI): ‘If a queen wants to come to the monastery for prayers, then she should be allowed in alone, with her servants.’

A FURTHER 'MISSING LINK' AND THE IDENTITY OF THE INTERMEDIATE SOURCE

In the previous discussion we could see that the Stoudite material in the Mamas-Typikon was taken from the lost Philanthropos-Typikon whose author in turn had made use of the intermediate source. By contrast the exact nature of the relation between the Pantokrator-Typikon and the intermediate source has not yet been established. However, this issue is of great importance because the version in the Pantokrator-Typikon is much less close to this source than the version in the Mamas-Typikon. This inevitably raises the question: are the modifications due to the author of the Pantokrator-Typikon or must we postulate the existence of a lost model for the Pantokrator-Typikon whose author had already reworked the intermediate source?

In order to address this further question we need to turn our attention to the first abbot of the Pantokrator monastery, the monk Joseph. Joseph is not mentioned in the rule itself but is known to us from several other sources.¹¹³ A notice from a manuscript of the Synaxarium of the Church of Constantinople, which has recently been edited by Cyril Mango, casts some light on the background of this figure.¹¹⁴ This notice, which commemorates the consecration in the year 1142 of the monastic church of the Pantanassa on the island of St Glykeria, informs us that Joseph the abbot of the Pantokrator monastery took a prominent part in organising the ceremony.¹¹⁵ We are then further told that before he took over the direction of John Komnenos' foundation Joseph had held the same position in the Pantanassa monastery. When he left for the capital he entrusted the community to his disciple Philip, but he did not sever his connections with his motherhouse. Indeed, his contribution to the building of the church was not the only sign of his continuing care: he also donated to it a manuscript in which he refers to himself both as the abbot of the Pantokrator monastery and as Hagioglykerites, thus acknowledging his link with the place where he had received his monastic training.¹¹⁶

When Joseph became abbot of the Pantanassa monastery it had already existed for several decades. From the notice in the Synaxarium we learn that the protovestiarios Gregory Taronites had become monk on the island of St Glykeria and that he had started building a church there. This church was then completed by Basil the 'second founder', and by Joseph, Basil's spiritual son.¹¹⁷ Thus it is clear that Joseph was the product of a well-established monastic tradition. Unfortunately the notice says very little about the circumstances of his transfer to the Pantokrator monastery.¹¹⁸ All we hear is that Emperor John II entrusted him with the office of abbot.¹¹⁹ However, it may well be that he had a hand in drawing up the Pantokrator-Typikon and that he made use of the rule of his old institution. After all, this was standard practice at the time. As we have seen the abbot of the Mamas monastery who had been the steward of the Philanthropos monastery and who continued to refer to himself as Philanthropenos also used the rule of his motherhouse as a model for the Mamas-Typikon. If the Pantokrator-Typikon was indeed based on the rule for the monastery of

¹¹³ Cf. GAUTIER, *Typikon de Pantocrator* 22, who lists all known contemporary sources relating to Joseph.

¹¹⁴ C. MANGO, Twelfth-Century Notices from Cod. Christ Church gr. 53. *JÖB* 42 (1992) 221–228. For a fuller discussion cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Imperial founders and first abbots: the cases of John II Komnenos and Basil the Macedonian, in: *Founders and Refounders of Byzantine Monasteries*. Papers of the fifth Belfast Byzantine International Colloquium, Portaferry, September 1999, ed. M. Mullett. Belfast 2007, 344–365.

¹¹⁵ Notice on the consecration (222, 24–25 MANGO). For the location of St Glykeria, cf. R. JANIN, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins: Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique*. Paris 1957, 56–57, and the map on 54. On Gregory Taronites, a relative of John II, cf. P. MAGDALINO, *The empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*. Cambridge 1993, 254.

¹¹⁶ *Codex Sinaiticus* 339, cf. V. GARDTHAUSEN, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Sinaiticorum*. Oxford 1886, 72.

¹¹⁷ Notice on the consecration (221–222, 4–21 MANGO).

¹¹⁸ That he was indeed the first abbot can be concluded from the fact that the Pantokrator-Typikon prohibits the election of new abbots who are not members of the community, cf. GAUTIER, *Typikon du Pantocrator* 22.

¹¹⁹ Notice on the consecration (222, 22–24 MANGO).

St Glykeria we would need to assume one more missing link, which separated the extant *typika* from the intermediate source. Unfortunately, the hypothetical nature of the argument does not permit us to make further inferences. Therefore we can no longer establish who was responsible for the modifications of the intermediate source that we have encountered in the Pantokrator-Typikon

This leaves us with one last question: who wrote the intermediate source, and for which monastery was it destined? To this question there is no answer. All we can say is that it must have originated in a Constantinopolitan monastery of some renown because otherwise it would hardly have been consulted by later monastic founders.

CONCLUSION

Through comparison of the Church Slavonic translation of Patriarch Alexius' rule for his monastic foundation of the Mother of God and of the three Southern Italian rules of Patirion, Soter and Trigona it has become possible not only to determine the content of the Stoudios-Typikon but also to ascertain that it had a tripartite structure where stipulations about communal meals and dietary prescriptions were followed first by chapters about the relationship between abbot and community and then by advice about the organisation of church services. Moreover, through comparative analysis of the rules for the Constantinopolitan houses of Pantokrator, Mamas and Kecharitomene it could be shown that the Stoudios-Typikon was shortened and reworked in quite a sophisticated manner in another monastery in or near the capital and that this now lost rule then became – either directly or through mediation of further lost versions – the main inspiration for the Pantokrator-Typikon and one of the sources of the Philanthropos-Typikon, which otherwise was indebted to the Evergetine tradition. The Stoudios-Typikon, composed before the year 1025 but possibly dating as far back as the second half of the tenth century, is the first extended rule with a clear reform agenda and its influence made itself felt over more than a hundred years.

In this article, and in its companion piece on the Panagios-Typikon, we have attempted to lay the groundwork for future study of the Byzantine monastic reform movement. Such research will need to take into account all available material, and not just rules that have come down to us in their original Greek version, and it will need to focus on monastic rather than on lay founders. Otherwise it will be impossible to understand the complexities of the Byzantine monastic discourse of the eleventh and early twelfth century.

GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TEXTS

- ω Original Stoudios-Typikon
- α Alexios-Typikon
- β Bartholomew of Simeri's copy of the Stoudios-Typikon
- γ Intermediate Source (reworked Stoudios-Typikon)
- δ Philanthropos-Typikon (Stoudite and Evergetine material)
- ε Pantanassa-Typikon (hypothetical link of unknown content)
- A Cave-Monastery-Typikon (Church Slavonic translation)
- B Patirion-Typikon
- C Soter-Typikon
- D Mamas-Typikon
- E Kecharitomene-Typikon
- F Pantokrator-Typikon

The relationship of the Trigona-Typikon (Italian translation) to the other Southern Italian rules can no longer be established with any certainty.



