

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](http://www.doaks.org/etexts.html)

## CHAPTER SIX

### Early Reform Monasteries of the Twelfth Century

“Accordingly, I myself, too, even though I have already suffered the death of the body, which is in accord with nature, and am covered by a tombstone, as you see, I am with you through this piece of writing and I use this as a mouthpiece and I offer it as the voice which I owe you.” (32) *Mamas* [48]

“A commemoration should be held for my worthless self annually on the anniversary of my death, and on the next day for my blessed parents, the monk Nikodemos and the nun Catherine, and for my brothers and sisters in the flesh, the monk Peter, and Helen, and the bishop John, and for my uncles who raised me, lord Constantine Antzas and the monk lord Iakobos . . .” (31) *Areia* [T12]

“. . . nor do I want a monk or ‘foreign tonsure’ who comes from Nauplia to be promoted to the position of superior, since they are passionately devoted to their relatives, and live indeed ‘according to the flesh’ (Rom. 8:5).” (31) *Areia* [T10]

This chapter includes four documents that are contemporaries of the five presented in Chapter Five. While the latter were all products of the milieu of imperial or royal patronage, those in this chapter were all composed by private individuals founding constitutionally independent monasteries in the reform tradition. (30) *Phoberos* was written by a monk and (33) *Heliou Bomon* by a court official, while another, (31) *Areia*, was written by a bishop, and (32) *Mamas* was written by the foundation’s superior. All of the documents employ (22) *Evergetis* either directly or indirectly, except perhaps for (31) *Areia* which is nevertheless sympathetic to Evergetian concerns. Therefore, these founders are the inheritors in the third generation of the tradition of Evergetian reform.

#### *A. Typology of the Documents*

Three of these documents, (30) *Phoberos*, (32) *Mamas*, and (33) *Heliou Bomon*, are long, complex *typika* like (22) *Evergetis* itself and their contemporaries, the imperial *typika* of Chapter Five, (27) *Kecharitome*, (28) *Pantokrator*, and (29) *Kosmosoteira*. (30) *Phoberos* is in fact the longest *typikon* in our entire collection of Byzantine monastic foundation documents. (31) *Areia* is a shorter document, analogous to (10) *Eleousa* in the previous century, another text authored by a bishop for a provincial monastery.

Three of the documents refer to associated inventories of landed and movable properties: (30) *Phoberos* [1], (32) *Mamas* [37], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [37]. All of these have since been lost; (31) *Areia* includes [T11] a brief surviving inventory of movable properties only.

## CHAPTER SIX

Official memoranda (*hypomnemata*) issued by officials of the ecclesiastical hierarchy served to confirm the independence of all of these foundations. Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084–1111) issued the memorandum for (30) *Phoberos* [33], Patriarch Nicholas IV Muzalon (1147–51) for (32) *Mamas* [4], and Patriarch Constantine IV Chliarenos (1154–57) for (33) *Heliou Bomon* [Prologue]; Leo, bishop of Nauplia, simply issued his own memorandum for (31) *Areia* which survives joined to the *typikon* (as [M]). All of the patriarchal memoranda have been lost. The authors of (32) *Mamas* [4] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [4] took the added precaution of obtaining imperial chrysobulls from Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–80) to confirm the independence of their foundations. The author of (32) *Mamas* also refers [Second *Semeioma*] to a transmissory deed that recalls the gift and grant ordinance mentioned in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [116].

Several auxiliary documents are preserved as attachments to (32) *Mamas*. The first *Semeioma* serves to authenticate the *typikon* drawn up some five years earlier. It is preceded and introduced by a judicial confirmation. A Second *Semeioma* from the same year, also preceded by an introductory statement, records the arrangements for the preservation of the foundation's most important documents.

Clearly as the twelfth century progressed, other documents joined the *typikon* as essential components of the legal underpinnings of certain Byzantine religious foundations. Indeed, the author of (33) *Heliou Bomon* [48] even cites that foundation's patriarchal memorandum as providing him with the authority to draw up a *typikon*. The fact that monasteries for which (32) *Mamas* [First *Semeioma*], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [Prologue], and (in all likelihood) also (30) *Phoberos* [33] were written had been nominally patriarchal institutions before they were all nearly ruined by concessionaires under the *charistike* must account for the solicitation and careful preservation of these auxiliary documents. Also, although the foundation for which he was legislating in (31) *Areia* was new, the author, Leo of Nauplia, thought he needed a memorandum as well, probably because he intended to support [M10] this independent monastery with revenues from diocesan monasteries transferred to it under ecclesiastical *epidosis*. Without a memorandum of independence, the bishop's successors might well be able to assert that this was a diocesan foundation simply on the basis of its endowment.

### *B. Place of the Documents within the Monastic Reform Movement*

By careful examination of the contents of the four *typika* in this chapter, it is possible to track the course of the monastic reform movement through the better part of the twelfth century. This is true even though not one of the four authors of the documents forthrightly acknowledges his dependence on (22) *Evergetis*.

#### 1. Reproduction of the Evergetian Canon

John, the author of (30) *Phoberos*, was a contemporary of Empress Irene Doukaina Komnene, author of (27) *Kecharitomene*, but whereas the latter text already demonstrates important qualifications of Evergetian reform principles along with intensifications of concern about others, John's *typikon* reflects the Evergetian ideological tradition virtually unchanged from his model. He even reproduces [35] his source's exceptional provision that a manifestly bad superior should be left in office if the preminent monks cannot agree on a suitable successor, thereby demonstrating a degree of Evergetian fealty his successors in the tradition would not feel obliged to match. This

author's preoccupation with supplementing his Evergetian quotations with citations from the canonical and ascetic traditions is indicative, however, of the increased use of these sources by the reform movement, beginning towards the end of the eleventh century and continuing on into the twelfth.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Evergetian Influence without Textual Dependence

Later on in the twelfth century, (31) *Areia*, like its contemporary the imperial *typikon* (28) *Pantokrator*, illustrates how even a document not actually quoting from (22) *Evergetis* can nevertheless show convincing evidence of its indebtedness to the reform tradition through its Evergetian-cadenced prescriptions for sacramental life [T2], refectory procedures [T3], consultative government [T10], and institutional independence [T12]. This strongly suggests an alternative route for the dissemination of Evergetian procedures and institutions through synopsis rather than direct quotation.

## 3. Influence of the Second Generation of Reformers

The Evergetian reform tradition also became more diverse, enriched both conceptually and textually, as the century progressed. One influential contributor to this process of diversification was either (27) *Kecharitomene* or (more likely) the lost *typikon* of Empress Irene's companion foundation for monks, *Philanthropos*. These documents seem to have reflected the concerns of a second generation of monastic reformers who felt more secure about the permanence of their ideological revolution but who sought to consolidate their gains and make *Evergetis'* ideas more palatable to aristocratic patrons. Although some version of (22) *Evergetis* continued to circulate independently, being employed as such not only by the author of (30) *Phoberos* but even as late as 1152 by Isaac Komnenos in (29) *Kosmosoteira*, the Evergetian tradition was also being represented by sympathetic works of new advocates during the second quarter of the twelfth century.

## 4. The Maman Summation of the Reform Tradition

Approximately forty years after the composition of (27) *Kecharitomene* and *Philanthropos*, Athanasios Philanthropenos, author of (32) *Mamas* made use of one of these texts, most likely the *typikon* of the *Philanthropos* monastery where he had previously served as steward. Careful textual analysis of (32) *Mamas* reveals no less than six identifiable layers of reform contributions over three generations since the original prototype, (22) *Evergetis*.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Athanasios may not even have set eyes on the venerable prototype. Some ten years later, (33) *Heliou Bomon* shows that some incremental change had occurred even in that short period of time.

## 5. Residual Studite Influence

As noted above in Chapter Four, (22) *Evergetis* represented only one strand of the reform, though

<sup>1</sup> For the use of canon law and ascetic quotations by the reformers, see (20) *Black Mountain*, Analysis; the scholiast on *Semeioma epi te kathairesei tou Chalkedonos*, ed. I. Sakkélion, "Décret d'Alexis Comnène portant déposition de Léon métropolitain de Chalcédoine," *BCH* 2 (1878), p. 123, n. 3, and p. 127, n. 2; and V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1: *Les registres de 381 à 715* (Chalcedon, 1932); 2nd ed. (Paris, 1972), nos. 952 (Athens decision) and 1000 (Kyzikos decision).

<sup>2</sup> See the discussion below in (32) *Mamas*, Analysis, B: Utility for the History of the Reform Movement.

## CHAPTER SIX

to be sure the most influential by far. Indeed, (31) *Areia* [M8] claims to be drawing on the lost *typikon* of Meletios the Younger (†1105), and does revive [T9] certain Studite institutions like monastic confinement. The durability of Studite notions of monastic governance, such as the insulation of the superior from the financial management of his monastery (cf. (3) *Theodore Studites* [22]), is likewise attested by occasional revivals in documents like (32) *Mamas* [48] that are more clearly in the Evergetian tradition. In (33) *Heliou Bomon* [8] the author even prescribes a return to the Studite *synaxarion* in preference to that of *Evergetis*. The importance the Evergetian reformers placed on the collection and study of the broader ascetic tradition must have made a contribution to the revival of older (and occasionally discordant) institutions and practices.

### *C. Endorsements and Developments of the Evergetian Canon*

Like the authors of the imperial documents discussed above in Chapter Five, the authors of these four documents shared a bedrock commitment to many basic Evergetian principles.

#### 1. Institutional Independence

Despite their diverse backgrounds, all four of our authors provide for the independence of their foundations. John, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [33], uses the precise language of (22) *Evergetis* [12] in his declaration, adding a vigorous condemnation of the *charistikarioi* who had earlier destroyed his foundation. Leo of Nauplia's formula in (31) *Areia* is similar though not identical to (22) *Evergetis* [12]. Both (32) *Mamas* [4] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [4] use a more developed post-Evergetian formula<sup>3</sup> that specifically mentions the *charistike* (which (22) *Evergetis* [12] does not) and rules out participation in it or any of the other official programs for financial exploitation of ecclesiastical institutions.

#### 2. Internal Selection of the Superior

All of our authors also recognized the importance for institutional independence of a free, internal choice of the superior. (30) *Phoberos* [35] adopts the arrangements of (22) *Evergetis* [13], [14] under which the superior was to choose the steward, who would become superior himself upon the latter's death unless he should prove unfit for the office and another suitable candidate was at hand. (31) *Areia* [T10] simply provides for the election of a candidate agreeable to "all or at least the majority" of the monks. (32) *Mamas* [1] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [1] adopt complicated post-Evergetian election procedures that leave the final choice to a chance selection if a consensus candidate could not be identified. These are an adaptation of the procedures first seen in (27) *Kecharitomene* [11]. The common theme of all of these arrangements was the need to avoid internal disagreements. These were thought to lead inevitably to appeals by the losing party to external authorities, whose intervention could easily compromise a foundation's independence.<sup>4</sup>

#### 3. Inalienability of Consecrated Property

The keen concern of (22) *Evergetis* [19] to assert the inalienability of an ecclesiastical foundation's property grew out of the reformers' bitter struggle with the imperial government of Alexios I

<sup>3</sup> See the discussion below in (32) *Mamas*, Analysis, B: Utility for the History of the Reform Movement.

<sup>4</sup> See (22) *Evergetis* [14], (23) *Pakourianos* [18], and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [4].

Kommenos during the first decade of his reign. Being not so far removed from that struggle, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [38] repeats the precise wording of the Evergetian formulation. Meanwhile, in (27) *Kecharitomene* the Empress Irene had signaled [9] the Komnenian dynasty's acceptance of the Evergetian position that such an alienation was tantamount to "sacrilege," while also maintaining [10] that emergency alienations of movable property to other ecclesiastical institutions were acceptable. The authors of (32) *Mamas* [37] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [37] implicitly reject this last compromise even though it had been supported by reformers of impeccable credentials.<sup>5</sup> Instead, both of these authors share an apparently new formulation of the principle of inalienability that emphasized protection of movable property, with immovable property added as an afterthought.

#### 4. Advocacy of Cenobitic Monasticism

These four authors also shared the Evergetian view of the centrality of cenobiticism in the monastic life. As usual, the author of (30) *Phoberos* is the closest copier of (22) *Evergetis*, arguably even exceeding it in disciplinary rigor.<sup>6</sup> The apparent Evergetian influences on (31) *Areia* are strongest in the latter's provisions for the regulation of cenobitic life.<sup>7</sup> The determination to insure the permanence of the cenobitic regime, so noticeable in (27) *Kecharitomene*'s post-Evergetian formulations,<sup>8</sup> had hardened by the time of (32) *Mamas*'s composition into a hostility to the alternative kelliotic form of monasticism. (32) *Mamas* [25] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [25] not only adapt (27) *Kecharitomene*'s position on the permanence of cenobiticism but also condemn [26] the kelliotic alternative. (33) *Heliou Bomon* [26] even requires the kelliotic monks of its Constantinopolitan dependency to change over to cenobiticism.

#### 5. Honest Financial Administration

The Evergetian reform movement had also insisted that a monastery have independent financial management by conscientious, honest officials. Our twelfth-century authors shared this opinion. As usual, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [41], [47] provides the most literal endorsement of (22) *Evergetis*, though his treatment may reflect an earlier version of the text of the latter than we have now. Later, Leo of Nauplia in (31) *Areia* [M9] foresaw the superior cooperating with his three chief financial officers in the financial administration of his foundation.

Financial administration was one area in which the reform movement insisted on a continual tightening of standards and procedures as the twelfth century progressed. Improvements in financial administration are among the most important concerns of a discrete group of thirteen chapters found in (27) *Kecharitomene* that may have originated in an earlier post-Evergetian *typikon*.<sup>9</sup> (32) *Mamas* and (33) *Heliou Bomon* endorse these new institutions and operational procedures by adopting all of these chapters, although (32) *Mamas* [48] leads the way to a return to the older

<sup>5</sup> See procedure for permitted alienations in (22) *Evergetis* [19] and Leo of Chalcedon's endorsement of conversions of ecclesiastical property from one sacred employment to another as noted in *Semeioma epi te kathairesei tou Chalkedonos*, ed. Sakkélion, "Décret," pp. 123–24.

<sup>6</sup> (30) *Phoberos* [44], [46]; cf. (22) *Evergetis* [25], [28].

<sup>7</sup> (31) *Areia* [M8], [T2], [T3], [T4].

<sup>8</sup> (27) *Kecharitomene* [2], [51], [55].

<sup>9</sup> (27) *Kecharitomene* [2], [3], [19], [20], [23], [24], [29], [45], [46], [49], [50], [53], [55].

## CHAPTER SIX

Studite model of fiscal administration in which the superior was insulated from direct involvement.

### 6. No Mandatory Entrance Gifts

(22) *Evergetis* [37]’s rejection of mandatory entrance gifts from postulants was another characteristic precept of Evergetian ideology endorsed by our authors. (30) *Phoberos* [51], (32) *Mamas* [22], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [22] employ the actual language of the Evergetian formulation, while (31) *Areia* [T6] echoes it in its regulation that rejects even free-will donations if the property they consist of is not tax-exempt. (30) *Phoberos* [51], (32) *Mamas* [22], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [22] also accept the Evergetian probationary novitiate (cf. (22) *Evergetis* [37]), though the last two documents provide for a considerable lengthening of its term for ordinary applicants from six months to two years.

### 7. Overall Commitment to Evergetian Principles

Our authors were often truer to Evergetian principles than their imperial counterparts in Chapter Five. The authors of (30) *Phoberos* and (31) *Areia* describe foundations that surely would have met the approval of the strictest Evergetian, even those of the first generation that produced (22) *Evergetis* itself. Also, unlike the author of (29) *Kosmosoteira* [107], none of our four authors in this chapter shows any willingness to allow resident laymen to be put on the payroll of their foundations or even, like (27) *Kecharitomene* [4], to bend the rules of cenobitic life to accommodate relatives of the founder. Both (32) *Mamas* [27] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [27] adopt the post-Evergetian formulation found in (27) *Kecharitomene* [53] to reject “imposed guests” (*katapemptoi*) sent to monasteries by imperial or patriarchal authority. Moreover, (30) *Phoberos* [43], (32) *Mamas* [34], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [34] all draw on the textual tradition of (22) *Evergetis* [24] in banning personal servants, which easily serves to distinguish these institutions from contemporary monasteries under imperial patronage.

### D. Fate of Other Evergetian Regulations

The allegiance of our twelfth-century founders to *Evergetis*, however, was based more on common ideology than on institutional loyalty. Whenever their own contemporary approaches to problems matched the solutions promoted by their Evergetian predecessors, most of them were happy not only to give implicit endorsement to these resolutions but even to quote from (either directly or through intermediaries) the relevant regulatory passages in (22) *Evergetis*. Whenever they disagreed, however, they had no compunctions about revising the relevant Evergetian texts or even devising entirely new approaches.

#### 1. Sacramental and Liturgical Life

Typically, (30) *Phoberos* introduces no major changes from its Evergetian model on sacramental and liturgical matters.<sup>10</sup> Leo of Nauplia in (31) *Areia* [M8], however, enjoins his monks to use the competing *typikon* of Meletios the Younger for the regulation of their liturgical services. In (32) *Mamas* [32], Athanasios Philanthropenos adopts Evergetian language but decreases the frequency

<sup>10</sup> (30) *Phoberos* [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [36]; cf. (22) *Evergetis* [4], [5], [6], [7], [15].

of the celebration of the holy liturgy and restricts his monks' access to communion. Also, he permits [29] his monks to have a confessor other than the superior, an important divergence from the principle enunciated in (22) *Evergetis* [15]. A little later, the *mystikos* Nikephoros reproduces these changes in (33) *Heliou Bomon* [29], [32] and even substitutes [8] the Studite for the Evergetian *synaxarion* concerning the regulation of liturgical services.

## 2. Imposition of Lay Protectorates

There are some features in these documents that are contradictory to the original Evergetian principles. Foremost among these is the imposition of the protectorate (*ephoreia*), following the example set by (27) *Kecharitomene* [3], in the monasteries represented by (32) *Mamas* [3] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [3], though not in those represented by the other two documents in this chapter. Certain anonymous contributors to the reform movement had evidently already worked out what they considered to be an acceptable way of reconciling reform ideology to the restoration of the protectorate. The product of their labors, the post-Evergetian source that lies behind both (27) *Kecharitomene* [3] and (32) *Mamas* [3], attempted to restrict the protector, the agent of the *ephoreia*, to a strictly constructive role in patronizing, supporting and defending the foundation assigned to his care. The tendency to associate traditional patronal powers with the protector is noticeable, however, particularly in (32) *Mamas* [3], cf. [15], where the incumbent protector, the brother of the institution's new founder, is permitted extraordinary powers, including revision of the *typikon*. Even subsequent protectors seem to have been allowed a more influential role [1] in such matters as the election of the superior than had been the case earlier in (27) *Kecharitomene* [11].

## 3. Ameliorations in Lifestyle

The author of (32) *Mamas* [28], followed by (33) *Heliou Bomon* [28], takes the lead in reintroducing money into the lives of the monks in their institutions (for bathing and purchases of clothing), though less blatantly than in (28) *Pantokrator* [31] ff., in which cash payments seem to have been routine. In (31) *Areia* [T3], Leo of Nauplia permits his monks to bathe weekly—more frequently than in any other twelfth-century foundation—except during Lent. However, in a rare example of disagreement with his source, (22) *Evergetis* [28], the author of (30) *Phoberos* [46] was unwilling to allow his monks to bathe at all, except for the sick.

### *E. Other Concerns of the Authors*

Aside from the various issues related to the monastic reform, we find that our authors had a somewhat different set of concerns than their counterparts in Chapter Five. For instance, the concern for the welfare of the dependent peasantry that is prominent in (29) *Kosmosoteira* and some of the other documents in that chapter simply does not appear in the works of our authors. Neither is there any indication that our authors realized the importance of building maintenance that was so evident to the authors of (27) *Kecharitomene* and (29) *Kosmosoteira*. To be fair, neither had been a concern of (22) *Evergetis* either. Other matters such as a greater concern with manual labor and a corresponding disinclination to pursue large-scale institutional philanthropy may well have been related to the generally smaller resources our authors are likely to have had at their disposal for the support of their foundations compared to their counterparts in Chapter Five.

## CHAPTER SIX

### 1. Institutional Governance

Aside from the revival of the protectorate in (32) *Mamas* [3] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [3], there are only a few institutional innovations in these documents. In (31) *Areia* [T10], Leo of Nauplia endorses a consultative style of government by the superior in conjunction with the leading monks that parallels the arrangement recommended in (22) *Evergetis* [14]; as usual, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [35] lends his endorsement by simply transcribing the Evergetian text. (32) *Mamas* [24] suggests a more authoritarian model of governance, though the superior's role [48] in financial administration was considerably restricted. In this as in most other matters, (33) *Heliou Bomon* [24], [47] follows its model's lead. Only (31) *Areia* [T9] addresses monastic discipline through the confinement of refractory monks. Initiating an important trend for the future, (32) *Mamas* [18], followed by (33) *Heliou Bomon* [18], gives the superior discretionary authority to make certain changes in dietary requirements.

### 2. Private Psalmody

Following the example of (22) *Evergetis* [4], (30) *Phoberos* [9], (32) *Mamas* [47], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [46] all provide for a private recitation of the psalter after the conclusion of the common service at matins. Even (31) *Areia* [T1] endorses this requirement in its own discussion of the performance of the office.

### 3. Moral Concerns

The author or (more likely) a later editor of (30) *Phoberos* [57], [58], [59] is alone in his obsession with the protection of the sexual purity of his monks from such threats as homosexuality and even bestiality. This concern far exceeds the hard-hearted but unemotional exclusion of women from charitable distributions at the gate in (22) *Evergetis* [38], which (30) *Phoberos* [55] (but not (32) *Mamas* or (33) *Heliou Bomon*) also endorses.

### 4. Increased Role of Manual Labor

The absence of servants in these foundations inevitably led to an increased role of manual labor in the lives of the monks, especially in the second half of the twelfth century. (30) *Phoberos*, like its Evergetian model, is circumspect on this subject, while (31) *Areia* [T3] contains a brief allusion to it. In (32) *Mamas* there are mentions of vine-dressers, gardeners and other outside workers [19] in addition to the usual kitchen staff [11]. To these (33) *Heliou Bomon* [19] adds fishermen and farmers; its manual workers may have constituted a second ranking order of "brothers," to be distinguished from the "fathers" who served in the church.

### 5. Performance of Commemorative Services

Memorial services, already attested in (22) *Evergetis* for the founder [35] and for departed monks and (unnamed) benefactors [36], seem to loom larger in importance as the twelfth century progresses. The author of (30) *Phoberos* [50], utilizing part of the text of his Evergetian model, makes specific provisions for many lay benefactors, Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos, and several of the founder's relatives. As we have seen, the authors of the imperial foundations in (28) *Pantokrator* [32], cf. [19] and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3] devoted most of their monastic personnel to the performance of liturgical services, including commemorative observances. Moreover, in (27) *Kecharitomene* Empress Irene provides for multiple commemorations [70] for deceased nuns

[70] as well as annual commemorations [71] for a long list of her relatives.

In (32) *Mamas* [5], Athanasios Philanthropenos apparently decided to scale back the monks' liturgical commitment, though he too provides for commemorations for the founder [40] and for deceased monks [39]. The procedures prescribed for the latter are based in part on those found in (27) *Kecharitomene* [70]. In (31) *Areia* [T12], Leo of Nauplia makes a modest provision for memorial services for himself, members of his immediate family, and deceased monks. The author of (33) *Heliou Bomon* imitates his model in provisions for deceased monks [39], but composes new chapters to regulate memorial services for the emperor [49], the monastery's ancient founders [51], and himself [50].

#### 6. Relations with the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy

As far as external relations were concerned, the most vexed question for all of these founders was how to acknowledge the spiritual authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy while assuring that the independence of their foundations remained unimpaired. Composed as it was at a time when relations between the reformers and the public authorities of the church were particularly bad, (22) *Evergetis* [12] simply rejects the notion of episcopal rights over the foundation entirely. After the reconciliation of reformers and the traditional ecclesiastical hierarchy at the Synod of Blachernai in 1094, patrons seem to have been more willing to revisit the question with open minds. Accordingly, even the author of (30) *Phoberos* [35] adds a provision in his transcription of (22) *Evergetis* [15], cf. [33] that a newly elected superior must be brought to the patriarch for installation. This was probably a requirement of the patriarchal memorandum granting the monastery's independence, as it was in the case of (32) *Mamas* [1] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [1]. Leo of Nauplia was in the advantageous position of writing his own memorandum of independence, however, and in (31) *Areia* [M15] he denies his episcopal successors at Nauplia any rights in the election or installation of superiors at his foundation.

#### 7. Acceptability of Monks Tonsured Elsewhere

Whether these monks should be welcomed as postulants or even as leaders of reform monasteries was another contentious issue for our authors. The safest course, perceived long ago by Athanasios the Athonite in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [12], was to make them ineligible for the office of superior, thereby foreclosing the possibility [20] that an external authority could use this means to seize control of an independent foundation. Yet, as we have seen, even Athanasios saw fit [21] to change his mind in order to promote an exceptionally worthy candidate as his successor. (22) *Evergetis* [37] took a middling position, neither encouraging such monks as applicants nor absolutely forbidding them, but leaving the decision on their admission to the superior. In another rare display of independence from his model, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [52] disagrees and bans such monks on the grounds that "from this action [i.e., their admission] there will come to you great harm and punishment of both a spiritual and physical kind." Predictably, Leo of Nauplia also takes a conservative approach in (31) *Areia* [T10], declaring that no outside monk should be chosen superior lest he "come to the monastery and take possession of it through some circumstance and dispensation."

Imperial founders, however, could understandably afford to take a more relaxed attitude. Empress Irene in (27) *Kecharitomene* [54] actually welcomed pious nuns tonsured elsewhere

## CHAPTER SIX

provided that they were not being imposed on her convent by imperial or patriarchal decree. In (29) *Kosmosoteira* [16], Isaac Komnenos made the reception of an externally tonsured monk dependent on his receiving the canonically required permission from his current superior. The authors of (32) *Mamas* [22] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [22] evidently could afford to accept these monks, even as superiors [1], without courting future problems because of provisions [26] in their patriarchal memoranda in which the imposition of “imposed guests” (apparently lay or religious) was forsworn. The fact that Athanasios Philanthropenos was himself a “foreign tonsure” likely influenced his tolerant attitude. The author of (32) *Mamas* [43], followed by (33) *Heliou Bomon* [42], thought it prudent, however, to exhort any future superior of this sort not to attempt to “pack” the monastery with monks from his former institution or to disdain those monks native to *Mamas*.

### 8. Decline in Institutional Philanthropy

Perhaps the relative scarcity of resources available to these authors accounts for their lesser contribution to institutional philanthropy compared to their imperial counterparts of this era. John, the author of (30) *Phoberos* [54], is content to reproduce the provisions in (22) *Evergetis* [38] for charitable distributions and lodging of travelers and the sick. The other foundations did not have philanthropic institutions attached to them, and the authors of (32) *Mamas* and (33) *Heliou Bomon* actually depended on external providers for bathing and the purchase of clothing [28], as well as for medical assistance [34].

### F. Historical Context

The discussion of Historical Context in Chapter Five is relevant for the documents discussed in this chapter as well, since both they and those of Chapter Five come from roughly the same era of Byzantine history. The discussion below concerns aspects of the historical context that are particularly relevant to the documents presented here in Chapter Six.

#### 1. Fate of the *Charistike*

The almost total disappearance of the *charistike* in the course of the twelfth century was certainly a remarkable phenomenon even when one considers the ferocity with which the reform movement attacked that embattled institution. As it happened, the *charistike*'s disappearance from the scene has left few traces in the historical record. The decisions of the patriarchal synods of 1089 and 1116 (for which see Chapter Five above) did authorize the metropolitans of Athens and Kyzikos, respectively, to abolish the *charistike* within their own jurisdictions, but did not (except possibly implicitly) delegitimize the institution generally.

Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos' own goals in the early years of his patriarchate clearly did not include the outright abolition of the *charistike*, and Emperor Alexios I Komnenos' novel on patriarchal rights (1096), helpful though it was for the reformers, did not authorize such an abolition. The Athens decision in 1089 suggests that at that time the patriarchate hoped to compel *charistikarioi* to make amends for the damages they had caused to the religious institutions under their supervision. After the reconciliation of the reform party and the patriarchate at the Synod of Blachernai in 1094, the way was open for another more promising possibility: enlisting reform-minded patrons for the restoration of patriarchal monasteries ruined by the *charistike*.

## 2. Restoration of Monasteries under Patriarchal Sponsorship

One of the patrons enlisted in this effort was the monk John who wrote the Evergetian *typikon* (30) *Phoberos* for the monastery of St. John the Forerunner that he received [33] as an independent foundation from Nicholas III Grammatikos towards the end of the patriarch's reign in 1111. He declares that previously various *charistikarioi* had "reduced to nothing the monastery which was once great and famous and admired." If we are to believe the author, a foundation which once had 170 ascetics [33] was under his direction now being restored to support [42] a mere twelve monks.

As noted above in Chapter Five, patriarchal support for reformist founders continued under John IX Agapetos (1111–34) and Leo Styppes (1134–43). With remarkable consistency and steadiness of purpose, we find the efforts to undo the damages caused by the *charistike* continuing also under later patriarchs, including Kosmas II Attikos (1146–47), who enlisted the pious layman George the Cappadocian to help restore the ruined monastery of St. Mamas at Constantinople.<sup>11</sup> Ironically, George received his first grant of the institution in *charistike* as its *charistikarios*. At that point his unscrupulous predecessors had so abused the property that all the auxiliary buildings had fallen down leaving only a roofless church still standing. Only two non-resident monks were assigned to the foundation, and at some point the church's movable property must have been taken away for safekeeping.<sup>12</sup> George was reluctant, however, to invest money in improvements unless he could be certain that a subsequent *charistikarios* would not plunder the foundation anew. Therefore he urged Patriarch Nicholas IV Muzalon (1147–51) to grant him the monastery as an independent foundation. Once he obtained the patriarchal memorandum to this effect and other necessary documentation, the patriarchal monastery of Mamas was effectively privatized.

A few years later, another benefactor, the courtier Nikephoros the *mystikos*, obtained the patriarchal monastery of the Mother of God *Heliou Bomon* through a similar memorandum of independence issued by Patriarch Constantine IV Chliarenos (1154–56).<sup>13</sup> Nikephoros claims that at the time of the privatization of the monastery "there was a danger not only that its restoration would be hard to achieve but that it would almost cease to be called simply a dwelling place for monks."

## 3. Privatization of Restored Patriarchal Monasteries

It can be surmised that these founders drove hard bargains with the patriarchs before being willing to make what the *mystikos* Nikephoros calls "no moderate expenditures" for such things as rebuilding structures, making capital improvements, and dedicating new furnishings in the churches. While the patriarchs may have preferred to continue to use the *charistike* since this vehicle preserved patriarchal rights of ownership over the donated institutions, the patrons, inspired perhaps by the example of *Evergetis*, insisted on outright privatization of these facilities and got it. With privatization came the right to issue *typika*, leading to (30) *Phoberos*, (32) *Mamas*, and (33) *Heliou Bomon*.

<sup>11</sup> For the account of the foundation's privatization, see (32) *Mamas*, Prologue, and First *Semeioma*.

<sup>12</sup> (32) *Mamas*, Prologue; [37] indicates the survival of movable property, including sacred vessels, icons and service books, despite the ruination of the church; see (33) *Heliou Bomon* [37] for how they likely were preserved.

<sup>13</sup> For this foundation's privatization, see (33) *Heliou Bomon*, Prologue.

## CHAPTER SIX

### 4. Hostility towards Alternative Forms of Monasticism

Simultaneously with these relief operations designed to aid institutions damaged by the *charistike*, the patriarchs and other reform-minded members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy were also working to curtail kelliotic monasticism in favor of the cenobitic form advocated by the Evergetians. As early as the closing years of the eleventh century, Nikon of the Black Mountain, acting as an agent of the patriarch of Antioch, tried to use persuasion and pressure in (21) *Roidion* to get that institution's kelliotic monks to surrender their property rights. Another approach was for the hierarchy to take advantage of well-endowed kelliotic institutions and simply subordinate them to new reform foundations organized on cenobitic principles. This is what one patriarch, probably Leo Styppes, did with the kelliotic monastery of Satyros in donating it through a patriarchal memorandum to Emperor John II Komnenos' *Pantokrator* foundation.<sup>14</sup> Perhaps the monasteries with surplus revenues that Leo of Nauplia subordinated to his foundation in (31) *Areia* [M10] under ecclesiastical *epidosis* were also kelliotic. Some twenty years later, the *mystikos* Nikephoros bluntly announces in (33) *Heliou Bomon* [26] that the monks of the kelliotic dependency of St. Basianos granted to him by Patriarch Constantine IV Chliarenos would have to convert to cenobitic monasticism.

### 5. Reassertion of Patriarchal Prerogatives

At the conclusion of the period covered by this chapter, we find another patriarch, Luke Chrysoberges (1157–70), taking a different approach to assisting the religious foundations of the empire. He issued a ruling that the patriarchate had the right to appoint a monk tonsured outside a monastery as that institution's superior despite a provision in the *typikon* to the contrary (e.g., in (30) *Phoberos* [52] or (31) *Areia* [T10]) if the monastery was suffering from an acute shortage of monks.<sup>15</sup> Also, and somewhat surprisingly, he declared in an extant synodal decision of 1169 that a *charistikarios* was not free to use a monastery he held in *charistike* as a dowry for his daughter (cf. (19) *Attaleiates* [46]), which indicates both the continued occasional patriarchal employment of that embattled institution and also its undiminished potential for misuse.

### 6. Manuel I Komnenos and Private Religious Foundations

At the same time, Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–80) was initiating a new government policy towards private foundations with a chrysobull of 1158 that forbade monasteries in Constantinople and its vicinity to acquire any additional landed properties.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the emperor established a new foundation of his own, the monastery of St. Michael at Kataskepe, that was supported by a cash grant from the imperial treasury rather the usual endowment of landed property.<sup>17</sup> Both George the Cappadocian, the founder of the institution described in (32) *Mamas*,

<sup>14</sup> (28) *Pantokrator* [27], cf. [28], [65].

<sup>15</sup> Grumel, *Regestes*, no. 1091.

<sup>16</sup> *Aurea bulla de possessionibus monasteriorum* (1158) (*JGR* 3.450–54) = Franz Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, 5 vols. (Munich-Berlin, 1924–65), no. 1419.

<sup>17</sup> For this foundation, see Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J. A. Van Dieten (Berlin, 1975), p. 207; cf. John Kinnamos, *Historia*, ed. A. Meineke, *CSHB* (Bonn, 1836), p. 276; Raymond Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, vol. 2: *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975); vol. 3: *Les églises et les monastères [de Constantinople]*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), p. 342.

## EARLY REFORM MONASTERIES OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

and the *mystikos* Nikephoros, founder of the monastery described in (33) *Heliou Bomon*, were court officials of Manuel, and their respective foundations were certainly within the geographic scope of the emperor's law. The emperor confirmed the independence of these foundations with chrysobulls of his own,<sup>18</sup> but although he granted one of them an imperial *solemnion* (gratefully acknowledged in the Prologue to (33) *Heliou Bomon*) that accorded with his own ideas of how a monastery should be endowed, it appears that both of these institutions also had landed properties.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> (32) *Mamas* [4] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [4].

<sup>19</sup> See (32) *Mamas* [5], [37] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [5], [37].