

# ERYTHEIA

REVISTA DE ESTUDIOS BIZANTINOS Y NEOGRIEGOS

39 - 2018



SEPARATA

## ÍNDICE

A. CALAHORRA BARTOLOMÉ, El marfil de Tréveris: una iconografía clave en el contexto de la propaganda político-religiosa del Triunfo de la Ortodoxia .	9
D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Affirming and Undermining Saintly Status: On the Different Uses of the Parable of the Sowing Man in Theosterictus' <i>Life of Nicetas of Medikion</i> and Methodius' <i>Life of Theophanes of Agros</i> . . . . .	55
D. KRAUSMÜLLER, A Patchwork Rule: The Machairas <i>Typikon</i> and Its Sources .	67
A. R. ÁVILA, La sátira de Teodoro Pródromo <i>Contra un viejo de barba larga</i> : una polémica sobre la sabiduría en la Bizancio del siglo XII . . . . .	85
J. M. FLORISTÁN, El crisóbulo de Andrónico II Paleólogo en favor de Gregorio Meliseno (1296) [Dölger, <i>Reg.</i> 2189] . . . . .	113
J. M. FLORISTÁN, El estamento nobiliario bizantino y su incorporación a la sociedad del Antiguo Régimen: los casos de las familias Sebasto y Meliseno-Comneno . . . . .	143
S. CARBONELL MARTÍNEZ, Pronunciación hispano-erasmiana vs. pronunciación griega: razones didácticas y emocionales . . . . .	181
D. M. MORFAKIDIS MOTOS, El diplomático Eduardo Badía y Ortiz de Zúñiga y su análisis sobre la construcción de la identidad nacional neohelénica (1869-1870) . . . . .	195
M. Γ. ΣΕΡΓΗΣ, Καλινίτσα: ένα πανάρχαιο θρακικό δρώμενο. Η ερμηνεία των ασμάτων της και η κοινωνική τους λειτουργία . . . . .	239
M. Γ. ΒΑΡΒΟΥΝΗΣ, Ελληνική λαϊκή λειτουργική ζωή και νεωτερικές αναπροσαρμογές . . . . .	265
P. YANNOPOULOS, La présence étymologique et sémantique du grec classique et du grec byzantin dans le néogrec: Les cas des βάνουσος, λαίμαργος, σαρίκι . . . . .	281
I. GÓMEZ LAGUNA-E. LEONTARIDI, Clasificación semántico-estructural de las preposiciones del griego moderno desde la perspectiva del análisis componencial . . . . .	293

## A Patchwork Rule: The Machairas *Typikon* and Its Sources

---

Dirk KRAUSMÜLLER

*Universität Wien*

dirk.krausmueller@univie.ac.at

ABSTRACT: The topic of this article is the monastic rule or *Typikon* of the monastery of Machairas on the island of Cyprus. This text is of great interest to students of Byzantine monasticism because it contains many passages that have counterparts in earlier rules, which had been composed in the capital Constantinople. By determining how the Machairas *Typikon* relates to these rules and how older material was reworked in order to suit new purposes one can gain an insight into the monastic discourse of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

KEYWORDS: Machairas *Typikon*, Mamas *Typikon*, Kecharitomene *Typikon*, Evergetis *Typikon*, Philanthropos *Typikon*.

RESUMEN: este artículo versa sobre la regla monástica o *typikon* del monasterio de Maqueras en la isla de Chipre. El texto ofrece gran interés a los estudiosos del monaquismo por incluir muchos pasajes que tienen paralelos en otras reglas anteriores compuestas en la capital Constantinopla. A través de un análisis de la relación que hay entre el *typikon* de Maqueras y estas otras reglas y del modo en el que el material anterior fue reelaborado para nuevos propósitos podemos hacernos una idea sobre la realidad monástica en los siglos XI y XII.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Typikon* del monasterio de Maqueras, *Typikon* del monasterio de Mamas, *Typikon* del monasterio *Kecharitomene*, *Typikon* del monasterio *Evergetis*, *Typikon* del monasterio *Pilanthropos*.

The monastery of Machairas was founded by the monk Neophytus who had come from Palestine together with his disciple Ignatius. When Neophytus

died Ignatius became the next abbot. He travelled to Constantinople and received material support from Emperor Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180). Ignatius was in turn succeeded by the monk Nilus who had joined the community in the year 1172. Although Nilus later became bishop of the neighbouring town of Tamasia, he did not sever his ties with the monastery<sup>1</sup>. In 1210 he composed for it a rule or *typikon* from which we can glean all this information<sup>2</sup>. As one might expect, the rule contains references to the customs of Palestinian monasticism<sup>3</sup>. Yet Nilus also made use of other sources. John Thomas could identify overlaps with two texts of Constantinopolitan provenance: the rule of the Evergetis monastery, which dates to the second half of the eleventh century and was a collaborative work of the two founder abbots Paul and Timothy; and the rule of the Mamas monastery, which the abbot Athanasius composed in the year 1158<sup>4</sup>. These two texts do not represent entirely different traditions because the Mamas *Typikon* contains much material that is derived from the Evergetis *Typikon*<sup>5</sup>. Even so, it has its own distinctive character. It includes many additional passages, which reflect a different understanding of monastic life<sup>6</sup>.

Jordan and Thomas established that sixteen chapters of the Machairas *Typikon* have counterparts in the Evergetis *Typikon* and ten chapters have counterparts in the Mamas *Typikon*, whereas forty-nine chapters appear in both these rules<sup>7</sup>. This raises the question: who was responsible for the creation of this patchwork text? It cannot be excluded that it was Nilus himself. Yet it seems more likely that it was the author of a now lost *typikon*, which Nilus then adapted for his own purposes<sup>8</sup>. This author may well have lived in Constantinople, where he would have had easy access to a great number of rules.

In order to establish how the Machairas *Typikon* relates to the Constantinopolitan monastic tradition I will discuss two passages, which have counterparts not only in the Evergetis *Typikon* and in the Mamas *Typikon* but also in the rule of the Kecharitomene convent, which was compiled between

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed history of the monastery see Thomas 2000: 1107-1108.

<sup>2</sup> Machairas *Typikon*, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 1-65. English translation by Jordan 2000c: 1122-1166.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of these passages see Thomas 2000: 1107-1108.

<sup>4</sup> Mamas *Typikon*, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 245-314. English translation by Bandy 2000: 991-1041.

<sup>5</sup> Evergetis *Typikon*, ed. Gautier 1982: 5-101. English translation by Jordan 2000a: 472-500.

<sup>6</sup> See Thomas 2000: 977-978. See also Krausmüller-Grinchenko 2013: 153-175.

<sup>7</sup> See Thomas 2000: 1108-1110 and Jordan 1994: 240.

<sup>8</sup> See Thomas 2000: 1109.

the years 1110 and 1116 at the behest of its founder, Empress Irene Doukaina<sup>9</sup>. The first passage details what monks should do during the small hours of Tierce and Sext.

Evergetis:

Ἀπιδόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελ-  
λοίοις ὑμῶν τὴν ὀφει-  
λομένην ἐκτελεῖν πᾶσαν  
ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν  
συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ  
γονυκλισίων κατὰ τὸν  
ῥηθέντα τύπον, τοὺς ἕξ  
φημι ψαλμούς, τὴν  
τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν  
ἕκτην, κρουομένων τῶν  
συμβόλων, κατὰ τὸ  
ἔθος<sup>10</sup>.

Machairas:

Κρουομένου τοίνυν τοῦ  
συμβόλου κατὰ τὸν και-  
ρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα συ-  
νάγεσθαι δὲ πάντας ἐν  
τῷ **νάρθηκι κάκεισε**  
**ψάλλειν** ὁμοῦ τὴν τρί-  
την ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην  
μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων<sup>11</sup>.

Mamas:

Κρουομένου τοίνυν τοῦ  
συμβόλου κατὰ τὸν  
καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα  
συνάγεσθαι δὲ πάντας  
ἐν τῷ **νάρθηκι** καὶ **ψάλ-  
λειν** ὁμοῦ τὴν τρίτην  
ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην  
μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς  
εὐχῶν<sup>12</sup>.

Kecharitomene:

Καταλαμβανοῦσης δὲ  
τῆς προσηκούσης ὥρας,  
κρουσθήσεται τὸ ξύλον  
**κάκεισε ψαλ**εῖτε τὰ  
μεσῶρια τῆς πρώτης,  
τὴν τε τρίτην καὶ  
ἕκτην ὥραν μετὰ τῶν  
μεσωρίων, τῶν εὐχῶν  
καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν,  
ἐνθα ἂν ἡ καθηγου-  
μένη βουληθῆ, εἴτε ἐν  
τῷ κοιμητηρίῳ, εἴτε ἐν  
τῷ **τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξω-  
νάρθηκι**<sup>13</sup>.

In this instance the Machairas *Typikon* and the Mamas *Typikon* have a very similar text. The ultimate model for this text was the Evergetis *Typikon* as can be seen from the common elements τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην and κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων / κρουομένου τοῦ συμβόλου. Yet it is obvious that the original version has been considerably reworked. What made these modifications necessary was a change in the organisation of monastic worship. Whereas the Evergetis *Typikon* stipulates that the monks should perform Tierce and Sext in their cells, the other two texts demand that they congregate in the vestibule of the church. The version of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* while being phrased differently nevertheless belongs to the same tradition. Comparison shows that it contains elements, which have counterparts in the Machairas *Typikon* and the Mamas *Typikon*: the phrases τῆς προσηκούσης ὥρας and ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξωνάρθηκι correspond to τὸν καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα and ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι. By contrast, it includes no feature of the Evergetis *Typikon* that is not also found in

<sup>9</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon*, ed. Gautier 1985: 5-165. English translation by Jordan 2000b: 664-717.

<sup>10</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 4, ed. Gautier 1982: 23, 135-138.

<sup>11</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 35, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 19, 25-20, 1.

<sup>12</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 31, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 285, 25-27.

<sup>13</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon* 33, ed. Gautier 1985: 81-83, 1132-1136.

the other two rules. This suggests that it is an adaptation not of the Evergetis *Typikon* but of a text that resembled the version of the Mamas *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon*. This hypothesis can be corroborated when we consider the element κάκεῖσε ψαλεῖτε, which has a counterpart in κάκεῖσε ψάλλειν in the Machairas *Typikon*. A look at the context reveals an important difference. In the Machairas *Typikon* the meaning of κάκεῖσε can be inferred from the immediately preceding ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι, whereas the version of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* makes mention of the vestibule only at the end of the sentence so that a referent for κάκεῖσε is missing. This shows clearly that the word order in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is the result of a secondary modification. Thus we can conclude that the text, which the redactor of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* used as his model, contained the sequence ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι κάκεῖσε. This in turn suggests that its version did not differ substantially from what we now read in the Machairas *Typikon* and in the Mamas *Typikon*. Circumstantial evidence shows that this model was the lost rule of the monastery of Christ Philanthropos. Empress Irene had founded this monastery and had given it a rule, which was based on the Evergetis *Typikon*<sup>14</sup>. Thus one can argue that she had this rule reworked in order to suit the needs of a community of nuns when she founded the Kecharitomene convent. Moreover, we know that Athanasius, the author of the Mamas *Typikon*, had lived for many years in the Philanthropos monastery before he was headhunted by the refounder of the Mamas monastery<sup>15</sup>. It would have been entirely natural for him to have recourse to the rule of his motherhouse. We can therefore conclude that in this instance the Machairas *Typikon* forms part of the Philanthropos tradition.

The second passage, a stipulation about diet on the feast of the Annunciation, is also found in all four rules.

<sup>14</sup> See Thomas 2000: 649. The liturgical *typikon* of the Evergetis monastery was used in the Philanthropos monastery. Thus we can be sure that the lost disciplinary *typikon* was also borrowed from the Evergetis monastery. See Pentkovskij 2004.

<sup>15</sup> See Thomas 2000: 976-977. The validity of Thomas' hypothesis was questioned by Jordan-Morris 2012: 140. They pointed out that the text of the Mamas *Typikon* was quite different from that of the Kecharitomene *Typikon*. The analysis of the stipulation about Tierce and Sext shows that these objections are unfounded.

Evergetis:

Τῆ τοίνυν ἀγία πέμπτη  
κατὰ τὰς ἀπολελυμένας  
ἡμέρας τῆς τεσσαρακο-  
στῆς ἢ ἐστίασις ὑμῖν  
ἔσται ἐν τε τοῖς ἐδέσμα-  
σιν καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ<sup>16</sup>.

Machairas:

Τῆ τοίνυν ἀγία πέμπτη,  
κατὰ τὰς ἀπολελυμένας  
ἡμέρας τῆς τεσσαρα-  
κοστῆς ἢ ἐστίασις ἔσται  
ὑμῖν ἐν τε τοῖς ἐδέσμασι  
καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ<sup>17</sup>.

Mamas:

Τῆ τοίνυν ἀγία καὶ με-  
γάλῃ πέμπτη, ὅτε μὴ  
ἐορτάζομεν τὸν Εὐαγγε-  
λισμὸν, κατὰ τὰς  
πέμπτας τῶν λοιπῶν  
ἐβδομάδων τῆς τεσσα-  
ρακοστῆς ἢ ἐστίασις  
ἔσται ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς  
ἐδέσμασιν, ὁ δὲ οἶνος  
τῷ μεῖζονι ἐξαγίω<sup>18</sup>.

Kecharitomene:

Τῆ τοίνυν ἀγία καὶ με-  
γάλῃ πέμπτη, ὅτε μὴ  
ἐορτάζομεν τὸν Εὐαγγε-  
λισμὸν, κατὰ τὰς  
τρίτας καὶ πέμπτας τῶν  
λοιπῶν ἐβδομάδων τῆς  
τεσσαρακοστῆς ἢ ἐστία-  
σις ἔσται ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς  
ἐδέσμασιν, ὁ δὲ οἶνος  
τῷ μεῖζονι ἐξαγίω<sup>19</sup>.

Here we encounter a striking contrast. Whereas the Machairas *Typikon* reproduces the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* without modifications, the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Mamas *Typikon* contain several diverging features. The prepositional phrase κατὰ τὰς ἀπολελυμένας ἡμέρας is replaced with κατὰ τὰς <τρίτας καὶ> πέμπτας τῶν λοιπῶν ἐβδομάδων, the subordinate clause ὅτε μὴ ἐορτάζομεν τὸν Εὐαγγελισμόν is added, καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ is rephrased as ὁ δὲ οἶνος and ἀγία πέμπτη is expanded to ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη πέμπτη. It is evident that the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Mamas *Typikon* have an identical text: the omission of τρίτας καὶ in the Mamas *Typikon* must be an oversight of its author because Tuesdays and Thursdays were the two days of the week where the fasting regime was more lenient. Since there is no sign that the author of the Mamas *Typikon* consulted the Kecharitomene *Typikon*, we can be sure that this version goes back to the Philanthropos *Typikon*. Accordingly, we can conclude that in this instance the version in the Machairas *Typikon* is not derived from the Philanthropos tradition but from the Evergetis tradition.

I have used the terms “Philanthropos tradition” and “Evergetis tradition” on purpose because it is difficult to establish which texts served as models. Was it the Evergetis *Typikon* and the Philanthropos *Typikon*, or do we need to assume the existence of intermediate sources? In the former case this intermediate source would have been a lost adaptation of the Evergetis *Typikon*. Whether such a text existed is difficult to prove. I will come back to this question at the end of the article when all the evidence has been presented. In the latter case we

<sup>16</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 7, ed. Gautier 1982: 43, 497-498.

<sup>17</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 70, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 35, 12-14.

<sup>18</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 18, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 275, 40-276, 2.

<sup>19</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon* 48, ed. Gautier 1985: 97, 1399-1402.

are faced with the opposite problem. Here the Philanthropos *Typikon* is lost and all we have is two adaptations, the Mamas *Typikon* and the Kecharitomene *Typikon*. In order to show that the Machairas *Typikon* depends directly on the Philanthropos *Typikon* one would need to find instances where its version is closer to the Kecharitomene *Typikon* than to the Mamas *Typikon*.

In the stipulation about Tierce and Sext that we have just discussed there are two such instances. Firstly, the element κάκεῖσε is found in the Machairas *Typikon* and in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* but not in the Mamas *Typikon*, where we read καί instead. Secondly, the prepositional clause μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων in the Machairas *Typikon* corresponds more closely to μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων, τῶν εὐχῶν καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* than to μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς εὐχῶν in the Mamas *Typikon*. Since the Evergetis *Typikon* has at this point μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισιῶν, one could argue that the Kecharitomene *Typikon* represents the version of the Philanthropos *Typikon*, where a reference to the inter-hours was added to the original text (the replacement of γονυκλισιῶν with its synonym μετανοιῶν is most likely a secondary modification introduced by the redactor of the Kecharitomene *Typikon*). In this case, the redactors of the Mamas *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* would have shortened this version in different ways, leaving out either μεσωρίων or εὐχῶν.

It must, however, be admitted that this evidence is not very strong. We do not have the original manuscript of the Mamas *Typikon* and it could well be that the scribe who copied this text changed κάκεῖσε to καί<sup>20</sup>. Moreover, it is possible that both the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* introduced the reference to the inter-hours independently from each other<sup>21</sup>. Indeed, it is noticeable that the Kecharitomene *Typikon* frequently has a text that differs from the consensus of the Mamas *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* and is much closer to the Evergetis *Typikon*. Here one example may suffice.

<sup>20</sup> See Jordan 1994: 242. See also Laurent 1931.

<sup>21</sup> See Krausmüller 2013.



Evergetis:

Μόνους γὰρ ἐκείνους  
θεραπευτέον ἐν ἅπασι  
καὶ χειραγωγητέον, ὅσοι  
δὴ προφανεῖς ἀρρωστίας  
περίκεινται καὶ διὰ τοῦτο  
δέονται τυχὸν **κρείτ-  
τονος βρώσεώς τε καὶ  
πόσεως** πρὸς σύστασιν  
τοῦ ταλαιπώρου αὐτῶν  
σώματος<sup>22</sup>.

Kecharitomene:

Μόνας γὰρ ἐκείνας θε-  
ραπευτέον ἐφ' ἅπασι καὶ  
χειραγωγητέον, ὅσαι δὴ  
καὶ προφανεῖς ἀρρωσ-  
τίας περίκεινται καὶ διὰ  
τοῦτο δέονται τυχὸν **κρείττονος βρώσεώς τε  
καὶ πόσεως** πρὸς σύσ-  
τασιν τοῦ ταλαιπώρου  
αὐτῶν σώματος<sup>23</sup>.

Mamas:

Μόνους γὰρ ἐκείνους  
θεραπευτέον ἐν ἅπασι  
καὶ χειραγωγητέον **εἰς  
δύναμιν**, ὅσοι δὴ προ-  
φανεῖς ἀρρωστίας περί-  
κεινται **καὶ** δέονται  
τυχὸν διὰ τοῦτο **βρώ-  
σεώς τε καὶ πόσεως  
κρείττονος** πρὸς σύσ-  
τασιν τοῦ **ἁσθενοῦς  
αὐτῶν** καὶ ταλαιπώρου  
σώματος<sup>24</sup>.

Machairas:

Μόνους γὰρ ἐκείνους  
θεραπευτέον ἐν ἅπασι  
καὶ χειραγωγητέον **εἰς  
δύναμιν**, ὅσοι δὴ προ-  
φανεῖς ἀρρωστίας πε-  
ρίκεινται καὶ δέονται  
τυχὸν διὰ τοῦτο **βρώ-  
σεώς τε καὶ πόσεως  
κρείττονος** πρὸς σύσ-  
τασιν τοῦ **ἁσθενοῦς  
αὐτῶν** καὶ ταλαιπώρου  
σώματος<sup>25</sup>.

In this instance the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Evergetis *Typikon* have the same text. By contrast, the Mamas *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* have two additional elements, εἰς δύναμιν and τοῦ ἁσθενοῦς αὐτῶν, and a different word order in the case of διὰ τοῦτο and κρείττονος. On the strength of this evidence one could argue that the version in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* represents the text of the Philanthropos *Typikon* and that the diverging phrases in the Mamas *Typikon* were introduced by its author. Yet such a hypothesis is not necessarily correct. As we have seen, the Machairas *Typikon* includes passages from the Evergetis tradition. Thus, it is entirely possible that the redactor of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* had recourse to the original Evergetis *Typikon* rather than following the text of the Philanthropos *Typikon*. In order to come to a more definite conclusion one would need to compare further passages that are not derived from the Evergetis tradition. Unfortunately, in all other instances both the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* deviate from the version in the Mamas *Typikon* to such an extent that no link can be discerned. Thus the question must remain open.

\* \* \*

Use of material from the Evergetis tradition and the Philanthropos tradition means that the Machairas *Typikon* is a patchwork text. This can be seen very clearly in the section about the refectory. The introduction to this

<sup>22</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 26, ed. Gautier 1982: 69, 947-949.

<sup>23</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon* 56, ed. Gautier 1985: 107, 1563-1566.

<sup>24</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 34, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 287, 28-32.

<sup>25</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 106-107, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 47, 7-11.

section reproduces the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* almost word for word, only changing ταμειούνται to συντηρεῖν πέφυκεν. By contrast, the Mamas *Typikon* only quotes the first sentence, again with minor changes, and then continues in an entirely different fashion.

Evergetis:

Καιρὸς δ' ἂν εἴη λοιπὸν καὶ τραπέζης ἐπιμνησθῆναι καὶ βρώσεως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὅσαπερ τὴν σύστασιν τῷ σώματι ταμειούνται· ὡςπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐκ δύο συγκεῖμεθα, ψυχῆς λέγω καὶ σώματος, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ τῆς μονῆς. καὶ ψυχὴ μὲν αὐτῆς εἰκότως ἂν νομίζοιτο ἢ ἐν ψαλμωδίαις πᾶσα θεοπρεπῆς ἀκολουθία, σῶμα δὲ αὐτῆς ἢ μονῆ καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἡμῶν λυσιτελεῖ σώμασιν<sup>26</sup>.

Machairas:

Καιρὸς δ' ἂν εἴη λοιπὸν καὶ τραπέζης ἐπιμνησθῆναι καὶ βρώσεως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ὅσαπερ τὴν σύστασιν τῷ σώματι συντηρεῖν πέφυκεν· ὡςπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐκ δύο συγκεῖμεθα, ψυχῆς τε λέγω καὶ σώματος, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ τῆς μονῆς· καὶ ψυχὴ μὲν εἰκότως ἂν αὐτῆς νομίζοιτο ἢ ἐν ψαλμωδίαις πᾶσα θεοπρεπῆς ἀκολουθία, σῶμα δὲ αὐτῆς ἢ μονῆ καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἡμῶν λυσιτελεῖ σώμασιν<sup>27</sup>.

Mamas:

Καιρὸς δ' ἂν εἴη καὶ τραπέζης ἐπιμνησθῆναι καὶ βρώσεως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὅσα τὴν σύστασιν τοῦ σώματος παρέχει· οὕτε γὰρ ψυχὴ χωρὶς τῶν ταύτης προσφθρων τροφῶν, προσευχῆς φημι καὶ ψαλμωδίας καὶ θείων γραφῶν ἀναγνώσεως εὐ ἕξει ποτέ, οὕτε μὴν σῶμα συστήσεται καὶ πρὸς τὰ θεῖα ταύτης διακονήματα ὑπουργήσοι δίχα τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης αὐτῷ χρεϊωδῶν<sup>28</sup>.

The section ends with remarks about the order of precedence in the refectory. The first sentence is an elaboration of a phrase in the Evergetis *Typikon*, which also appears in the Mamas *Typikon*.

Evergetis:

Καθέδρας οὖν ἔνεκεν οὐδ' ὄλωσιν εἰπεῖν ἀνεχόμεθα<sup>29</sup>.

Mamas:

Καθέδραν δὲ ὑψηλοτέραν ἢ τὴν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ προτίμησιν οἴκοθεν ἐπιζητεῖν τινα οὐδὲ ἀκοῦσαι τὸ σύνολον ἀνεχόμεθα<sup>30</sup>.

Machairas:

Καθέδραν δὲ ὑψηλοτέραν ἢ τὴν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ προτίμησιν οἴκοθεν ἐπιζητήσαι τινα οὐδὲ ἀκοῦσαι τὸ σύνολον ἀνεχόμεθα<sup>31</sup>.

The last sentence is not found in the Evergetis *Typikon*. It is only appears in the Mamas *Typikon*.

<sup>26</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 9, ed. Gautier 1982: 33, 325-330.

<sup>27</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 61, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 31, 17-22.

<sup>28</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 17, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 273, 18-23.

<sup>29</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 9, ed. Gautier 1982: 35, 364.

<sup>30</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 36, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 289, 11-12.

<sup>31</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 64, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 32, 13-14.

Mamas:

Ἄλλὰ προκαθεδούνται μὲν τῶν ἀπάντων οἱ τὰς δύο ταύτας πρώτας ἐγκεχειρισμένοι διακονίας, ὁ τε οἰκονόμος καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ μέρει, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ οἱ ἱερεῖς κατὰ τὴν τούτων προβαθμιότητα<sup>32</sup>.

Machairas:

Ἄλλὰ προκαθεδούνται μὲν τῶν ἀπάντων οἱ τὰς δύο ταύτας πρώτας ἐγκεχειρισμένοι διακονίας, ὁ τε οἰκονόμος καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ μέρει, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ οἱ ἱερεῖς κατὰ τὴν τούτων προβαθμιότητα<sup>33</sup>.

Between the three passages that I have quoted other stipulations are inserted. These stipulations have exact counterparts both in the Evergetis *Typikon* and in the Mamas *Typikon*. This raises the question: which text was the immediate source for the Machairas *Typikon*? It seems likely that the stipulations following the introduction were lifted from the Evergetis *Typikon* whereas the stipulations that are ensconced by the two passages, which have counterparts in the Mamas *Typikon*, were taken from the other rule.

This does not, however, mean that the text is always constructed from larger building blocks. Sometimes elements from the two traditions appear in the same passage. One such passage is found in the section about diet.

Evergetis:

Ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας, ἣτις χρεωστικῶς **καθεκάστην ὀφείλει τελεῖσθαι** ἐν τῷ ναῶ, πλὴν ἄλλ' ἐν ταύτῃ προσεκτέον ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς, ἀδελφοί, ἀσφαλῶς, ὅτι τε θεῖα τὰ ἐν ταύτῃ τελούμενα καὶ φρικώδη, καὶ ὅτι **ταύτῃ μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων** τὸ φρικτὸν καὶ ὑπέρμεγα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἡμῶν πίστεως τελεσιουργεῖται μυστήριον<sup>34</sup>.

Machairas:

Ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας, ἣτις χρεωστικῶς **καθεκάστην ὀφείλει τελεῖσθαι**, πλὴν ἄλλ' ἐν ταύτῃ προσεκτέον, ἀδελφοί, ἀσφαλῶς ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι τε θεῖα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τελούμενα καὶ φρικώδη, ὅτι **μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἐν ταύτῃ** τὸ φρικτὸν καὶ ὑπέρμεγα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου **καὶ θείας** ἡμῶν πίστεως τελεσιουργεῖται μυστήριον<sup>35</sup>.

Mamas:

Ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας, ἣτις χρεωστικῶς **ὀφείλει τελεῖσθαι, εἰ μὴ καθεκάστην, ἄλλ' οὖν ἀπαραπροθέσμως τετράκις τῆς ἐβδομάδος ἄνευ τῶν δεσποτικῶν ἑορτῶν**: πλὴν ἄλλ' ἐν ταύτῃ προσεκτέον, ἀδελφοί, ἑαυτοῖς ἀσφαλῶς ὅτι τε θεῖα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τελούμενα καὶ φρικώδη, ὅτι **μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἐν ταύτῃ** τὸ φρικτὸν καὶ ὑπέρμεγα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου **καὶ θείας** ἡμῶν πίστεως τελεσιουργεῖται μυστήριον<sup>36</sup>.

Kecharitomena:

Ἡ γε μὴν ἱερὰ καὶ θεῖα λειτουργία **ἐκτελεῖσθαι ὀφείλει καθεκάστην τετράδα, παρασκευὴν, σάββατον καὶ κυριακὴν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἑορτάς**: ἐν μέντοι γε ταῖς τεσσαρακοσταῖς γίνεσθαι ὀφείλει καθὼς περιέχει τὸ συναξάριον. εἰσηγοῦμαι δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφαί, τῆς θείας τελουμένης ἱερουργίας προσεκτικωτέρας ἑαυτὰς ἑαυτῶν γίνεσθαι καὶ φόβου καὶ φρίκης μεστὰς παρεστάναι θεϊότερα καὶ φρικωδέστερα καὶ φοβερώτερα τὰ ἐν ταύτῃ τελούμενα...<sup>37</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 36, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 289, 23-25.

<sup>33</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 65, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 33, 9-11.

<sup>34</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 5, ed. Gautier 1982: 23, 151-157.

<sup>35</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 36, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 20, 7-14.

<sup>36</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 32, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 285, 36-286, 6.

<sup>37</sup> Kecharitomena *Typikon* 33, ed. Gautier 1985: 83, 143-149.

Comparison shows that the text in the Machairas *Typikon* is by and large closer to the Mamas *Typikon* than to the Evergetis *Typikon*. In both rules καὶ θείας is added to the original text and ταύτη μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων is changed to μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἐν ταύτῃ. However, in the case of καθεκάστην ὀφείλει τελεῖσθαι the situation is starkly different. Here the Machairas *Typikon* sides with the Evergetis *Typikon*, which also requires that mass be said every day of the week, whereas the Mamas *Typikon* speaks of four days only. Significantly, this variant is also found in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and must therefore go back to the Philanthropos *Typikon*. Thus we can conclude that the person responsible for the text in the Machairas *Typikon* adopted a passage from the Philanthropos tradition but modified the text in one instance through recourse to the Evergetis tradition.

As Jordan and Thomas have already pointed out, this is no mechanical combination of elements from the two different traditions<sup>38</sup>. Quite the contrary, it is likely that the author made a conscious choice because he was not satisfied with the “laxer” regime stipulated in the Philanthropos tradition that limited the number of church services. In the section about the refectory we find the same pattern. Here the author deviates from the Evergetis tradition only when he deals with the order of precedence, arguably because he was dissatisfied with the vague arrangements of the Evergetis *Typikon*. Such instances could be multiplied. In the section about the Lenten diet, for example, the Machairas *Typikon* follows the Evergetis tradition but adds a polemical passage about the “artzibourion” fast of the Armenians, which is also found in the Mamas *Typikon*<sup>39</sup>. This reflects a growing concern with religious practice where any deviation from the Byzantine norm was castigated as heretical<sup>40</sup>.

The analysis so far has given the impression that the originality of the Machairas *Typikon* rests in the combination of older sources. Yet this does not mean that these sources are never updated. One passage where new features are introduced is found in a section about the Lenten diet where the monks are told what they should eat when the feast of the Annunciation falls on Holy Week.

<sup>38</sup> See Thomas 2000: 1109 and Jordan 1994: 242.

<sup>39</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 19, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 277, 6-34; Machairas *Typikon* 68, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 37, 4-10.

<sup>40</sup> See Ermilov 2010.

Evergetis:

Ἴχθυοφαγήσομεν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγία ταύτῃ ἑορτῇ, ὡς εἴρηται, ἂν μὴ τῇ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη ἑβδομάδι συνδράμοι· τότε γὰρ τοῖς **ὄστρακοδέρμοις** χρῆσόμεθα μόνοις, μᾶλλον δὲ παρακληθῆσόμεθα διὰ τὴν ἑορτήν, ἐπεὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας ταύτης τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἦγουν δευτέραν, τρίτην καὶ τετράδα, **ἐπίσης ταῖς τῆς πρώτης ἑβδομάδος** διάγειν εἰκός, ὄσπριοις τισὶ διαβρόχοις καὶ λαχάνοις ὡμοῖς καὶ ὀπώραις ταῖς παρατυχοῦσαις ἀρκοῦμενοι καὶ τῷ κυμινάτῳ θερμῷ πόματι<sup>41</sup>.

Machairas:

Ἴχθυοφαγήσομεν δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγία ταύτῃ ἑορτῇ τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ, ὡς εἴρηται, ἂν μὴ τῇ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη ἑβδομάδι συνδράμη· τότε γὰρ **λαχάνοις καὶ ὄσπριοις μαγειρευτοῖς καὶ μετόχοις ἐλαίου**, μόνον χρῆσόμεθα διὰ τὴν ἑορτήν, ἐπεὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας ταύτης τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἦγουν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην καὶ τετράδα, **ἐπίσης ταῖς τῶν λοιπῶν ἑβδομάδων τετραδοπαρασκευαῖς** διαιτητέον, ὄσπριοις τε καὶ λαχάνοις ὡμοῖς καὶ ὀπώραις ταῖς παρατυχοῦσαις ἀρκοῦμένους **καὶ τῷ διὰ μέλιτος ἢ κυμινάτῳ θερμῷ ὕδατι**<sup>42</sup>.

Kecharitomene (Mamas):

Ἴχθυοφαγήσετε δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγία ταύτῃ (M: τοιαύτη) ἑορτῇ, ὡς εἴρηται, ἔαν (M: ἂν) μὴ τῇ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη ἑβδομάδι συνδράμη· τότε **γὰρ τοῖς ὄστρακοδέρμοις** χρῆσασθε μόνοις, μᾶλλον δὲ παρακληθῆσασθε διὰ τὴν ἑορτήν, ἐπεὶ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας ταύτης τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἦγουν δευτέρα, τρίτην καὶ τετράδα) διάγειν εἰκός τισιν ὄσπριοις (M: ὄσπριοις τισὶ) διαβρόχοις καὶ λαχάνοις ὡμοῖς καὶ ὀπώραις ταῖς παρατυχοῦσαις ἀρκοῦμεναι (M: ἀρκοῦμένους) **καὶ τῷ κυμινάτῳ θερμῷ πόματι** (M: καὶ τὸ ἦμισυ τοῦ κρασοβολίου πίεσθε διὰ τὸν κόπον)<sup>43</sup>.

In this case the four versions are quite similar to each other. Nevertheless, the elements Ἴχθυοφαγήσομεν and ἐπίσης show that the Machairas *Typikon* follows the Evergetis tradition. This tradition, however, is considerably modified. Whereas the Evergetis *Typikon* permits the consumption of shellfish, the Machairas *Typikon* stipulates that only legumes with oil be eaten. Significantly, the text of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and Mamas *Typikon* is in this case identical with that of the Evergetis *Typikon*. This meant that it was in this instance not possible to use the Philanthropos tradition as a corrective.

\* \* \*

The part of the Machairas *Typikon* in which such reworking is most evident is the section about the monastic officials. In the Evergetis *Typikon* this section begins on a personal note. The author tells his audience that he had originally wanted the monastery to have two abbots, one of whom should live as a recluse, and then explains why he changed his mind. Then he gives more concrete advice. His chosen successor should select a new steward and then install him. If this steward should prove himself trustworthy, he should become the next

<sup>41</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 10, ed. Gautier 1982: 43, 485-492.

<sup>42</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 71, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 34, 30-35, 6.

<sup>43</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon* 47, ed. Gautier 1985: 95-97, 1375-1383; Mamas *Typikon* 18, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 275, 26-32.

abbot. If this was not the case, the abbot should depose him, and if the abbot made common cause with him, the community should intervene. In all other cases the community should be obedient. This section ends with a chapter about confession and exhortations to the abbot and to the monks<sup>44</sup>. In a later part of the text the author declares that other officials should be installed in the same manner as the steward and then adds a few remarks about the duties of the *docheiarios-skeuophylax*, the *epistemonarches* and the *trapezarios*<sup>45</sup>.

It is evident that this is a highly idiosyncratic treatment of the topic. Stipulations about the selection and installation of the steward are intercalated in a passage that focuses on the abbot and at the same time separated from the regulations concerning other officials by a series of chapters that have an entirely different subject matter. Thus it is not surprising that the corresponding passages in the Machairas *Typikon* are considerably modified. The intervening chapters are moved to other parts of the text so that the two sections follow each other immediately. In the first section all stipulations concerning the abbot are removed so that the focus is entirely on the steward. Since the discussion about whether or not there should be two abbots in the monastery is not reproduced, the text begins with the immediately following passage, which is now preceded by a more formal introduction:

## Machairas:

Προσθήκει τοιγαροῦν καὶ οἰκονόμον προσθεῖναι τῇ μονῇ, εἰς τὸ ἔχειν τοῦτον ὁ προεστὼς συλλήπτορα ἐν ἅπασι καὶ συναγωνιστὴν δοκιμώτατον εἰς τὸν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιστηριγμὸν καὶ τὴν τῆς μονῆς ἐπιμέλειαν· προχειρίσασθαι δὲ τοῦτον τρόπῳ τοιῷδε:

συνδιασκεψάμενος ὁ προεστὼς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὁποῖος εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων ὁ κρείττων ἐν τε βίῳ καὶ τρόπῳ καὶ ἤθει καὶ λόγῳ καὶ τάξει, τοῦ εἶναι πιστὸν καὶ φρόνιμον, ὡς πού φησι τὸ ἱερὸν εὐαγγέλιον, τῶν ἄλλων, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὑπερέχοντα, προχειρίσασθαι τοῦτον<sup>46</sup>.

## Evergetis:

Μετὰ τὸ ἐμὲ τὴν πρόσκαιρον ταύτην ἐκμετρήσαι ζωὴν,

συνδιασκεψάμενος ὁ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταλειφθεὶς προεστὼς μετ' ὀλίγων τινῶν ἐξ ὑμῶν, ὧν δῆπου πάντως ὑπάρχει τὸ τῶν ἄλλων προέχειν ἐν τε βίῳ καὶ τρόπῳ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἤθει καὶ τάξει καὶ τῇ πνευματικῇ καταστάσει καὶ διαγωγῇ, ἐκλεγέσθω τῶν πάντων προέχοντα ἐν πᾶσι τοῦτοις, καὶ εἰς οἰκονόμον προχειρίζεσθω<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>44</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 13-25, ed. Gautier 1982: 47, 572-61, 817.

<sup>45</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 29-32, ed. Gautier 1982: 71, 973-73, 1018.

<sup>46</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 80, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 37, 19-25.

<sup>47</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 13, ed. Gautier 1982: 49, 605-610.

Machairas:

Αἱ προχειρίσεις τῶν διακονητῶν ἀπάντων, ἤγουν τοῦ ἐκκλησιάρχου, τοῦ κελλαρῖτου, τῶν δοχειαρίων, τοῦ ὠρειαρίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κατὰ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον προβήτωσαν.

μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ὄρθρου ἀπόλυσιν καὶ τὴν συνήθη τοῦ ἱερέως εὐχὴν τρισαγίου παρὰ πάντων γενομένου, ποιεῖτω τρεῖς βαθεῖας γονυκλισίας ἔμπροσθεν καὶ πλησίον τοῦ βήματος ὁ εἰς διακονίαν ἐκλελεγμένος, εἶτα καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἱερὰ εἰκονίσματα καὶ σεβάσματα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς θεομήτορος εὐλαβῶς ἀσπαζέσθω

καὶ αὐτὸς πάλιν μετάνοιαν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἁγίων κικλίδων ποιεῖτω καὶ εἰς τὸν καθένα χορὸν ὡσαύτως

εἶθ' οὕτως **λαμβάνετω αὐτοχειρῶς τὰς κλεῖς** ἐκ τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου, καὶ **τῷ προεστῶτι τὸν ἴδιον αὐχένα ὑποκλινάτω, εὐλόγησθω παρ' αὐτοῦ,** καὶ **τῷ τιμίῳ σφραγίζεσθω σταυρῷ,** τὴν εὐχὴν ἐπιλέγοντος ταύτην:

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος, ἀδελφέ, δι' εὐχῶν τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐνισχύσει σε καλῶς, καὶ ὡς αὐτῷ φίλον τὴν ἀνατεθεῖσάν σοι ἐκπληρώσεις διακονίαν.

...

Ταῖς μέντοι μὴ ἔχουσαις κλειδίδια διακονίας ὁ τῶν θείων εἰκόνων ἀσπασμὸς καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἡγουμένου σφραγὶς μετὰ τοῦ τρισαγίου ἀρκέσουσιν εἰς προχειρίσιν<sup>48</sup>.

Evergetis II:

Αἱ χειροτονία τῶν διακονητῶν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ οἰκονόμου προχειρίσιν ὀφείλουσι γίνεσθαι,

τῶν κλειδίων δηλαδὴ ἐνώπιον τιθεμένων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ τῆς θεοτόκου, καὶ τρισαγίου γινομένου, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ προχειριζομένου μετὰ τὰς δεύσας τρεῖς γονυκλισίας

**τὰς κλεῖς ἐκεῖθεν λαμβάνοντας αὐτοχειρῶς,**

εἶτα **τῷ προεστῶτι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ὑποκλινόντος αὐχένα,** καὶ τὴν ἄνωτέρω ρηθεῖσαν **εὐλόγησιν παρ' ἐκείνου ἐκδεχομένου.**

Ταῖς μέντοι μὴ ἔχουσαις κλειδίδια ὁ τῆς θείας εἰκόνος ἀσπασμὸς καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἡγουμένου σφραγὶς ἀρκέσουσιν εἰς προχειρίσιν<sup>49</sup>.

Evergetis I:

Εἰς οἰκονόμον προχειριζέσθω, προχειριζέσθω δὲ τρόπον τοιόνδε.

Μετὰ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ ὄρθρου καὶ τὴν συνήθη τοῦ ἱερέως εὐχὴν τρισαγίου παρὰ πάντων γινομένου, ποιεῖτω τρεῖς βαθεῖας γονυκλισίας ἔμπροσθεν καὶ πλησίον τοῦ θείου βήματος ὁ εἰς διακονίαν ἐκλελεγμένος, εἶτα καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἱερὰ εἰκονίσματα καὶ σεβάσματα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου καὶ κοινῆς εὐεργέτιδος εὐλαβῶς ἀσπαζέσθω.

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ προεστῶτι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀπονεμέτω προσκύνησιν, εἶθ' οὕτως ὑποκλινῆ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν ἐκείνῳ δίδότω καὶ ἀπερικάλυπτον, κάκεινος **τῷ τιμίῳ σφραγίζων σταυρῷ,** οὕτως πῶς εὐλαβῶς λεγέτω· Ἡ πρεσβεῖα τῆς ὑπεραγίας μου θεοτόκου διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων προχειρίζεται οἰκονόμον τῆς μονῆς<sup>50</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Machairas *Typikon* 91, ed. Tsiknopoullos 1969: 41, 24-42, 6.

<sup>49</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 29, ed. Gautier 1982: 71, 973-978.

<sup>50</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 13, ed. Gautier 1982: 49, 610-618.

In the second part of the passage, which is borrowed from the Evergetis *Typikon*, the number of modifications is very small. Moreover, they are largely of a cosmetic nature. Yet the Machairas *Typikon* is not always so faithful to the text of the Evergetis *Typikon*. In the introduction to the second section elements from different passages in the older rule are interwoven to create a new text:

The primary model for this passage in the Machairas *Typikon* is the introduction to the second section about monastic offices in the Evergetis *Typikon*. However, the original text is enriched with borrowings from the beginning of the first section, where we are told how a steward should be installed. It is not difficult to grasp why the redactor took such a step. In the Evergetis *Typikon* the introduction to the second section is an abbreviated version of the earlier passage. This made it possible to replace some elements with their longer counterparts. The most striking example of such interweaving is found in the last passage where an element from the second section, τῷ προσεστώτι τὸν ἴδιον ἀχένα ὑποκλινάτω, is followed by two elements from the first section, the sentence τῷ τιμίῳ σφραγιζέσθω σταυρῷ and the formula of investiture.

At this point a comparison with the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Mamas *Typikon* is instructive. Here, too, the introduction to the second section is considerably reworked.

Mamas:

Καὶ πάντων δὲ τῶν τῆς μονῆς διακονητῶν τὴν πρόκρισίν τε καὶ προχειρίσιν ὁ καθηγούμενος ἔσται ποιῶν κατὰ γνώμην οἰκείαν καὶ προκρίνων καὶ προχειριζόμενος πάντως γὰρ ἂν τοὺς τῶν ἄλλων προέχοντας προχειριεῖται κατὰ τε ἀρετὴν καὶ δεξιότητα τοῦ τῆς διακονίας ἀποτελέσματος.

ὡσάκις δ' ἂν δεήσῃ προχειρισθῆναί τινα εἰς ὁποιαοῦν διακονίαν, αἱ

Evergetis II:

Αἱ χειροτονία τῶν διακονητῶν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ οἰκονόμου προχειρίσιν ὀφείλουσι γίνεσθαι,

Evergetis I:

Μετὰ τὸ ἐμὲ τὴν πρόσκαιρον ταύτην ἐκμετρησαί ζώην, συνδιασκεψάμενος ὁ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταλειφθεὶς προσεστώς μετ' ὀλίγων τινῶν ἐξ ὑμῶν,

ᾧν δῆπου πάντως ὑπάρχει τὸ τῶν ἄλλων προχεῖν ἔν τε βίῳ καὶ τρόπῳ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἤθει καὶ τάξει καὶ πνευματικῇ καταστάσει καὶ διαγωγῇ, ἐκλεγέσθω τὸν πάντων προέχοντα ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις, καὶ εἰς οἰκονόμον προχειριζέσθω, προχειριζέσθω δὲ τρόπον τοιοῦτον.



κλειδες μὲν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου τεθήσονται, τρισαγίου δὲ γινομένου προσελεύσεται ὁ εἰς τὴν διακονίαν ἀφορισθεὶς, τρίτον τε γονυκλιτήσας καὶ τὰς κλειεὶς εἰληφώς,

γυμνὴν ὑποκλιεῖ τῷ καθηγουμένῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν· ὁ δὲ σφραγίσει τοῦτον, εἰπὼν·

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ προχειρίζεται σε.

ἐν μέντοι ταῖς διακονίαις αἷς οὐ πρόσεισιν κλειδες ἀρκέσει μόνον εἰς προχείρισιν ἢ τοῦ καθηγουμένου σφραγίς καὶ τὰ ταύτη ἐπιλεγόμενα ῥήματα, ὡς ἂν εἰδείη ὅθεν τε ἀναδέχεται τὴν διακονίαν καὶ ὅπως ὑπισχνεῖται ταύτην διέπειν<sup>51</sup>.

τῶν κλειδίων δηλαδὴ ἐνώπιον τιθεμένων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ τῆς θεοτόκου, καὶ τρισαγίου γινομένου, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ προχειριζομένου μετὰ τὰς δεούσας τρεῖς γονυκλισίας τὰς κλειεὶς ἐκεῖθεν λαμβάνοντος αὐτοχείρωσ,

εἶτα τῷ προεστῶτι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ὑποκλίνοντος ἀχένα, καὶ τὴν ἀνωτέρω ῥηθεῖσαν εὐλόγησιν παρ' ἐκείνου ἐκδεχομένου.

ταῖς μέντοι μὴ ἐχούσαις κλειδιά ὁ τῆς θείας εἰκόνας ἀσπασμὸς καὶ ἢ τοῦ ἡγουμένου σφραγίς ἀρκέσουσιν εἰς προχείρισιν<sup>52</sup>.

Μετὰ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ ὄρθρου καὶ τὴν συνήθη τοῦ ἱερέως εὐχὴν τρισαγίου παρὰ πάντων γινομένου, ποιεῖτω τρεῖς βαθεῖας γονυκλισίας ἔμπροσθεν καὶ πλησίον τοῦ θεοῦ βήματος ὁ εἰς διακονίαν ἐκλελεγμένος. εἶτα καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἱερά εἰκονίσματα καὶ σεβάσματα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου καὶ κοινῆς εὐεργέτιδος εὐλαβῶς ἀσπαζέσθω.

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῷ προεστῶτι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀπονεμέτω προσκύνησιν, εἰθ' οὕτως ὑποκλιῆ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν ἐκεῖνῳ διδότω καὶ ἀπερικάλυπτον, κάκεῖνος τῷ τιμῷ σφραγίζων σταυρῷ, οὕτω πως εὐλαβῶς λεγέτω Ἡ πρεσβεία τῆς ὑπεραγίας μου θεοτόκου διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων προχειρίζεται σε οἰκονόμον τῆς μονῆς<sup>53</sup>.

Since in this case the Mamas *Typikon* is almost identical with the Kecharitomene *Typikon*, we can be sure that its text goes back to the Philanthropos *Typikon*<sup>54</sup>. It is evident that its author conflated two passages from the Evergetis

<sup>51</sup> Mamas *Typikon* 6, ed. Eustratiades 1928: 268, 7–16.

<sup>52</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 29, ed. Gautier 1982: 71, 973–978.

<sup>53</sup> Evergetis *Typikon* 13, ed. Gautier 1982: 49, 610–618.

<sup>54</sup> Kecharitomene *Typikon* 18, ed. Gautier 1985: 63–65, 793–807. Feminine forms are substituted for masculine ones. The only real discrepancy is the explanation πάντως... ἀποτελέσματος, which is missing in the Kecharitomene *Typikon*.

*Typikon* with one another, thus using the same technique that we have already encountered in the Machairas *Typikon*. In this case, too, elements from the first section are used to flesh out the instructions in the second section. The phrase τὰς κλειῖς εἰληφώς, which is taken from the second section, is immediately followed by the phrase γυμνήν ὑποκλινεῖ τῷ καθηγουμένῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν, which is closer to ὑποκλινῆ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν ἐκείνῳ διδόντω καὶ ἀπερικάλυπτον in the first section, after which we again find the formula of installation.

This does not, however, mean that the version in the Machairas *Typikon* is derived from the Philanthropos tradition, because the material from the two sections is combined in quite different ways. As we have seen, the Machairas *Typikon* reads τὸν ἴδιον αὐχένα ὑποκλινάτω, which is borrowed from the second section. Moreover, the stipulations about the installation of the steward, which in the Evergetis *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon* are placed before this introduction, follow it in the Philanthropos tradition, so that they immediately precede the chapters about the other monastic officials.

Thus we can conclude that two different authors modified the Evergetis *Typikon* independently from one another in an analogous fashion. In the case of the Machairas *Typikon* it seems unlikely that the author who combined material from the Evergetis tradition and the Philanthropos tradition was responsible for this reworking. It is hard to believe that he would have laboriously reorganised material from the Evergetis *Typikon* when this task had already been done in quite a satisfactory fashion by the author of the Philanthropos *Typikon*. Thus I would suggest that we must distinguish between a first redactor who rewrote the Evergetis *Typikon* and a second redactor who combined elements from this rewritten version with elements from the Philanthropos tradition.

\* \* \*

In sum, the Machairas *Typikon* is a highly complex text. It combines material from the Philanthropos tradition, taken either from the Mamas *Typikon* or from the Philanthropos *Typikon* itself, with material from the Evergetis tradition, almost certainly taken not from the Evergetis *Typikon* itself but from a now lost adaptation. We do not know who conflated the two traditions. It may have been Nilus or the author of his immediate source. Whoever was responsible for the conflation selected the material quite carefully. He usually followed the Evergetis tradition and had recourse to the Philanthropos tradition only when its

stipulations were closer to his monastic ideal. When necessary he improved on both traditions by introducing modifications of his own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BANDY, A. (2000), «32. Mamas: Typikon of Athanasios Philanthropenos for the Monastery of St. Mamas in Constantinople», in: J. Thomas-A. Constantinides-Hero-G. Constable (eds.) (2000), pp. 991-1041.
- ERMILOV, P. (2010), «Satanic Heresy: On One Topic in Anti-Armenian Polemic», in: A. Rigo-P. Ermilov (eds.), *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Byzantium. The Definition and the Notion of Orthodoxy and Some Other Studies on the Heresies and the Non-Christian Religions*, Rome [Quaderni di Nea Rhome 4], pp. 79-90.
- EUSRATIADES, S. (1928), «Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Μονῆς τοῦ ἀγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος», *Hellenika* 1, 245-314.
- GAUTIER, P. (1982), «Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis», *REB* 40, 5-101.
- (1985), «Le typikon de la Théotokos Kécharitôménè», *REB* 43, 5-165.
- JORDAN, R. (1994), «The monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, its children and its grandchildren», in: M. Mullett-A. Kirby (eds.), *The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism*, Belfast [Belfast Byzantine Text and Translations 6.1], pp. 215-245.
- (2000a), «22. Evergetis: Typikon of Timothy for the Monastery of the Mother of God Evergetis», in: J. Thomas-A. Constantinides-Hero-G. Constable (eds.) (2000), pp. 472-500.
- (2000b), «27. Kecharitomene: Typikon of Empress Irene Doukaina for the Convent of the Mother of God Kecharitomene in Constantinople», in: J. Thomas-A. Constantinides-Hero-G. Constable (eds.) (2000), pp. 664-717.
- (2000c), «34. Machairas: Rule of Neilos, Bishop of Tamasia, for the Monastery of the Mother of God of Machairas in Cyprus», in: J. Thomas-A. Constantinides-Hero-G. Constable (eds.) (2000), pp. 1107-1108.
- JORDAN, R.-MORRIS, R. (2012), *The Hypotyposis of the Monastery of Theotokos Evergetis, Constantinople (11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Farnham and Burlington.

- KRAUSMÜLLER, D. (2013), «Liturgical Innovation in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Constantinople: Hours and Inter-Hours in the Evergetis *Typikon*, its Daughters and its Grand-Daughters», *REB* 71, 149-172.
- KRAUSMÜLLER, D.-GRINCHENKO, O. (2013), «The Tenth-Century Stoudios-Typikon and its Impact on Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Byzantine Monasticism», *JÖB* 63, 153-175.
- LAURENT, V. (1931), «Remarques critiques sur le texte du typikon du monastère du Saint-Mamas», *EO* 30, 233-242.
- PENTKOVSKIJ, A. (2004), «Bogoslužebnyi sinaksar' konstantinopol'skogo monastyra Christa Chelovekoljubtsa», *Bogoslovskij Vestnik* 4, 177-208.
- THOMAS, J.-CONSTANTINIDES-HERO, A.-CONSTABLE, G. (eds.) (2000), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, Washington DC [Dumbarton Oaks Studies 35].
- TSIKNOPOULLOS, I. (1969), *Κυπριακά τυπικά*, Nicosia.

## Discusiones y reseñas

- C. G. CONTICELLO, *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition I/1 (VIe-VIIe s.)* (por M. LÓPEZ SALVÁ), 325.— Maria Rosaria ACQUAFREDDA, *Un documento inesplorato: il pinax della Biblioteca di Fozio* (por Á. IBÁÑEZ CHACÓN), 329.— *Theodori Metochitae Carmina*, ed. Ioannis D. POLEMIS; *Theodore Metochites. Poems*, introduction, translation and notes by Ioannis D. POLEMIS (por P. BÁDENAS DE LA PEÑA), 331.— *Itineraria Orientis: Miguel CORTÉS ARRESE, Constantinopla. Viajes fantásticos a la capital del mundo; Voces de El Cairo* (por P. BÁDENAS DE LA PEÑA), 337.— B. HUGHES, *Estambul. La ciudad de los tres nombres* (por M. CORTÉS ARRESE), 345.— *Urbs Beata Ierusalem. Los viajes a Tierra Santa en los siglos XVI y XVII* (por M. CORTÉS ARRESE), 348.— *Gelasius of Caesarea. Ecclesiastical History. The Extant Fragments*, with an Appendix containing the Fragments from Dogmatic Writings (por José M. FLORISTÁN), 351.— *The letters of Theodoros Hyrtakenos*. Greek text, translation and commentary by A. KARPOZILOS and G. FATOUROS (por José M. FLORISTÁN), 355.— G. VESPIGNANI, *La memoria negata. L'Europa e Bisanzio* (por José M. FLORISTÁN), 357.— Álvaro GARCÍA MARÍN, *Historias del vampiro griego* (por J. ÁNGEL Y ESPINÓS), 360.— Eusebi AYENSA PRAT, *Στις εσχατιές της θάλασσας: Ισπανοελληνικές λαογραφικές συγκριτικές μελέτες* (por M. G. VARVUNIS), 368.— F. J. ORTOLÁ SALAS-E. AYENSA PRAT-E. LATORRE BROTO-A. GARCÍA MARÍN-A. DEL CAMPO ECHEVARRÍA (eds.), *Pedro Bádenas de la Peña. Έτσι σοφός πού έγινες (Sabio como te has vuelto). Selección de artículos* (por José SIMÓN PALMER), 372.— Κωνσταντίνος ΚΥΡΙΑΚΟΣ, *Επιθυμίες και Πολιτική. Η Ξυερ Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Κινηματογράφου (1924-2016)* (por A. VALVERDE GARCÍA), 374.— Costas MAVRUDÍS, *La inmortalidad de los perros*, pról. de V. Fernández González, trad. de Á. Pérez González (por J. R. DEL CANTO NIETO), 376.— Ana CAPSIR, *Mil viajes a Ítaca. Una visión personal sobre Grecia* (por J. R. DEL CANTO NIETO), 379.— Pedro BÁDENAS DE LA PEÑA, *Cavafis. Selección de prosas* (por Fco. Javier ORTOLÁ SALAS), 382.— Dimitris TZIOVAS (ed.), *Greece in Crisis. The Cultural Politics of Austerity* (por H. GONZÁLEZ-VAQUERIZO), 385.—

