

This is an extract from:

Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents:

A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments

edited by John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero

with the assistance of Giles Constable

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

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

© 2000 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

Introduction

A. Purpose of the Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents Project

Although there have been a handful of valuable studies of the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents, no one has ever attempted to assemble the documents themselves in a collection for study. This shortcoming has severely handicapped our ability to understand medieval Byzantine monasticism, for which these documents are unquestionably the most important historical texts. That being the case, it might seem that the obvious step to remedy this deficiency would be to produce a set of new critical editions with scholarly commentaries. The late Paul Gautier certainly made an impressive start on this worthy project by undertaking the publication of the *typika* of the Komnenian era, beginning with his edition of (28) *Pantokrator* in 1974. He completed editions with commentaries and French translations (all monuments of the most scrupulous scholarship) for five of these documents by the time of his death in 1985.¹

Our own project, though inspired by Gautier, has had a more modest scope, namely the production of accurate English translations, with commentaries and annotations, of all of the founders' documents drawn up for medieval Byzantine monasteries for which there were available texts in printed editions. Even though it was clear that—aside from those editions then being prepared by Gautier—a very strong case could be made for also producing a set of modern critical editions of all of the documents, Giles Constable advised against such an expansion of our undertaking. Since it has taken a decade just to produce and edit the translations, time has amply proven the wisdom of this restriction of scope.

Constable foresaw how immensely valuable even a collection of translations would be not only for Byzantine historians but also for western medievalists and all those interested in the history of Christianity. Our readers can now reap the rewards of his foresight. We can now learn a very great deal about Byzantine monasticism that might otherwise have had to be deferred for another generation. Yet it must be admitted that the production of a corpus of translations before a complete set of modern critical editions was available has made this present work extremely difficult and necessarily tentative.

B. Publication of the Texts and Definition of the Corpus

One fundamental problem resulting from our decision to produce a collection of translations ahead of a complete modern set of editions was that the content of the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents had not yet been defined. The process of definition began as early as the seventeenth century, at which time Leo Allatius was aware of some of the texts which would come

¹ (28) *Pantokrator* (1974), (19) *Attaleiates* (1981), (22) *Evergetis* (1982), (23) *Pakourianos* (1984), and (27) *Kecharitomene* (1985).

INTRODUCTION

to make up the corpus.² The first editions began to be prepared, one of which in the imprint of J. J. Sirmond³ remains, remarkably enough, the only one in existence for its document and is used here as the basis for our translation of (3) *Theodore Studites*. The seventeenth century also saw Bernard de Montfaucon's first edition of (27) *Kecharitomene* in 1688.⁴

In the eighteenth century, the most important work was published in Italy, including J. Pasini's Turin edition of the *Memorandum* of (31) *Areia* in 1749, the monk Ephraim's Venetian editions of the *Rule* of (24) *Christodoulos* and (34) *Machairas* in 1756, and then first editions of (45) *Neophytos* by Archimandrite Kyprianos in 1779 and of (17) *Nikon Metanoeite* by Nicholas Glykys in 1780.⁵

Nothing more was accomplished until the middle of the nineteenth century, when certain of the documents that would eventually come to be recognized as part of our corpus were published in conjunction with other scholarly endeavors.⁶ In 1849, Cardinal Angelo Mai executed an edition of one of the two versions we now have of (4) *Stoudios* in the fifth volume of his *Nova patrum bibliotheca*. J. P. Migne began to bring out his still convenient *Patrologia Graeca* in 1857. Eventually this series would include reprints of existing editions of (3) *Theodore Studites*, Mai's version of (4) *Stoudios* [B] and of Montfaucon's (27) *Kecharitomene*. In 1859, C. W. Goodwin produced the first, and for a long time the only, English translation of one of the documents, (1) *Apa Abraham*. In 1861, Giuseppe Spata published the second and third versions of (25) *Fragala* in conjunction with his study of medieval Greek manuscripts in Palermo. In 1865, P. Aravantinos published the first edition of (49) *Geromeri* in the Greek provincial journal *Pandora*.

By 1858, the eminent canonist, Cardinal J. B. Pitra, then engaged in the publication of many of the sources of Greek canon law in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, recognized the necessity of distinguishing between purely liturgical *typika* and the monastic (i.e., "founders") *typika* that make up the documents included in our present collection.⁷

² Leo Allatius, *De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis graecorum* (Paris, 1646).

³ (3) *Theodore Studites*, ed. J. J. Sirmond, *Opera Varia*, ed. J. de la Baume, vol. 5: *Sancti Theodori Studitae Epistolae aliaque scripta dogmatica* (Paris, 1696), pp. 80–88.

⁴ Bernard de Montfaucon, *Analecta graeca sive varia opuscula graeca hactenus non edita* (Paris, 1688), pp. 136–307.

⁵ (31) *Areia* (*Memorandum* [M] only): ed. J. Pasini, *Codices manuscripti bibliothecae Regiae Taurinensis* (Turin, 1749), pp. 426–29; (17) *Nikon Metanoeite*: ed. Nicholas Glykys, *Prostetheises eis to telos tes Diathekes, kai diaphoron thaumaston Nikonos Monachou tou Metanoeite* (Venice, 1780); (24) *Christodoulos* (*Rule* [A] only): ed. Ephraim, *Biblos periechousa kanonas merikon tinon hagion . . .* (Venice, 1756), pp. 24–45; (34) *Machairas*: ed. Ephraim, *Typike Diataxis hos euretai tes kata neson Kypron sebasmiias kai basilikes mones tes hyperagias Theotokou, Machairidos epilegomenes* (Venice, 1756); (45) *Neophytos*: ed. Archimandrite Kyprianos, *Typike syn Theo Diataxis kai logoi eis ten hexaemeron tou hosiou patros hemon Neophytou tou Enkleistou* (Venice, 1779).

⁶ (4) *Stoudios* [B], ed. Angelo Mai, *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, vol. 5 (Rome, 1849), pp. 78–145; (3) *Theodore Studites*, PG 99, cols. 1813–24 and (4) *Stoudios* [B], cols. 1703–20; (27) *Kecharitomene*, PG 127, cols. 985–1128; (1) *Apa Abraham*, trans. C. W. Goodwin, "Curiosities of Law. 1. Conveyancing among the Copts of the Eighth Century," *The Law Magazine and Law Review* 6, no. 12 (1859), pp. 237–48; (25) *Fragala* [B], [C], ed. Giuseppe Spata, *Le pergamene greche esistenti nel grande archivio di Palermo* (Palermo, 1861), pp. 197–214; (49) *Geromeri*, ed. P. Aravantinos, "Peri tou hosiou Neilou tou Erichiotou," *Pandora* 15 (1865), 470–74.

⁷ J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1858), p. 381.

INTRODUCTION

Some more important work was done in the 1870s.⁸ Johann Curtius and Adolph Kirchoff published (18) *Nea Gephyra* in the fourth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* in 1877, after a transcription made by Michel Fourmont in 1730. In 1872, Konstantinos Sathas published the first edition of (19) *Attaleiates* and the first excerpts from (58) *Menoikeion* in Venice. In Russia, Porfirii Uspensky published his editions and Russian translations of (12) *Tzimiskes* and (15) *Constantine IX* in 1877 and of (59) *Manuel II* in 1892 as part of a multi-volume study of Mount Athos.⁹

The study of the foundation documents for their own sake resumed towards the end of the nineteenth century in Russia, Austria, and Germany. A group of Russian historians including Ivan Mansvetov and P. Bezobrazov—the rediscoverer of the manuscript of (28) *Pantokrator*—did some important work. Mansvetov wrote the first modern study on monastic *typika* in 1885, while Bezobrazov pointed out the importance of the monastic foundation documents for the history of the Byzantine Empire and church in an article he wrote in 1887, when many of them were still in manuscript, like (23) *Pakourianos*, (32) *Mamas*, (37) *Auxentios*, (39) *Lips*, (50) *Gerasimos*, and (60) *Charsianeites*.¹⁰ Bezobrazov's study also provided the first transcription of the text of (2) *Pantelleria*.

Mansvetov and Bezobrazov's work coincided with a revival of scholarly interest in the Byzantine monastic foundation documents. Already I. G. Troitzki had published the first edition of the fragmentary (38) *Kellibara I* in St. Petersburg in 1885 along with a Russian translation.¹¹ Meanwhile, in Austria, Franz Miklosich and Josef Müller republished Sathas' edition of (19) *Attaleiates* (1887), Montfaucon's edition of (27) *Kecharitomene* (1887), and Ephraim's edition of (34) *Machairas* (1887); then they produced new and more complete editions of (24) *Christodoulos* (1890) and (31) *Areia* (1887) in the last two volumes of their *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*.¹² Their text of (24) *Christodoulos* is still the best currently available. In Leipzig in 1894, Ph. Meyer published many of the Athonite documents in his *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster*, including (11) *Ath. Rule*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, (14) *Ath. Testament*, (44) *Karyes*, all first editions except for (13) *Ath. Typikon*.¹³ A year later in 1895 in an article in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Meyer published first editions of (47) *Philanthropos* and (56) *Kellibara*

⁸ (18) *Nea Gephyra*, ed. Curtius and Kirchoff, *CIG*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1877), pp. 327–28; (19) *Attaleiates*, ed. K. A. Sathas, *Mesaionike Bibliothek. Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1872), pp. 3–69, and (58) *Menoikeion*, pp. 202–11.

⁹ (12) *Tzimiskes*, ed. Porfirii Uspensky, *Vostok kristianskii. Athon. Istoriia Athona*, vol. 3, pt. 1 (Kiev, 1877), pp. 265–76; (15) *Constantine IX*, ed. Uspensky, pp. 277–90; (59) *Manuel II*, ed. Uspensky, vol. 3, pt. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1892), 675–82.

¹⁰ Ivan Mansvetov, *Tserkovnii ustav* (Moscow, 1885); P. Bezobrazov, “Materiali dlya istorii vizantiiskoi imperii: I. Ne izdannie monastirskie ustav,” *ZMNP* 254 (1887), 65–78; rev. Ed. Kurtz, *BZ* 2 (1893), 627–31.

¹¹ (38) *Kellibara I*, ed. I. G. Troiskii, *Autobiographia imperatora Mikhaila Paleologa* (St. Petersburg, 1885), pp. 1–20.

¹² (19) *Attaleiates*, ed. Franz Miklosich and Josef Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* (MM), vol. 5 (Vienna, 1887), pp. 293–327; (27) *Kecharitomene*, pp. 327–91; (31) *Areia*, pp. 178–90; (34) *Machairas*, pp. 392–432; (23) *Christodoulos*, vol. 6 (1890), pp. 59–90.

¹³ (11) *Ath. Rule*, ed. Ph. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 130–40; (13) *Ath. Typikon*, pp. 102–22; (14) *Ath. Testament*, pp. 123–30; (44) *Karyes*, pp. 184–87.

INTRODUCTION

II.¹⁴ He was aware of Troitzki's edition of (38) *Kellibara I*, but could not read the latter's Russian translation. In 1896, also at Leipzig, August Heisenberg published all that was then known of (36) *Blemmydes*.¹⁵ This as well as all of Meyer's other editions is still standard.

In 1894 at Jena, Waldemar Nissen produced one of the first important secondary works on one of the documents, (19) *Attaleiates*.¹⁶ This work contains a list of the fourteen monastic foundation documents then known to the author. Meanwhile, some additional work of editing was being done in Greece by the prolific Manuel Gedeon, who produced first editions of (13) *Ath. Typikon* in 1885 and of (37) *Auxentios* in 1895, while the Greek scholar Georgios Mousaios published the first edition of (23) *Pakourianos*, based on an inferior manuscript, as his dissertation at Jena in 1888.¹⁷ In England in 1893, F. G. Kenyon published (1) *Apa Abraham* in the first volume of his *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*.¹⁸

In 1895, the Russian Aleksei Dmitrievsky began the truly ambitious project of producing a collection of critical editions of all of the texts, both founders' and liturgical *typika*.¹⁹ Earlier, he had produced an edition of (42) *Sabas* (1890) that was reviewed by Ed. Kurtz in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* in 1894, showing again the close connection between Russian and German scholarship despite the language barrier.²⁰ The founders' *typika* are to be found in the first volume of Dmitrievsky's corpus, including an alternate version of (4) *Stoudios* [A] (first edition), (11) *Ath. Rule*, (14) *Ath. Testament*, (22) *Evergetis* (first edition), (28) *Pantokrator* (first edition), (33) *Heliou Bomon* (first edition), (32) *Mamas* (excerpts only), (37) *Auxentios*, a reprint of his (42) *Sabas*, and (43) *Kasoulon* (first edition). Dmitrievsky's monumental work, happily available in a recent German reprint, is still of great value, and the translations of the first of the two versions of (4) *Stoudios*, of (33) *Heliou Bomon*, of (37) *Auxentios*, and of (42) *Sabas* as presented here are based on his editions.

¹⁴ (47) *Philanthropos*, ed. Ph. Meyer, "Bruchstücke zweier typika ktetorika," *BZ* 4 (1895), pp. 48–49; (56) *Kellibara II*, pp. 45–48.

¹⁵ (36) *Blemmydes*, ed. August Heisenberg, *Nicephori Blemmydae curriculum vitae et carmina* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 93–99.

¹⁶ Waldemar Nissen, *Die Diataxis des Michael Attaleiates von 1077. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Klosterwesens im byzantinischen Reich* (Jena, 1894).

¹⁷ (13) *Ath. Typikon*, ed. Manuel Gedeon, *Athos, anamneseis, engrapha, semeioseis* (Constantinople, 1885); (37) *Auxentios*, ed. Manuel Gedeon, *Michael Palaiologou Typikon tes epi tou Bounou tou Auxentiou sebasmiar mones Michael tou Archangelou* (Athens, 1895); Georgios Mousaios (Stenimachites), *Gregorios Pakourianos megas domestikos tes Dyseos kai to hyp'autou typikon tes mones tes Theotokou tes Petritzonitisses* (Leipzig, 1888).

¹⁸ (1) *Apa Abraham*, ed. F. G. Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. 1 (London, 1893), pp. 231–36.

¹⁹ Aleksei Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rykopiesei*, vol. 1: *Typika* (Kiev, 1895); vol. 2: *Euchologia* (Kiev, 1901); vol. 3: *Typika* (Petrograd, 1917). Ed. (4) *Stoudios* [A], *Opisanie*, vol. 1, pp. 224–38; (11) *Ath. Rule*, pp. 246–56; (13) *Ath. Typikon*, pp. 238–46; (22) *Evergetis*, pp. 615–56; (28) *Pantokrator*, pp. 656–702; (32) *Mamas*, pp. 702–15; (33) *Heliou Bomon*, pp. 715–69; (37) *Auxentios*, pp. 769–94; (42) *Sabas*, pp. 222–24; and (43) *Kasoulon*, pp. 795–823.

²⁰ (42) *Sabas*, ed. Aleksei Dmitrievsky, *TKDA* (January 1890), 170–92, and Ed. Kurtz (review of the preceding), *BZ* 3 (1894), 168–70.

INTRODUCTION

Around the turn of the century, the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople published Louis Petit's editions of (10) *Eleousa*, (61) *Eleousa Inv.* (both 1900) and of (29) *Kosmosoteira* (1908) as well as S. Pétridès' edition of (54) *Neilos Damilas* (1911) in its *Izvestiia*.²¹ All of these documents are still the best current editions even though the journal in which they were published is unfortunately quite rare. Russia itself remained a center for scholarship on the documents right up to the revolution.²² Louis Petit published a much improved edition of (23) *Pakourianos* in a special supplementary issue of the pioneering Russian Byzantine journal *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* in 1905. A. I. Papadopoulos-Kerameus published (50) *Gerasimos* in 1891 and (30) *Phoberos* in 1913 (posthumously), both in St. Petersburg in their first and only editions. In 1917 in Petrograd, Vladimir Benešević published all that ever appeared of his *Taktikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain, from which we gain our still standard texts of (20) *Black Mountain* and (21) *Roidion*.

Thus, thanks primarily to the efforts of Russian and German scholars, there was a lively interest in the Byzantine monastic foundation documents by the beginning of the twentieth century.²³ In 1905, J. Cozza-Luzi, continuing Cardinal Mai's *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, published a first edition of (26) *Luke of Messina* and a new one of (43) *Kasoulon* that have been used for the translations of these documents in our collection. Also in 1905, Spyridon Lampros edited the hagiographic life in which (53) *Meteora* is preserved. We have employed another edition of (53) *Meteora*, by N. A. Bees, that appeared a few years later in 1909.

The great Bollandist hagiographer Hippolyte Delehaye incidentally gave us our first editions of (7) *Latros* (1913) and (9) *Galesios* (1910) in the course of his extensive publication of Greek hagiographic texts.²⁴ In 1921, Delehaye published first editions of (8) *John Xenos*, (39) *Lips*, (40) *Anargyroi*, and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* in his *Deux typica byzantins de l'époque des paléologues*. In a

²¹ (10) *Eleousa* and (61) *Eleousa Inv.*, ed. Louis Petit, "Le Monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine," *IRAIK* 6 (1900), 1–153, at 69–93 and 114–25; (24) *Kosmosoteira*, ed. Petit, "Typikon du monastère de la Kosmosotira près d'Aenos (1152)," *IRAIK* 13 (1908), 17–75; (54) *Neilos Damilas*, ed. S. Pétridès, "Le typikon de Nil Damilas pour le monastère de femmes de Baeonia en Crète (1400)," *IRAIK* 15 (1911), 92–111.

²² (23) *Pakourianos*, ed. Louis Petit, "Typikon de Grégoire Pacourianos pour le monastère de Petritzos (Bačkovo) en Bulgarie," *VV Prilozhenie* 11, no. 1 (1904); (50) *Gerasimos*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta Hierosolymitikes Stachyologias*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 255–57; (30) *Phoberos*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Noctes Petropolitanae* (St. Petersburg, 1913), pp. 1–88; (20) *Black Mountain* and (21) *Roidion*, ed. Vladimir Benešević, *Taktikon Nikona Chernogortska* (Petrograd, 1917), pp. 22–67, 68–80.

²³ (26) *Luke of Messina* and (43) *Kasoulon*, ed. J. Cozza-Luzi, *NPB*, vol. 10, pt. 2 (Rome, 1905), pp. 117–37, 149–66; (53) *Meteora*, ed. Sp. Lampros, "Symbolai eis ten historian ton Meteoron," *NH* 2 (1905), 49–156, at 76–77, and ed. Nikos Bees, "Symbole eis ten historian ton monon ton Meteoron," *Byzantis* 1 (1909), 191–331, at 250–52.

²⁴ (7) *Latros*, ed. Hippolyte Delehaye, *Monumenta Latrensia hagiographica*, in Theodor Wiegand, *Milet, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen*, vol. 3, pt. 1: *Der Latmos* (Berlin, 1913), pp. 152–53; (9) *Galesios*, ed. Delehaye, *Acta sanctorum novembris*, vol. 3 (Brussels, 1910), pp. 508–606; (9) *John Xenos*, ed. Delehaye, *Deux typica byzantins de l'époque des paléologues* (Brussels, 1921), pp. 188–90; (8) *John Xenos*, pp. 191–96; (39) *Lips*, pp. 106–36; (40) *Anargyroi*, pp. 136–40; (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, pp. 18–105; (46) *Akropolites*, ed. Delehaye, "Constantini Acropolitae hagiographi byzantini epistularum manipulus," *AB* 51 (1933), 263–84, at 279–84.

INTRODUCTION

list that he prepared for the introduction to this work, he lists 27 documents known to him in addition to the four presented in his own publication. Delehaye's last contribution to the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents was his edition of (46) *Akropolites* in 1933. All of Delehaye's editions, with the exception of (8) *John Xenos*, have been employed in the preparation of the translations of these documents in this collection.

The early twentieth century also saw the discovery of additional texts with just claims to positions in the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents, but not all of them were adequately edited.²⁵ Iordan Ivanov's edition of the Slavonic text of (6) *Rila* appeared in 1917. The editions of (32) *Mamas* (1928) and (35) *Skoteine* (1930) by Sophronios Eustratiades are generally considered to be unsatisfactory. The Archimandrite Christophoros Ktenas provided us with what were for a long time the only editions of (41) *Docheiariou* and (48) *Prodromos* (both 1929). In extreme old age, Manuel Gedeon attempted an improved edition of (35) *Skoteine* in 1930, but without notable success. Martin Jugie's edition of (58) *Menoikeion* appeared in 1937 in *Byzantion* and served as the standard edition of that document for nearly twenty years.

Placide de Meester, who could lay claim to the first modern attempt to document the institutions of Byzantine monasticism,²⁶ not coincidentally produced the first reasonably complete working list of the foundation documents in 1940 in an article that provides a thorough discussion of earlier attempts to organize the material.²⁷ De Meester made the enduring distinction between founders' *typika* (*typika ktetorika*) and founders' testaments (*diathekai*). He included 33 documents (including 5 that are post-Byzantine) in the former list and 14 (5 post-Byzantine) in the latter list. His article also provides a list of 19 founders' *typika* now lost but attested in surviving sources.

Work continued after the war with the publication of several first editions and useful re-editions.²⁸ Paul Lemerle published (51) *Koutloumousi* in his 1945 edition of the *Actes de Kutlumis*.

²⁵ (6) *Rila*, ed. Iordan Ivanov, sv. *Ivan Rilski i negoviyat monastir* (Sofia, 1917), pp. 136–42; (25) *Mamas*, ed. Sophronios Eustratiades, "Typikon tes en Konstantinoupolei mones tou hagiou megalomartyros Mamantos," *Hellenika* 2 (1928), 256–314; (35) *Skoteine*, ed. Eustratiades, "He en Philadelphieia mone tes hyperagias Theotokou tes Koteines," *Hellenika* 3 (1930), 317–39; (41) *Docheiariou* and (48) *Prodromos*, ed. K. Ktenas, "Ho Protos tou Hagiou Orous Atho kai he 'Megale Mese' e 'Synaxis,'" *EESB* 6 (1929), 233–81, at 253–57 and 263–67; (35) *Skoteine*, ed. Manuel Gedeon, "Diatheke Maximou monachou ktitoros tes en Lydia mones Kotines," *Mikrasiatika Chronika* 2 (1939), 263–91; (58) *Menoikeion*, ed. Martin Jugie, "Le typicon du monastère du Prodrome au mont Ménécée, près de Serrès. Introduction, texte et remarques," *Byzantion* 12 (1937), 25–69.

²⁶ Placide de Meester, *De monachico statu juxta disciplinam Byzantinam* (Vatican City, 1942).

²⁷ Placide de Meester, "Les typiques de fondation," *SBN* 6 (1940), 496–508; cf. Th. Zielinski, "Projet de la création d'un 'Corpus scriptorum juris graecoromani tam canonici quam civilis,'" *SBN* 5 (1939), 735–40.

²⁸ (51) *Koutloumousi*, ed. V. Laurent, *Actes de Kutlumis* (Paris, 1945), pp. 113–38; (52) *Choumnos*, ed. Laurent, "Écrits spirituels inédits de Macaire Choumnos († c. 1382), fondateur de la 'Nea Moni' à Thessalonique," *Hellenika* 14 (1955), 40–86, at 60–71, 76–85; (58) *Menoikeion*, ed. André Guillou, *Les archives de saint-Jean-Prodrome sur le mont Ménécée* (Paris, 1955), pp. 163–76; (5) *Euthymios*, ed. Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "Vita S. Euthymii," *Byzantion* 25 (1955–57), 1–172, at 148–51; (38) *Kellibara I*, ed. Henri Grégoire, "Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi de vita sua," *Byzantion* 29–30 (1959–60), 447–76.

INTRODUCTION

Vitalien Laurent provided us with our first and only edition of (52) *Choumnos* in 1955. In that same year André Guillou produced a new edition of (58) *Menoikeion*, replacing Jugie, in conjunction with his study of the cartulary of the Monastery of St. John the Forerunner near Serres. In an issue of *Byzantion* that appeared in 1957, Patricia Karlin-Hayter, one of our translators, published the *Life* in which (5) *Euthymios* is contained. In 1960, Henri Grégoire's re-edition of (38) *Kellibara I* appeared in *Byzantion*.

By the time Raymond Janin published his list of them in 1964, the monastic foundation documents had been acknowledged as the most important body of source material for the history of Byzantine monasticism, and a consensus had formed on how to categorize the documents.²⁹ Janin, counting only founders' *typika*, reckoned on 32 documents. His article attempts a general discussion of Byzantine religious life based on the evidence of these texts.

A few years later in 1969, I. Tsiknopoullos brought the two Cypriot *typika*, (34) *Machairas* and (45) *Neophytos*, together in a convenient new edition.³⁰ Tsiknopoullos' edition, though much criticized, was the first to attempt to show the textual dependence of one of the documents, (34) *Machairas*, on earlier models. This suggested a rewarding approach to recreating an important part of the lost history of Byzantine monasticism that has been adopted in the presentation of our own collection.

The study of Byzantine monastic foundation documents was taken to a higher level of scholarship by Konstantinos Manaphes, who produced in 1970 the first modern monographic study (since Mansvetov) that examined the founders' *typika* as a group.³¹ Building on a distinction observed by de Meester, Manaphes subdivided the corpus into monastic testaments (8 documents) and *typika* (31 documents), and then used this distinction as the basis for his analysis. Our project's debt to Manaphes is considerable, for he considerably advanced the notion of dealing with the documents as a corpus, and our initial list of documents to be translated was drawn directly from an appendix in his study, which was itself based on the earlier lists of de Meester and Janin.

In the years before our own project began, scholarship continued at a slow rate, mostly in the form of contributing new editions or the publication of hitherto overlooked texts.³² In 1970 Patricia Karlin-Hayter's *Life* of Euthymios, including (5) *Euthymios*, that had originally appeared in *Byzantion*, was republished separately. Ivan Dujčev published a facsimile edition of (2) *Pantelleria* in 1971. Basiles Krapsites produced a new edition of (49) *Geromeri* in 1972, replacing Aravantinos'

²⁹ R. Janin, "Le monachisme byzantin au Moyen Age. Commende et typica (X^e–XIV^e siècle)," *REB* 22 (1964), 5–44.

³⁰ (34) *Machairas* and (45) *Neophytos*, ed. I. Tsiknopoullos, *Kypriaka Typika* (Nicosia, 1969), pp. 3–68 and 71–104.

³¹ Konstantinos Manaphes, *Monasteriaka typika-diathekai* (Athens, 1970).

³² (5) *Euthymios*, ed. Patricia Karlin-Hayter, *Vita Euthymii Patriarchae CP* (Brussels, 1970), pp. 143–47; (2) *Pantelleria*, ed. Ivan Dujčev, "Il Tipico del monastero di S. Giovanni nell'isola di Pantelleria," *BBGG*, n.s., 25 (1971), 3–17; (49) *Geromeri*, ed. Basilio Krapsites, *Thesprotika*, vol. 2 (Athens, 1972), pp. 160–68; (28) *Pantokrator*, ed. Paul Gautier, "Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator," *REB* 32 (1974), 1–145; (12) *Tzimiskes*, (15) *Constantine IX*, and (59) *Manuel II*, ed. Denise Papachryssanthou, *Actes du Prôtaton* (= Archives de l'Athos 7) (Paris, 1975), pp. 202–15, 216–32, and 254–61; (31) *Areia*, ed. G. A. Choras, *He "hagia mone" Areias* (Athens, 1975), pp. 239–52.

INTRODUCTION

edition of more than a hundred years earlier. The first of Paul Gautier's editions, (28) *Pantokrator*, appeared in 1974. With the publication of the *Actes du Prôtaton* by Denise Papachryssanthou in 1975, we received welcome new critical editions of (12) *Tzimiskes*, (15) *Constantine IX*, and (59) *Manuel II*. G. A. Choras provided a modern edition of (31) *Areia* in 1975.

Our own project, conceived in 1981, coincided with a burst of scholarly activity that would keep the project's directors scrambling to stay abreast of the new output.³³ K. A. Manaphes and Ioannes Konidares produced the first complete edition of (60) *Charsianeites* in 1982, the last of the unedited texts to which Bezobrazov had called attention to nearly a hundred years earlier. In swift succession, Paul Gautier completed his modern critical editions of (19) *Attaleiates* in 1981, (22) *Evergetis* in 1982, (23) *Pakourianos* in 1983, and finally (27) *Kecharitomene* in 1985. Od. Lampsidis provided a new edition of (17) *Nikon Metanoeite* in 1982. Vera von Falkenhausen published the first version of (25) *Fragala* in 1983, completing Spata's edition of this work begun 120 years earlier. Nicolas Oikonomides' edition of the *Actes de Docheiariou* in 1984 gave us welcome new critical editions of (41) *Docheiariou* and (48) *Prodromos*, replacing those of Ktenas. In conjunction with his work on Nikephoros Blemmydes, our translator Fr. Joseph Munitiz has edited (1984 and 1986) the remaining fragments of (36) *Blemmydes*, overlooked by Heisenberg ninety years earlier. A. Philippidis-Braat republished (18) *Nea Gephyra* in 1985. In 1986, N. B. Tomadakes published a new edition of (8) *John Xenos*. Paul Lemerle's 1945 edition of (51) *Koutloumousi* was republished in 1988 in conjunction with the second edition of the *Actes de Kutlumus*. Thomas Drew-Bear and Johannes Koder published the inscription that supplies us with the partial text of (16) *Mount Tmolos* in 1988. Finally, one of our translators, Timothy Miller, has prepared a first edition of (55) *Athanasios I* that will be published by him separately with a commentary by John Thomas.

Meanwhile, contemporary scholarship continued to debate and redefine the corpus as our own work was being produced over the last decade. Ioannes Konidares produced a study in 1984

³³ (60) *Charsianeites*, ed. I. M. Konidares and K. A. Manaphes, "Epiteleutios boulesis kai didaskalia tou oikoumenikou patriarchou Matthaïou A' (1397–1410)," *EEBS* 45 (1981–82), 462–515; (19) *Attaleiates*, ed. Paul Gautier, "La diataxis de Michel Attaliate," *REB* 39 (1981), 5–143; (22) *Evergetis*, ed. Gautier, "Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis," *REB* 40 (1982), 5–101; (23) *Pakourianos*, ed. Gautier, "Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos," *REB* 42 (1984), 5–145; (27) *Kecharitomene*, ed. Gautier, "Le typikon de la Théotokos Kécharitôméné," *REB* 43 (1985), 5–165; (17) *Nikon Metanoeite*, ed. Od. Lampsidis, *Ho ek Pontou hosios Nikon ho metanoeite* (Athens, 1982), pp. 251–56; (25) *Fragala*, ed. Vera von Falkenhausen, "Die Testamente des Abtes Gregor von San Filippo di Fragala," *HUS* 7 (1983), 174–95; (41) *Docheiariou* and (48) *Prodromos*, ed. Nicolas Oikonomides, *Actes de Docheiariou* (= Archives de l'Athos 13) (Paris, 1984), pp. 91–97, and pp. 133–38; (36) *Blemmydes*, ed. Joseph Munitiz, *Nicephori Blemmydae autobiographia sive curriculum vitae necnon epistula universalior* (Turnhout, 1984), pp. xxx–xxxii, and "A Missing Chapter from the Typikon of Nikephoros Blemmydes," *REB* 44 (1986), 199–207; (18) *Nea Gephyra*, ed. D. Feissel and A. Philippidis-Braat, "Inventaires en vue d'un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance. III. Inscriptions du Péloponnèse (à l'exception de Mistra)," *T&M* 9 (1985), 267–396, at 301–2; (8) *John Xenos*, ed. N. B. Tomadakes, "Ho Hagios Joannes ho Xenos kai Eremites en Krete (10os–11os aion)," *EEBS* 46 (1983–86), 1–117, at 11–12; (51) *Koutloumousi*, ed. Paul Lemerle, *Actes de Kutlumus*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1988), pp. 113–38; (16) *Mount Tmolos*, ed. Thomas Drew-Bear and Johannes Koder, "Ein byzantinisches Kloster am Berg Tmolos," *JÖB* 38 (1988), 197–215.

INTRODUCTION

focusing on the monastic *typika*'s contribution to canon law, with an updated list of 60 documents attached.³⁴ In 1987, one of our translators, Catia Galatariotou, produced the first comparative study of the documents in English, based on the working list for this project.³⁵ Then, as our project manuscript was being prepared in 1992, a group of scholars, including Mary Cunningham, Robert Jordan, Rosemary Morris, Margaret Mullett, Joseph A. Munitiz, Fr. Robert Taft, S.J., John Turner, and John Wortley, formed a project based at Queens University Belfast to edit, translate and annotate all of the documents associated with the pivotal eleventh-century reform monastery of Evergetis.³⁶

C. Scope, Exclusions, and Rationale of Our Collection

We follow the example of Delehaye (1921), de Meester (1940), Janin (1964), Manaphes (1970), and Konidares (1984) in concentrating on foundation documents to the exclusion of purely liturgical *typika*. The latter have been omitted partly on grounds of length (their inclusion would have increased the size of the present work considerably) but also because they have relatively little to tell us, aside from their discussions of the liturgy itself, about the lives of the monasteries for which they were written. They are also mostly well edited, and less difficult to read for those with at least some command of Greek.³⁷ The other category of documents identified by our distinguished predecessors, the *typika ktetorika*, or “founders” *typika*, form the core of our collection.³⁸ The content of these documents is primarily disciplinary, but also touches on a large number of other subjects of interest to both specialists and general readers.

As our previous discussion indicates, the concept of a corpus of foundation documents with an agreed membership has only recently started to solidify. In a very real though surely unintended way, Catia Galatariotou's article referred to above illustrates the ultimate futility at this point of trying to impose rigorous criteria for including or excluding documents from the corpus. The approach adopted for our own project has been to include those regulatory documents that shed some light on the life of medieval Byzantine monasteries even if some of these texts might fail to meet the strictest theoretical criteria for being considered proper *typika*. Until a scholarly consensus is finally formed on the content of the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents, it seems to us that a tolerant “admissions policy” is in order, given the great obscurity in which most of these texts have languished.

These then have been the principles for the composition of our collection: 1) only documents which are represented by printed editions are included; 2) chronologically, our scope is from the

³⁴ Ioannes Konidares, *Nomike theorese ton monasteriakon typikon* (Athens, 1984).

³⁵ Catia Galatariotou, “Byzantine Ktetorika Typika: A Comparative Study,” *REB* 45 (1987), 77–138.

³⁶ For which see *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, ed. Margaret Mullett and Anthony Kirby (Belfast, 1994).

³⁷ Robert Taft, “Typikon, Liturgical,” *ODB*, pp. 2131–32; for editions, see Dmitrievsky, *Opisanie*, vol. 1, pp. 256–656 (*Evergetis*), and vol. 3, pp. 1–486 (*Sabas*); Miguel Arranz, *Le typikon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine* (= *OCA* 185) (Rome, 1969); Juan Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1962–63); see also General Bibliography, XXIII. Liturgy.

³⁸ Alice-Mary Talbot, “Typikon, Monastic,” *ODB*, p. 2132; Karl Krumbacher, “*Ktetor*, ein lexicographischer Versuch,” *IF* 25 (1909), 393–421, rev. A. Heisenberg, *BZ* 19 (1910), 588–89.

INTRODUCTION

seventh through the fifteenth century, i.e., medieval Byzantium, thus excluding the mostly well-edited and translated monastic rules of the Later Roman Empire such as those of Pachomios and Basil of Caesarea as well as post-Byzantine documents; 3) geographically, we take an expansive view of the Byzantine world, including documents in Greek from Norman Italy and Sicily as well as from Palestine;³⁹ 4) linguistically, we have included only documents composed in Greek (thereby excluding some early Coptic testaments and Syriac rules), with the exception of two short but interesting documents preserved in Old Church Slavonic translations;⁴⁰ 5) as noted above, purely liturgical *typika* are excluded; 6) *typika* of the Byzantine commonwealth of nations, e.g., of medieval Serbia and the old Russian principalities, despite their admitted interest and strong dependence on Byzantine models,⁴¹ have been excluded; 7) a very few documents that fail to find admission to our collection under any of the criteria enumerated above are nevertheless presented here because of their special interest and importance for presenting the overall interpretational framework for the collection itself.⁴² Although these criteria may seem arbitrary, our collection includes nearly all of the edited works in the lists of Delehaye, de Meester, Janin, Manaphes and Konidares, a concordance to which is supplied in Appendix A.

Also, although the distinction drawn by de Meester and Manaphes between founders' *typika* and testaments is useful for some purposes, we have chosen here to include both testaments and *typika* without differentiation. The distinctions between them, while real enough in many cases, are not hard and fast. The documents themselves sometimes seem to frustrate a classification along these lines, as some *typika* adopt the format of monastic testaments while several testaments contain a considerable amount of disciplinary content.⁴³

D. Organization, Features, and Conventions of This Edition

Our collection is presented in a multi-volume edition, with the documents organized in nine chapters, preceded by a narrative chapter on the early monastic rules of antiquity by John Thomas, who has also provided introductions to each of the nine chapters that attempt to illustrate the common themes of the documents contained in each and to set them in a broader historical context.

Within the chapters, each of the 61 documents is prefaced with basic identifying information, including its formal title, translator, date, edition employed, manuscript, and other translations; a bibliography of previous work related to the document;⁴⁴ a brief institutional history of the foundation for which the document was written; and a fairly detailed analysis of the document. For the

³⁹ Sicily: (25) *Fragala* and (26) *Luke of Messina*; Italy: (36) *Kasoulon*; Palestine: (42) *Sabas* and (50) *Gerasimos*.

⁴⁰ (2) *Pantelleria* and (6) *Rila*.

⁴¹ See General Bibliography, XIII. Byzantine Monasticism and the Slavs.

⁴² (1) *Apa Abraham*, (5) *Euthymios*, and (61) *Eleousa Inv.*

⁴³ *Typika* in testamentary format: (10) *Eleousa*; (19) *Attaleiates*; (34) *Machairas*; (35) *Skoteine*; (45) *Neophytos*; (54) *Neilos Damilas*; (60) *Charsianeites*; testaments with disciplinary content: (3) *Theodore Studites*; (9) *Galesios*; (14) *Ath. Testament*; (17) *Nikon Metanoeite*; (24) *Christodoulos*; and (25) *Fragala*; for a general discussion, see Artur Steinwenter, "Byzantinische Mönchstestamente," *Aegyptus* 12 (1932), 55–64.

⁴⁴ For some famous founders like Theodore the Studite or Athanasios the Athonite, there are additional

INTRODUCTION

longer documents, the analyses are broken down into a topical scheme of organization that is intended to facilitate the study of common themes. These introductory materials, with the accompanying notes, are the work of John Thomas. Being fully aware that no one individual could hope to produce a comprehensive commentary on all the matters encompassed in this diverse collection of documents, he chose to draw on his particular expertise by emphasizing the administrative aspects of Byzantine monasticism in this first commentary.

In order to facilitate cross-reference, we have adopted the following format for reference to the documents and chapters therein: document number in parentheses, short title in italics, and chapter reference in brackets, e.g., (22) *Evergetis* [12].

The translations, edited by Angela Hero, follow after the introductory materials. Readers will see that we have tried to treat this collection of translations consistently as if it were an edition. Indeed, we have perforce had to follow conventions and take some liberties usually reserved for the editors of texts, such as renumbering the chapters of one document, (40) *Anargyroi*, and providing a chapter numeration (and occasionally also chapter titles) for others, like (28) *Pantokrator*, that have none in their editions. These changes have been carefully bracketed. Readers should exercise special care in reference to documents with multiple parts. These are (4) *Stoudios*, presented in two versions [A] and [B] in parallel columns; (19) *Attaleiates*, in which the inventory, along with two attached imperial chrysobulls, has a separate chapter numeration, e.g., [INV 8]; (21) *Roidion*, which includes both a *typikon* [A] and a treatise by the same author [B]; (24) *Christodoulos*, which is made up of a *Rule* [A], a *Testament* [B], and a *Codicil* [C]; (25) *Fragala*, in which there are three versions [A], [B], [C] of the *Testament*; (31) *Areia*, which contains a *Memorandum* [M] as well as a *Typikon* [T]; (45) *Neophytos*, which also includes a set of the author's canons [C] as well as others attributed to Basil of Caesarea [CB]; (51) *Koutloumousi*, in which there are three versions [A], [B], [C] of the author's *Testament*; and (60) *Charsianeites*, which contains the author's *Autobiography* [A], his predecessors' *Rule of Mark and Neilos* [B], and his own *Subsequent Chapters* [C].

Although (39) *Lips* is actually two documents by different authors, we have preserved the continuous chapter numeration of the edition. (40) *Anargyroi*, composed by the primary author of (39) *Lips* but for a different institution, has been treated as a separate document. We have also presented (38) *Kellibara I* and (56) *Kellibara II* as two distinct documents by different authors for the same institution. Overall, we have tried to maintain a delicate balance between leaving the conventions of the underlying editions as undisturbed as possible while facilitating our own cross-referencing and that of our readers among all the various components of this large collection of translations. On occasion, this has meant that when cross-referencing a section of a document that lies outside its traditional chapter numeration, we must use a referent like "Preface" or "Prologue" for prefatory materials, or "Appendix A" or [INV] for an appendix or inventory. These should be self-explanatory.

Although access to the underlying Greek and Old Church Slavonic texts is not assumed, especially since many of the editions are quite rare, it is facilitated throughout our collection of

biographical bibliographies. These latter include references to related hagiographic texts that are often important supplements to the information available in the foundation documents.

INTRODUCTION

translations by insertion of bracketed page or column references to the editions of the texts that we have employed.

Among the editors of these documents, only Tsiknopoullos with his edition of (34) *Machairas* and Gautier with his (27) *Kecharitomene* made any attempt to indicate the nature and extent of the borrowings of their authors from earlier documents. Only Gautier actually indicates the specific passages borrowed in his edition. We believe that it is absolutely essential to be aware of these borrowings in order to appreciate the extent of each author's own contribution. The ability to reconstruct a considerable part of monastic history through the study of these borrowings is a great bonus. Therefore we have attempted to indicate the precise borrowings among the documents, with the borrowed text placed in bold and/or italics, wherever we could identify them. Scriptural citations are also noted directly in the documents. Their translation follows the L. C. Brenton translation of the Septuagint (London, 1844) and the *Revised Standard Version* of the New Testament (New York, 1946). Finally, words and phrases inserted by translators in order to clarify obscure passages appear within square brackets ([...]).

Like the introductory materials, the translations are supplied with footnotes. These are primarily the work of the editors John Thomas and Angela Hero, though for certain documents individual translators have assisted us. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged in the notes to the individual documents. A series of fairly extensive cross-references to nearly all of the documents have also been provided in the document notes to the translations. These are the work of John Thomas.

A glossary of technical terms by Angela Hero will be found after the documents. There are three appendices by John Thomas: "Concordance with Previous Lists" (Appendix A); "The Regulation of Diet in the Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents" (Appendix B); and three tables illustrating the topical interrelationships of three families of monastic *typika* (Appendix C). The first table in the last appendix, titled "Topical Interrelationships of the Evergetian Family of Monastic *Typika*," should be consulted to identify the "related documents" frequently referred to in the endnotes to many of the translations in conjunction with cross-references to (22) *Evergetis*. A general bibliography by John Thomas, subdivided into thirty topical bibliographies, concludes our work.

We have chosen not to adopt a strictly chronological ordering for the placement of the documents within our nine chapters. Given the uncertainty of the dating of many documents, chronology would not have been a sure guide to organization in any event. Moreover, such a large collection of documents as ours needs a more helpful conceptual framework. While various alternative schemes of organization are possible,⁴⁵ we think that our modified chronological arrangement of the documents according to the types of institutions for which they were written works well for making Byzantine monasticism understandable over some 750 years of medieval history.

Necessarily in a work of this size, complexity and novelty, there will be many shortcomings for which the editors must beg indulgence. The emphasis has been on making the documents, through the medium of the translations, notes, and commentaries, considerably more accessible for future work rather than attempting to do all of that work ourselves.

⁴⁵ Such as the "aristocratic" versus "non-aristocratic" distinction proposed by Galatariotou, "Ktetorika Typika," pp. 89, 109.

INTRODUCTION

E. Principles of This Translation

Presuming neither knowledge of medieval Greek nor access to the underlying editions, we have endeavored to translate the documents in the corpus as completely as possible. Titles of monastic officials and some technical terms have been translated into English equivalents where possible. Otherwise, they have been transliterated and their meaning explained in the Glossary. The editors were the final arbiters of how the translations read. We have struggled mightily to maintain consistency in the translations, though with fifteen contributors in America and Europe working independently on this project for over a decade, perfection was hardly within reach.

Readers will find that the style of these translations varies somewhat from one translator to another, as it does from one author to another in the original texts. We have tried to see to it that, whatever the individual variations from one document to another, the overall style of the corpus should be idiomatic contemporary American English.

F. General Observations on the Documents

1. Original Texts

One of the outstanding claims to interest that the corpus of 61 Byzantine monastic foundation documents makes is the relatively large number of them that exist as original texts. The oldest document in this category is (1) *Apa Abraham* of the seventh century, preserved on papyrus in the British Museum. Two of the documents were preserved as monumental inscriptions, (16) *Mount Tmolos* and (18) *Nea Gephyra*, the former recently discovered, the latter now lost. Perhaps as many as 19 autograph or isotype manuscripts also survive to the present day. From the tenth century comes (12) *Tzimiskes*, the earliest of them. Isotype copies of (15) *Constantine IX* and (19) *Attaleiates* survive from the eleventh century. The *Testament* [B] and *Codicil* [C] of (24) *Christodoulos* are autographs of the late eleventh century as is the first version [A] of (25) *Fragala*. From the twelfth century come the autographs of the second [B] and third [C] versions of (25) *Fragala*, (26) *Luke of Messina*, (27) *Kecharitomene*, (33) *Heliou Bomon*, (41) *Docheiariou*, (43) *Kasoulon*, and possibly also (30) *Phoberos*. Sad to say, the immensely valuable twelfth-century autograph of (28) *Pantokrator* survived in a Peloponnesian monastery until 1934, when it was destroyed in a fire.

The originals of the two Cypriot *typika*, (34) *Machairas* and (45) *Neophytos*, both of the early thirteenth century, survive, the latter at Edinburgh University, the former *in situ* at its home institution on Cyprus. A manuscript in the British Library preserves the original copies of (39) *Lips* and (40) *Anargyroi*. The thirteenth-century manuscript of (35) *Skoteine*, surviving in the Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos, may also be an autograph. Originals of the three versions of (51) *Koutloumousi* at the Kutlumus monastery on Mount Athos survive from the fourteenth century. Another fourteenth-century manuscript may preserve the original of (48) *Prodromos*. (57) *Bebaia Elpis* survives at Lincoln College, Oxford, in a deluxe fourteenth-century original edition. Finally, from the fifteenth century, (59) *Manuel II* survives in autograph at the Athonite Iveron monastery; the *Inventory* associated with (54) *Neilos Damilas* may also be a fifteenth-century original.

Counting the surviving inscription and the papyrus, perhaps as many as 20 of the documents can be traced to the author's or his scribe's hand, with (15) *Constantine IX* being derived from an

INTRODUCTION

authenticated copy made a half century after the original. Further palaeographic research may indicate that the corpus of Byzantine monastic foundation documents contains some additional autographs. The nature of the documents partly explains the good rate of survival for autographs. As profoundly personal documents of the founders intended for the regulation of their own communities, they were among the most important possessions of the institutions for which they were written. The documents themselves provide some evidence of the precautions taken in Byzantine times to assure their survival.⁴⁶ On the other hand, since these documents were highly idiosyncratic and particular in their application, most would have been of slight interest to scribes in other institutions.⁴⁷ Therefore, survival of the texts in any form was ordinarily dependent on institutional continuity into relatively modern times, as even a cursory examination of the history of the institutions represented by these documents will show.

2. Manuscripts

Aside from the autographs or isotypes described above, the remaining texts survive in medieval manuscripts or more modern transcriptions. Particulars could not be determined about some of these manuscripts, but (3) *Theodore Studites*, (5) *Euthymios*, (22) *Evergetis*, (42) *Sabas*, and the balance of (24) *Christodoulos* not represented by autographs are from the twelfth century. (32) *Mamas* dates from a manuscript of the late twelfth or thirteenth centuries. (23) *Pakourianos* dates from a thirteenth-century manuscript. Version [A] of (4) *Stoudios* derives from a manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. From the fourteenth century come eight documents: (7) *Latros*, (9) *Galesios*, (36) *Blemmydes*, (38) *Kellibara I*, (46) *Akropolites*, (52) *Choumnos*, (53) *Meteora*, and (55) *Athanasios I*; these include many of the texts preserved in hagiographic or quasi-hagiographic literature. The manuscript witnesses to (60) *Charsianeites* date from the fifteenth century; those of (54) *Neilos Damilas* from either that century or the sixteenth.

We are dependent on post-Byzantine copies for (11) *Ath. Rule*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, and (14) *Ath. Testament*, (31) *Areia*, (47) *Philanthropos*, and (56) *Kellibara II*, which are all of the sixteenth century. The chief Slavonic manuscript of (2) *Pantelleria* is from either the sixteenth or the seventeenth century. Later still are the manuscripts underlying the texts of (8) *John Xenos*, what is now the oldest witness to (28) *Pantokrator*, (37) *Auxentios* and (58) *Menoikeion*, that are all from the eighteenth century. Fourmont's transcription of the (8) *Nea Gephyra* inscription was made in 1730. We are dependent on modern copies of the nineteenth century of lost medieval manuscripts for (6) *Rila*, (10) *Eleousa*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (44) *Karyes*, (49) *Geromeri*, and (61) *Eleousa Inv.* The manuscript of (50) *Gerasimos*, of uncertain date, may be a forgery.

3. Editions

Some older editions have held up well against the test of time, such as (39) *Lips*, (40) *Anargyroi* and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* (Delehay, 1921). There are, however, some old editions, such as (3) *Theodore*

⁴⁶ See (14) *Ath. Testament* [1], (19) *Attaleiates* [40], (23) *Pakourianos* [33A], and (32) *Mamas*, *Second Semeioma*.

⁴⁷ The families of interrelated documents among the Studite and Evergetian monasteries form a major exception to this generalization (see below, Chapters Two, Five, and Six, for a discussion of the influence of the *typika* of these monasteries on later institutions).

INTRODUCTION

Studites (Sirmond, 1696) and the second testament of (25) *Fragala* (Spata, 1861), which deserve another look. The edition of the *Taktikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain, including (20) *Black Mountain* and (21) *Roidion* (Benešević, 1917), was never completed. Like the Evergetis family of documents, the smaller group of Studite texts, including (3) *Theodore Studites*, both versions of (4) *Stoudios* (Mai, 1849 and Dmitrievsky, 1895), (11) *Ath. Rule*, and (13) *Ath. Typikon* (Meyer, 1894) are textually interrelated, and ought to be edited together as a group. Moreover, as Dmitrievsky himself was aware, the two edited versions of (4) *Stoudios* are far from being the only significant witnesses to the manuscript tradition of that document.

A great deal of progress has been made in editing or re-editing the texts since the beginning of our project. Thanks to Gautier, the texts of (28) *Pantokrator* (1974), (19) *Attaleiates* (1981), (22) *Evergetis* (1982), (23) *Pakourianos* (1984), and (27) *Kecharitomene* (1985) are now firmly established. The last two editions appeared while our translation effort was underway, and Robert Jordan, the translator to whom they were assigned, was able to benefit from Gautier's improvements to these texts. As noted above, many of the shorter texts have also been edited or re-edited within the last decade. Although the appearance of these editions caused the editors some headaches during the last decade, their availability has strengthened the textual base on which this translation project rests.

Some texts stand in need of new editions. The (35) *Skoteine* is perhaps in the worst shape, with both editions (Eustratiades, 1930 and Gedeon, 1939) unsatisfactory. Now that Gautier has provided us with a fine edition of (22) *Evergetis* (1982), the re-edition of the Evergetian family of texts, aside from his (27) *Kecharitomene* (1985), becomes both more pressing and possible. Eustratiades, the editor of (32) *Mamas* (1928), does not seem to have collated his manuscript with that of (33) *Heliou Bomon* (Dmitrievsky, 1895) even though the latter is in large part an exact copy of the former document, and is itself an autograph original composed only three or four years after its model. Unless somehow the lost fifteenth-century manuscript of (29) *Kosmosoteira* should turn up, the best we can hope for with it is an improvement of the text based on the many borrowings it makes from (22) *Evergetis*.⁴⁸

There is also the problem of those documents which are available only in rare or obscure publications. Among these are the editions of (10) *Eleousa*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, and (48) *Neilos Damilas*, still available only in the editions of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Istanbul published around the turn of the century. The rare original editions of Papadopoulos-Kerameus' *Analekta Hierosolymitikes Stachyologias*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1891), for which we must turn for the only edition of (50) *Gerasimos*, and his *Noctes Petropolitanae* (St. Petersburg, 1913), in which is to be found the only edition of (30) *Phoberos*, have fortunately been reprinted (Brussels, 1963, and Leipzig, 1976). What may be the sole original copy in America of Benešević's edition of (20) *Black Mountain* and (21) *Roidion* is to be found in the Harvard College Library. The

⁴⁸ After this volume had gone to press, a new edition of the *typikon* of *Kosmosoteira* was published by G. K. Papazoglou based on a late sixteenth-century manuscript recently discovered in the library of the monastery of Saint Gerasimos on Cephalonia (*Typikon Isaakiou Alexiou Komnenou tes mones Theotokou tes Kosmosoteiras* [Komotene, 1994]). We wish to thank Dr. Nancy P. Ševčenko for bringing this edition to our attention and regret that it appeared too late for us to benefit from it.

INTRODUCTION

editors suspect that the assembly of the original editions made over ten years ago at Dumbarton Oaks, before assigning the translations, was the first ever successfully accomplished. Even we had difficulty locating some publications, like the relevant number of the Greek periodical *Thesprotika*, our source for the edition of (49) *Geromeri*. Therefore, there is a clear need to re-edit or at least reprint the editions of these texts to increase their general accessibility.

It was never the intent of the Byzantine monastic documents project to translate any additional documents with a claim to inclusion in the corpus which might still remain unedited in manuscript. The editors are aware of a few such texts which might someday find their way into the corpus, though without careful examination of the manuscripts, their claims to admission cannot now be considered.⁴⁹

4. Other Translations

The Byzantine monastic foundation documents have not been served well by translations into any language before this edition. Apart from Gautier's valiant effort, there has been no systematic attempt to translate the documents into any language. Yet as the editors and our translators can attest, any help from prior scholarship is welcome in an ambitious enterprise such as ours. Readers more familiar with languages other than English may appreciate the cross-references which follow.

In accordance with traditional editing practice, seven of the documents have Latin translations provided by their editors: (3) *Theodore Studites* (Sirmond, 1696), (4) *Stoudios [B]* (Mai, 1849), (7) *Latros* (Delehay, 1892), (25) *Fragala* (partial, Spata, 1861), (27) *Kecharitomene* (Montfaucon, 1688), and (26) *Luke of Messina* and (43) *Kasoulon* (both by Cozza-Luzi, 1905). Another seven have generally excellent French translations: (19) *Attaleiates* (1981), (22) *Evergetis* (1982), (23) *Pakourianos* (1984), (27) *Kecharitomene* (1985), and (28) *Pantokrator* (1974) (all by Gautier); also (18) *Nea Gephyra* (Philippidis-Braat, 1985), (43) *Kasoulon* (Jeanselme and Oeconomos, 1922), and two partial translations of (38) *Kellibara I* (Chapman, 1926, and Grégoire, 1960). Not coincidentally, these are the best known documents at the present time.

Reflecting an abiding interest in these documents stimulated by pre-revolutionary Russian scholars, there are Russian translations of (5) *Euthymios* (Kazhdan, 1959), (12) *Tzimiskes* (Uspensky 1877), (15) *Constantine IX* (Uspensky, 1877), two versions of (23) *Pakourianos* (Shanidze, 1971 and Arutyunova-Fidanyan, 1978), (42) *Sabas* (Dmitrievsky, 1890) and (59) *Manuel II* (Uspensky, 1892). There is also a partial Russian translation of (38) *Kellibara I* (Troitskii, 1885), to supplement the French translations mentioned above. Unfortunately, all except the most recent editions are very rare in American libraries.

A few of the shorter documents have been translated into Modern Greek: (47) *Meteora* (Lampros, 1905), and the *Rule [A]* of (24) *Christodoulos* (Georgousakes, 1913) and the *Memo-*

⁴⁹ A *typikon* of Patriarch Alexios Studites for the Monastery of The Divine Mother (1034): Avgustin Nikitin, "Das Studios-Kloster und die alte Rus," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 37 (1988), 107–47, with discussion and partial translation in David Petras, *The Typicon of the Patriarch Alexis the Studite: Novgorod-St. Sophia 1136* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1991); a late eleventh-century rule for the Constantinopolitan monastery of Petra: Alice-Mary Talbot, "Petra Monastery," *ODB*, p. 1643; *typikon* of Patir, ca. 1130–50, for which see the discussion below in (26) *Luke of Messina*, Institutional History, D.

INTRODUCTION

randum [M] of (31) *Areia* (Papadopoulos, 1967). Of course these are unlikely to have much value to readers who cannot read the documents in medieval Greek. Otherwise, translations have been few and far between: (2) *Pantelleria* (Dujčev, 1971) into Italian; (3) *Theodore Studites* and (4) *Stoudios* (Goshev, 1940) and (6) *Rila* (Dujčev, 1947) into Bulgarian; (16) *Mount Tmolos* into German (Koder, 1988); (23) *Pakourianos* (Kauchtschischvili, 1963) into modern Georgian (in addition to the French and Russian translations). There is also a German paraphrase of part of (60) *Charsianeites* (Hunger, 1958). Though not modern translations, there is an Old Church Slavonic version of (4) *Stoudios* (unedited) and an old Serbian version of (44) *Karyes* (ed. Corović, 1928).

Finally, these documents are hardly known at all in the few prior English translations, which are: (1) *Apa Abraham* (Goodwin, 1859); (5) *Euthymios* (Karlin-Hayter, 1955, reproduced here); (42) *Sabas* (Di Segni, 1995); and a very small part of (36) *Blemmydes* (Munitiz, 1986, also reproduced here). Unfortunately these are not the documents of the greatest historical importance in our collection. The first English translation of (55) *Athanasios I*, produced for this edition, will also be published separately. Bibliographic citations and further details on prior translations will be found in the introductory materials for the individual documents.

Allowing for overlapping coverage, this means that 23 of 61 documents have been available in complete and another five in partial translations prior to this edition. The rest have never before been translated into any language whatsoever. These include documents of exceptional importance such as (9) *Galesios*, (10) *Eleousa*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (32) *Mamas*, (37) *Auxentios*, (45) *Neophytos* and (60) *Charsianeites*, to name just a few, which are making their appearance now in our edition.

5. Commentaries

Given that the editions of the documents are so widely dispersed and often inadequate besides, it is no surprise that scholarship on them in many cases is not very far advanced. Of the individual texts, (23) *Pakourianos* has attracted the greatest attention, no doubt because of its peculiar interest for cross-cultural history. There are full commentaries in French (Lemerle, 1977), Russian (Arutyunova-Fidanyan, 1978), and Georgian (Kauchtschischvili, 1963). Some of the very brief documents, e.g., (5) *Euthymios*, (16) *Mount Tmolos*, and (18) *Nea Gephyra*, have been adequately discussed by their editors. But again, as is the case with translations, many important documents have been almost completely ignored by scholarship, such as (20) *Black Mountain*, (21) *Roidion*, (30) *Phoberos*, (33) *Heliou Bomon*, (34) *Machairas*, (37) *Auxentios*, (54) *Neilos Damilas*, (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, and (60) *Charsianeites*. That said, the editors have found that there is, nevertheless, a surprising amount of bibliography that can be assembled to shed light on many of the individual documents. Much of this is only incidental treatment in the course of work with other objectives, but given the overall state of scholarship on the documents, it must still be welcomed. Details will be found in the bibliographies for the individual documents.

Scholarship on the entire collection of these documents necessarily has had to await the definition of the corpus itself. As noted above, a consensus on the content of the corpus is even now not complete. Janin (1964) attempted the first overall evaluation in our own times, though he was

⁵⁰ Janin, “Commende et typica,” pp. 5–44.

INTRODUCTION

unaware of many of the texts in this present collection.⁵⁰ The contributions of Manaphes (1970) and Konidares (1984) have been acknowledged above, while Galatarriotou's overview (1987) and that of Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer (1992), which is based on it, are stimulating if necessarily tentative. Rosemary Morris (1982), Robert Volk (1983), Angeliki Laiou (1985), one of our translators Alice-Mary Talbot (1983), and our editor John Thomas (1985) have examined some of the documents together for particular purposes.⁵¹

6. Geographic and Chronological Distribution

As is the case with most other types of sources from the Byzantine era, it is likely that only a small proportion of the monastic foundation documents have survived. Geographically, the largest number (25) of survivors come from 22 institutions once located in what is now Turkey. Of these, there are 14 documents representing 12 institutions in the old capital city of Constantinople and its environs⁵² and 10 representing a like number of institutions located elsewhere in modern Turkey.⁵³ Greece is next best represented with 20 documents representing four individual monasteries on Mount Athos, the entire group of Athonite monasteries, two monasteries on the island of Crete, and eight elsewhere in Greece.⁵⁴ There are no other large geographic concentrations. Four documents come from Italy (including two from Sicily), two each from Bulgaria, (former Yugoslavian) Macedonia, Jerusalem and the West Bank, and Cyprus.⁵⁵ One document, (1) *Apa Abraham*, comes from Egypt.

Twenty-one documents are associated with religious institutions that are still functioning in some way, though not always as monasteries; of these, most are still *in situ* at the monasteries for which they can be said in some sense to have been written: Iveron, Docheiariou, and Kutlumus on

⁵¹ Rosemary Morris, "Legal Terminology in Monastic Documents of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," *JÖB* 32.2 (1982), 281–90; Robert Volk, *Gesundheitswesen und Wohltätigkeit im Spiegel der byzantinischen Klostartypika* (Munich, 1983); Angeliki Laiou, "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women," *BF* 9 (1985), 59–102; Alice-Mary Talbot, "A Comparison of the Monastic Experiences of Byzantine Men and Women," *GRBS* 30 (1985), 1–20; John Philip Thomas, "The Rise of the Independent and Self-Governing Monasteries as Reflected in the Monastic *Typika*," *GOTR* 30 (1985), 21–30; Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, "Das Typikon-Ktetorikon und sein literarhistorischer Kontext," *OCF* 58 (1992), 475–513.

⁵² (3) *Theodore Studites*, (4) *Stoudios*, (22) *Evergetis*, (27) *Kecharitomene*, (28) *Pantokrator*, (32) *Mamas*, (38) *Kellibara I*, (39) *Lips*, (40) *Anargyroi*, (46) *Akropolites*, (47) *Philanthropos*, (56) *Kellibara II*, (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, and (60) *Charsianeites*.

⁵³ (7) *Latros*, (9) *Galesios*, (16) *Mount Tmolos*, (19) *Attaleiates*, (20) *Black Mountain*, (21) *Roidion*, (30) *Phoberos*, (33) *Heliou Bomon*, (35) *Skoteine*, and (37) *Auxentios*.

⁵⁴ Mount Athos: (11) *Ath. Rule*, (12) *Tzimiskes*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, (14) *Ath. Testament*, (15) *Constantine IX*, (41) *Docheiariou*, (44) *Karyes*, (48) *Prodromos*, (51) *Koutloumousi*, and (59) *Manuel II*; Crete: (8) *John Xenos* and (54) *Neilos Damilas*; elsewhere in Greece: (17) *Nikon Metanoieite*, (18) *Nea Gephyra*, (24) *Christodoulos*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (49) *Geromeri*, (52) *Choumnos*, (53) *Meteora*, and (58) *Menoikeion*.

⁵⁵ Italy: (2) *Pantelleria*, (25) *Fragala*, (26) *Luke of Messina*, and (43) *Kasoulon*; Bulgaria: (6) *Rila* and (23) *Pakourianos*; (former Yugoslavian) Macedonia: (10) *Eleousa* and (61) *Eleousa Inv.*; Jerusalem and the West Bank: (42) *Sabas* and (50) *Gerasimos*; Cyprus: (34) *Machairas* and (45) *Neophytos*.

⁵⁶ (6) *Rila*, (10) *Eleousa*, (11) *Ath. Rule*, (12) *Tzimiskes*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, (14) *Ath. Testament*, (15) *Constantine IX*, (23) *Pakourianos*, (24) *Christodoulos*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (31) *Areia*, (34) *Machairas*, (41)

INTRODUCTION

Mount Athos; Meteora, Patmos, and Geromeri in Greece; and Machairas on Cyprus.⁵⁶ Others remained on site until relatively modern times, like (45) *Neophytos*, which remained *in situ* at its original monastery on Cyprus until the mid-seventeenth century, when its hard pressed monks sold their manuscripts to agents of the French crown.⁵⁷ Therefore it appears highly likely that the representativeness of the corpus for Byzantine monasticism as a whole is affected by the circumstances of their highly motivated preservation by the institutions for which they were composed. Necessarily, those parts of the Byzantine Empire which remained Christian through modern times are likely overrepresented in the surviving corpus of documents, most notably in the group from the Athonite monasteries. Portions of the empire now in Turkey, except for Constantinople, are likely underrepresented, though it must be admitted that there have been some remarkable survivals, e.g., (19) *Attaleiates* (isotype in the National Library, Athens) and (35) *Skoteine* (autograph, Vatopedi monastery, Mount Athos).

Inevitably, the long passage of time also distorts the sample chronologically somewhat. There are four documents from the fifteenth century; twelve from the fourteenth century; eight from the thirteenth century; thirteen from the twelfth century; eleven from the eleventh century; ten from the tenth century; two from the ninth century; and one each from the eighth and seventh centuries.⁵⁸ The impression of relative balance (except for the earliest centuries) is in fact deceptive, since most of the documents before the later eleventh century are very short, and many owe their preservation not as free-standing monastic foundation documents but as testaments encapsulated in hagiographic sources.⁵⁹

7. Utility for Monastic History

With careful exploitation, it is possible to utilize the documents in this collection to illustrate the outlines of the development of Byzantine monasticism from its origins to the end of the empire. The nine chapter introductions, prefaced by the discussion of early monastic rules, will attempt to

Docheiariou, (42) *Sabas*, (48) *Prodromos*, (49) *Geromeri*, (51) *Koutloumoussi*, (53) *Meteora*, (58) *Menoikeion*, (59) *Manuel II*, and (61) *Eleousa Inv.*

⁵⁷ Cyril Mango and Ernest Hawkins, "The Hermitage of St. Neophytus and Its Wall Paintings," *DOP* 20 (1966), 128, 130.

⁵⁸ Fifteenth century: (54) *Neilos Damilas*, (59) *Manuel II*, (60) *Charsianeites*, and (61) *Eleousa Inv.*; fourteenth century: (46) *Akropolites*, (47) *Philanthropos*, (48) *Prodromos*, (49) *Geromeri*, (50) *Gerasimos*, (51) *Koutloumoussi*, (52) *Choumnos*, (53) *Meteora*, (55) *Athanasios I*, (56) *Kellibara II*, (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, and (58) *Menoikeion*; thirteenth century: (34) *Machairas*, (35) *Skoteine*, (36) *Blemmydes*, (37) *Auxentios*, (38) *Kellibara I*, (39) *Lips*, (40) *Anargyroi*, and (45) *Neophytos*; twelfth century: (25) *Fragala [B], [C]*, (26) *Luke of Messina*, (27) *Kecharitomene*, (28) *Pantokrator*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (30) *Phoberos*, (31) *Areia*, (32) *Mamas*, (33) *Heliou Bomon*, (41) *Docheiariou*, (42) *Sabas*, (43) *Kasoulon*, and (44) *Karyes*; eleventh century: (8) *John Xenos*, (9) *Galesios*, (10) *Eleousa*, (18) *Nea Gephyra*, (19) *Attaleiates*, (20) *Black Mountain*, (21) *Roidion*, (22) *Evergetis*, (23) *Pakourianos*, (24) *Christodoulos*, and (25) *Fragala [A]*; tenth century: (5) *Euthymios*, (6) *Rila*, (7) *Latros*, (11) *Ath. Rule*, (12) *Tzimiskes*, (13) *Ath. Typikon*, (14) *Ath. Testament*, (15) *Constantine IX*, (16) *Mount Tmolos*, and (17) *Nikon Metanoeite*; ninth century: (3) *Theodore Studites* and (4) *Stoutleria*; eighth century: (2) *Pantelleria*; seventh century: (1) *Apa Abraham*.

⁵⁹ (5) *Euthymios*, (6) *Rila*, (7) *Latros* (8) *John Xenos*, (9) *Galesios*, (17) *Nikon Metanoeite*.

INTRODUCTION

do this insofar as the current scope of scholarship allows. Given this intent, the geographical and chronological limitations on the Byzantine monastic foundation documents as discussed above will necessarily serve as caveats on our conclusions.

It should also be kept in mind that, ambitious as this current project has been, there are some other critically important bodies of source material that need to be well understood before a definitive history of Byzantine monasticism can be attempted. The hagiography project based at Dumbarton Oaks formerly under the direction of Alexander Kazhdan†, with the assistance of our translator Alice-Mary Talbot, promises to be one of these important sources. The on-going publication of the *Actes de l'Athos*, from which our own project has benefited, will continue to illuminate another important group of sources. Hagiography and the Athonite cartularies are especially important as correctives, in their own very different ways, for the normative bias of most of the Byzantine monastic foundation documents, aside from a few exceptional texts like (12) *Tzimiskes*, (15) *Constantine IX*, (21) *Roidion*, and (55) *Athanasios I*. Finally, John Thomas hopes to undertake a comprehensive study of the canon law tradition in the Byzantine world in order to illuminate the much-neglected viewpoint of the empire's public authorities on the essentially private world of Byzantine religious foundations.