

Liturgical innovation in 11th- and 12th-century Constantinople:  
hours and inter-hours in the Evergetis Typikon, its 'daughters'  
and its 'grand-daughters'

Dirk Krausmüller

---

**Citer ce document / Cite this document :**

Krausmüller Dirk. Liturgical innovation in 11th- and 12th-century Constantinople: hours and inter-hours in the Evergetis Typikon, its 'daughters' and its 'grand-daughters'. In: Revue des études byzantines, tome 71, 2013. pp. 149-172;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.2013.4993>

[https://www.persee.fr/doc/rebyz\\_0766-5598\\_2013\\_num\\_71\\_1\\_4993](https://www.persee.fr/doc/rebyz_0766-5598_2013_num_71_1_4993)

---

Fichier pdf généré le 16/04/2018

### **Abstract**

From the middle of the 11th century onwards the adoption of a new liturgical element, the inter-hours, and the communal performance of both hours and interhours on all days of the year were promoted as the hallmarks of monastic reform. The abbots of Evergetis monastery resisted this trend, most probably because they wished to leave space for individual expressions of worship. However, the pull of the reform discourse made it difficult to maintain such a position. This can be seen from the later adaptations of the Evergetis Typikon, which modify the text of their model by adding stipulations about communal performance of the hours and in most cases also of the inter-hours. Study of these adaptations further reveals that the Philanthropos Typikon was an adaptation of the Evergetis Typikon and in turn served as the model for the later rules of Kecharitomene and Machairas.

### **Résumé**

À partir du milieu du 11e siècle, l'adoption d'un nouvel élément liturgique, les heures intermédiaires, et la célébration commune des heures et des heures intermédiaires tous les jours de l'année, furent promues comme des marqueurs de la réforme monastique. Les abbés du monastère de l'Évergétis résistèrent à cette tendance, probablement parce qu'ils souhaitèrent laisser un espace pour l'expression individuelle de la prière. Cependant, l'attrait pour le discours de la réforme rendit difficile le maintien d'une telle position. Ceci peut être vu à partir des adaptations ultérieures du Typikon de l'Évergétis qui modifièrent le texte de leur modèle en ajoutant des dispositions sur la célébration collective des heures et, dans la plupart des cas également, des heures intermédiaires. L'étude de ces adaptations révèle que le Typikon du Philanthropos est une adaptation du Typikon de l'Évergétis, lequel a servi à son tour de modèle pour les règles tardives de la Kécharitoménè et de Machairas.

LITURGICAL INNOVATION  
IN 11th- AND 12th-CENTURY CONSTANTINOPLE  
Hours and Inter-Hours in the Evergetis *Typikon*,  
its ‘Daughters’ and its ‘Grand-Daughters’

Dirk KRAUSMÜLLER

It has long been recognised that the Evergetis *Typikon* is of crucial importance for the study of Byzantine monasticism because it reflects the ideals of its authors and thus offers us vital insights into the monastic discourse of 11th-century Constantinople. Moreover, to judge by the surviving evidence, it appears to have been the preferred model for later rules by monastic and lay founders. However, one must be careful not to make inflated claims about its importance. There can be no doubt that its authors wished to found a model community but it is much less certain that there ever existed an Evergetine reform movement.<sup>1</sup> It should not be forgotten that the Evergetis *Typikon* was not the first text of its kind. Rules with an explicit reform agenda had been produced several decades earlier in the Stoudios monastery and in the Panagios monastery.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, one cannot simply assume that the Evergetis *Typikon* represents the monastic mainstream. In a recent article I have analysed stipulations about monastic diet in 11th- and 12th-century rules.<sup>3</sup> This analysis revealed that total conformity is demanded in the Panagios *Typikon* and in the *Testament* of John the Faster for the Petra monastery, which dates to the beginning of the 12th century: the monks are told to come to every meal and to eat from every dish that is being served. By contrast, the Evergetis *Typikon*, which was written in the intervening years, encourages monks to fast more than their brethren and allows them to stay away from

1. The case for an Evergetine reform movement was made by J. P. THOMAS, Documentary evidence from the Byzantine monastic *typika* for the history of the Evergetine Reform Movement, in M. MULLETT and A. KIRBY (ed.), *The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism*, Belfast 1994, p. 246-273. For a recent critique of Thomas’ hypothesis, cf. R. H. JORDAN and R. MORRIS, *The Hypotyposis of the Monastery of Theotokos Evergetis, Constantinople (11th-12th Centuries). Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Farnham and Burlington 2012, p. 17-32.

2. Cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, On Contents and Structure of the Panagiou *Typikon*: A Contribution to the Early History of ‘Extended’ Monastic Rules, forthcoming in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.

3. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, The abbots of Evergetis as opponents of “monastic reform”: a reappraisal of the monastic discourse in 11th- and 12th-century Constantinople, *REB* 69, 2011, p. 111-134.

meals. This leaves no doubt that its authors deliberately abstained from implementing a strictly coenobitic regime. Significantly, one of the adaptations of the Evergetis *Typikon*, the Kecharitomene *Typikon*, suppresses in this case the stipulations of its model and replaces them with a new passage that demands strict conformity of the nuns. This suggests that a redactor who chose the Evergetis *Typikon* as his model did not necessarily also accept the monastic vision that was encapsulated in it.

In this article I will continue my exploration of the reform discourse in 11th- and 12th-century Constantinople and the role that the Evergetis monastery played in it. This time I will focus not on monastic diet but on worship and in particular on the minor hours and on the inter-hours, a recent liturgical innovation. Through detailed analysis of the Evergetis *Typikon* and *Synaxarion* I will show that on ordinary days of the year all minor hours were performed in private with the exception of Prime and that only Prime was complemented with an inter-hour, which was sung in the cells. Comparison with Stoudite normative texts and with the Eleousa *Typikon* will reveal that in the decades when the Evergetine texts were written patterns of worship were changing at a rapid pace. At that time an influential group within Constantinopolitan monasticism claimed that in proper coenobia all inter-hours should be sung on all days of the year and that both hours and inter-hours should be performed communally. Further study will show that these features were introduced into almost all adaptations of the Evergetis *Typikon*. In the Phoberos *Typikon*, the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* we find the complete reform agenda. By contrast, the Mamas *Typikon* turns only the performance of the minor hours but not the singing of the inter-hours into communal activities. Through detailed comparison of the last-mentioned three adaptations I will establish that they all go back to the lost Philanthropos *Typikon* and that the version in the Mamas *Typikon* is in this instance a faithful copy of its model whereas the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* are considerably modified. This will allow me to conclude that the Philanthropos *Typikon* reflected an intermediary stage in the implementation of the reform agenda. Close comparison of the texts will reveal that both direct adaptations of the Evergetis *Typikon*, the Phoberos *Typikon* and the Philanthropos *Typikon*, remained very close to the text of their model. However, the few modifications that they introduced changed radically the nature of monastic life, with the result that the Evergetine monastic vision of a proper balance between private and communal worship was altogether abandoned. In the last part of the article I will ask how the Evergetis monastery itself responded to the growing influence of the discourse of radical reform. I will argue that the Kosmosoteira *Typikon*, which reproduces the stipulations of the Evergetis *Typikon* without change, was based on a special edition that the monks of Evergetis supplied to monastic founders in order to regain the initiative

The Evergetis *Typikon*, which was composed by Paul and Timothy, the first two abbots of the monastery, and which dates to the second half of the 11th century, is a lengthy text that attempts to regulate all aspects of commu-

nity life.<sup>4</sup> Its first section is devoted to the daily worship of the monks. As one would expect in a coenobitic community the monks spend a considerable amount of time together. Having been wakened from sleep they gather in the church for Matins and after the end of Matins they remain there in order to perform ‘without break’ (συνημμένως) the minor hour of Prime and to listen to a short sermon delivered by the abbot.<sup>5</sup> Later they again congregate in the church in order to celebrate Mass and from there they go together to the refectory where they eat the first meal of the day.<sup>6</sup> In the evening they meet for Vespers and the so-called *Pannychis*, partake of the second meal of the day, and perform Compline.<sup>7</sup> From this overview it is evident that there were three clearly defined blocks of communal activity at the Evergetis monastery. However, this does not mean that the rest of the day was unstructured. Indeed, the Evergetis *Typikon* puts just as much emphasis on private devotion in the cells. Between Matins and Mass the monks are to execute by themselves the diurnal *akolouthia*, ‘that is, the recital of six psalms, and Tierce and Sext’ (τοὺς ἕξ φημι ψαλμούς, τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην);<sup>8</sup> before they go to Vespers they are to perform None;<sup>9</sup> after returning from Compline they are to sing the nocturnal *akolouthia*;<sup>10</sup> and after waking up they are to perform the midnight service before making their way to the church in order to celebrate Matins.<sup>11</sup>

The Evergetis *Typikon* only gives a partial account of monastic worship because it deals exclusively with the ordinary days of the year. During Lent a different regime was in place that demanded communal performance not only of Prime but also of Tierce, Sext and None. This we know from the Evergetis *Synaxarion* where Lenten practice is described in great detail.<sup>12</sup> The *synaxarion* confirms that on ordinary days of the year the minor hours were performed in the cells but adds that during the two Lenten periods of the Holy Apostles and St Philip they took place in the narthex of the church and that during Great Lent they were performed in the church proper.<sup>13</sup> When we further consider that during Great Lent the structure of the minor hours was much more elaborate than on other days of the year, we can conclude that the

4. Evergetis *Typikon*, ed. P. GAUTIER, Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis, *REB* 40, 1982, p. 1-101.

5. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 27<sup>222-238</sup>; 4, p. 19<sup>75-21</sup>104.

6. Evergetis *Typikon*, 5, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>151-152</sup>; 9, p. 33<sup>337-35</sup>351.

7. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 25<sup>195-27</sup>199.

8. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-138</sup>.

9. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 25<sup>195</sup>.

10. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 27<sup>209-213</sup>.

11. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 27<sup>217-218</sup>.

12. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. R. H. JORDAN, *The Synaxarion of the monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August. The Movable Cycle. Text and translation*, Belfast 2005, esp. p. 308-750.

13. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 714<sup>1-5</sup>: Δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι τὰς γ’ μόνας τεσσαρακοστὰς ψάλλομεν τὰς ὥρας ἐν τῷ κοινῷ μετὰ καὶ στιχολογίας. Τὴν δὲ γε μεγάλην ἐν τῷ ναῷ μετὰ καὶ ἀναγνώσεως, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς β’ χωρὶς ἀναγνώσεως καὶ ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τοῦ ὅλου χρόνου ἐν ταῖς κέλλαις ἡμῶν.

monks spent a much greater amount of time than usual in the company of each other. However, this does not mean that there was no room for private devotions during the three Lenten periods because the Evergetis *Synaxarion* makes mention of a further type of service, the so-called *mesoria* or inter-hours of Prime, Tierce, Sext and None. The inter-hours were to be performed in the cells after the monks returned from the minor hours that they had celebrated together in church and, in the case of the inter-hour of None, after Compline.<sup>14</sup> There is only one exception to this pattern. At Pentecost the inter-hour of Tierce was sung in church together with Tierce in order to mark the hour when the Holy Spirit descended on the Apostles.<sup>15</sup>

This raises the question: Were the inter-hours also performed during ordinary days of the year? At first sight this does not appear to be the case because the term *mesoria* is never used in the Evergetis *Typikon*. However, a closer look reveals that the inter-hours are present there, too. As we have seen the *typikon* makes mention of ‘the six psalms’ (τοὺς ἕξι... ψαλμούς), which the monks were expected to recite in their cells after their return from Prime. Comparison with the Evergetis *Synaxarion* shows that the six psalms correspond to the inter-hour of Prime. This text informs us that during Lent the monks were to perform Prime and listen to a catechesis in the church and were then to return to their cells where ‘we sing the *mesoria*, that is, the six psalms’ (ψάλλομεν τὰ μεσώρια ἡγουν τοὺς ς΄ ψαλμούς), before going back to church and performing Tierce and Sext.<sup>16</sup> That both devotions were indeed identical is confirmed by another passage in the *Synaxarion* where we read that after Prime, the monks are to sing in their cells the six psalms ‘as is customary’ (ὡς σύνηθες) and that after the other hours they are to perform their *mesoria* there, too.<sup>17</sup> In the *Synaxarion* the comment ‘as is customary’ is only added in cases where Lenten practice did not diverge from the practice observed on ordinary days. For example, it follows the reference to the communally celebrated Prime and the catechesis that I have just mentioned.<sup>18</sup>

14. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 688<sup>17-19</sup>: Τὰ δὲ μεσώρια τῆς γ΄ καὶ τῆς ς΄ ψάλλομεν ἐν ταῖς κελλίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γεύματος τὰ τῆς θ΄ ὥρας. Cf. also *ibidem*, p. 694<sup>5-6</sup>: Ἀρχόμεθα ἀπὸ τρισαγίου καὶ ψάλλομεν τὸ ἔσχατον μεσώριον τῆς θ΄.

15. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 656<sup>15-17</sup>: Δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι περὶ γ΄ ὥραν κρουομένου τοῦ μικροῦ σημαντήρος συναγόμεθα ἅπαντες ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἔσω, καὶ ψάλλομεν ὁμοῦ τὴν γ΄ ὥραν μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων αὐτῆς.

16. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 688<sup>4-6</sup>.

17. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 368<sup>26-29</sup>: Δεῖ γινώσκειν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ὄρθρου ἀπολύσεως ψάλλομεν ἐν ταῖς κέλλαις ἡμῶν τοὺς ς΄ ψαλμούς ὡς σύνηθες, καὶ καθ΄ ἐκάστην ὥραν μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ψάλλομεν ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ἡμῶν τὰ μεσώρια τῶν ὥρῶν.

18. Evergetis *Synaxarion*, ed. JORDAN, p. 686<sup>22-23</sup>: Καὶ ἡ πρώτη ὥρα συνημμένως ὡς σύνηθες. Cf. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 197<sup>5-76</sup>: Χρὴ τοίνυν μετὰ τὴν ὄρθρινὴν δοξολογίαν συνημμένως ψάλλεσθαι ὑφ΄ ὑμῶν τὴν πρώτην ὥραν, ὡς σύνηθες. It should be noted, however, that in the *Concise Hypotyposis* of Nicetas Stethatos, which will be discussed in the following, the inter-hour of Prime is comprised of nine psalms, just as the other inter-hours are; cf. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. G. PAPPALOU, *Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters*, PhD thesis, University of Chicago 2004, p. 477<sup>66-82</sup>.

Thus we can conclude that the inter-hour of Prime was performed throughout the year. But what about the inter-hours of the other minor hours? In the Evergetis *Typikon* Tierce, Sext and None are mentioned without any further specifications. This suggests that their inter-hours were not performed on ordinary days. Such an interpretation can be supported by the fact that in the Evergetis *Synaxarion* the inter-hours of Tierce and Sext are never referred to as six psalms and that they are never characterised as customary practice.<sup>19</sup> The reason for the privileged status of the inter-hour of Prime is most likely that Prime itself was celebrated in church throughout the year whereas Tierce and Sext were private devotions. Thus one could argue that in the case of Prime the Lenten regime had been extended to ordinary days of the year.

In order to put our findings into context we need to turn to other rules of the time. I will start with the *Typikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain, which has been dated to the 1050s.<sup>20</sup> In this text it is stipulated that ‘the hours must always be sung... with inter-hours, regardless of whether it is a feast or an ordinary day’ (πάντοτε τὰς ὥρας εἴτε ἑορτή ἐστὶν εἴτε καθημερινὴ ὅλας μετὰ μεσώρια... χρὴ ψάλλεσθαι).<sup>21</sup> Moreover, it is specified that for these services all monks must gather together after the signal has been given. Only those who are away from the community can perform these services in private.<sup>22</sup> The repeated references to normative texts leaves no doubt that we are in the presence of a self-conscious reform project.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, we know that Nikon took on himself the role of a monastic reformer at the behest of Patriarch Theodosius III of Antioch (1057-1059).<sup>24</sup> Unfortunately, we have no such evidence from mid-11th-century Constantinople, but this does not mean that similar developments were not taking place there, too. After all, Theodosius, a scion of the Constantinopolitan family of Chrysoberges, which was closely

19. As we have seen the Evergetis *Typikon* makes a reference not only to a diurnal *akolouthia* but also to a nocturnal *akolouthia*. Thus one might consider the possibility that this *akolouthia* corresponded to the inter-hour of None. However, the texts provide us with no clear indications that we are indeed dealing with the same service. In the *Concise Hypotyposis* of Nicetas Stethatos the nocturnal *akolouthia*, consisting of twelve psalms, is clearly distinguished from the inter-hour of None, which consists of nine psalms; cf. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 466-470<sup>487-566</sup>.

20. *Typikon* of Nikon, ed. V. BENEŠEVIĆ, *Тактикон Никона Черногорца Греческий текст по рукописи № 441 Синайского монастыря св. Екатерины*, Petrograd 1917, p. 22-67.

21. *Typikon* of Nikon, 7, ed. BENEŠEVIĆ, p. 23<sup>19-23</sup>.

22. *Typikon* of Nikon, 9, ed. BENEŠEVIĆ, p. 24<sup>1-8</sup>.

23. Cf. e.g. the reference to the coenobitic constitutions in *Typikon* of Nikon, 7, ed. BENEŠEVIĆ, p. 23<sup>23</sup>. The frequent recourse to Patristic authority is noted and discussed in R. ALLISON (tr.), 20. Black Mountain: Regulations of Nikon of the Black Mountain, in J. THOMAS, A. CONSTANTINIDES-HERO, G. CONSTABLE (ed.), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, III, Washington D.C. 2000, p. 377-424, esp. p. 379-381. However, it is explained as springing from a lack of self-confidence, which suggests that Nikon's approach was a personal matter and not the consequence of a broader reform movement. Such an interpretation does not take into account comparable evidence from the Byzantine heartland; cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Abbots of Evergetis, p. 130-134.

24. Cf. R. ALLISON, Black Mountain, p. 337.

linked to the patriarchate, had been sent to his see from the capital. This makes it very likely that his views of what constituted proper coenobitic monasticism had been shaped in Constantinople.<sup>25</sup> From the Byzantine heartland the first clear evidence of the regime described by Nikon is found in the rule for the Eleousa monastery near Strumica in Macedonia, which was composed by the bishop Manuel in the last decades of the 11th century.<sup>26</sup> Like the Evergetis *Typikon* Manuel's rule regulates the daily worship of the monks. However, instead of offering a comprehensive description of all services he only speaks briefly about Matins and the midnight service and then focuses exclusively on Prime, Tierce, Sext and None whose religious significance he highlights, without mentioning Eucharist, Vespers or Compline.<sup>27</sup> This section concludes with the exhortation that the monks should not be negligent 'when they perform these... divine services... together with their inter-hours' (ταύτας... τὰς θείας συνάξεις... ἐκτελοῦντες μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων αὐτῶν).<sup>28</sup> From the context it is evident that Manuel wished these services to be celebrated communally. He starts by saying that the monks should congregate in the church 'at the time of glorification' (κατὰ τὸν τῆς δοξολογίας καιρὸν) and then specifically mentions 'the glorification of the hours' (ἡ τῶν ὥρων... δοξολογία);<sup>29</sup> and he counts among the 'services' (συνάξεις) not only the hours but also 'the midnight services' (τὰς μεσονυκτίους συνάξεις), which were without doubt performed in the church, together with the prayers for the emperor, before Matins began with the *hexapsalmos*.<sup>30</sup> The striking similarity of these stipulations with their counterparts in Nikon's text suggests that we are in the presence of a broad reform discourse. From the Eleousa *Typikon* we know that Manuel had previously been monk on Mount St Auxentius.<sup>31</sup> This makes it very likely that his stipulations reflect the practice of his mother house, which was situated in the vicinity of Constantinople. Since Manuel must have been monk there in the third quarter of the 11th century, one can argue that the communal performance of both hours and inter-hours was introduced in the capital at the same time as it was in the region of Antioch.

The impact of the reform discourse in Constantinople can be gauged from two texts related to the monastery of Studios, the rule that Patriarch Alexius

25. Theodosios had previously been monk in Bithynia; cf. K.-P. TODT, *Region und griechisch-orthodoxes Patriarchat von Antiocheia in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit (969-1084)*, *BZ* 94, 2001, p. 239-267. On the Chrysoberges family and its close connections to the patriarchate, cf. M. ANGOLD, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni (1081-1261)*, Cambridge 1995, p. 147.

26. Eleousa *Typikon*, ed. L. PETIT, *Le monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine*, *IRAİK* 6, 1900, p. 1-153, text p. 69-93. The text is dated between the years 1085 and 1106 in A. BANDY (tr.), 10. Eleousa: Rule of Manuel, Bishop of Stroumitza, for the Monastery of the Mother of God Eleousa, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, I, p. 167-191, esp. p. 167.

27. Eleousa *Typikon*, 6-7, ed. PETIT, p. 73<sup>18</sup>-75<sup>21</sup>.

28. Eleousa *Typikon*, 8, ed. PETIT, p. 75<sup>22-25</sup>.

29. Eleousa *Typikon*, 6, ed. PETIT, p. 73<sup>18-19</sup>; 7, p. 74<sup>23-25</sup>.

30. Eleousa *Typikon*, 6, ed. PETIT, p. 73<sup>23-24</sup>.

31. Eleousa *Typikon*, 1, ed. PETIT, p. 70<sup>1-7</sup>; cf. p. 119<sup>19-20</sup>.

(1025-1043), a former abbot of Stoudios, gave to a monastery that he had founded in the capital,<sup>32</sup> and the *Concise Hypotyposis* of the Stoudite abbot Nicetas Stethatos, which most likely dates to the 1080s.<sup>33</sup> Patriarch Alexius' rule, which is based on a now lost Stoudite *Typikon*, consists of a disciplinary and a liturgical section, which correspond to the Evergetis *Typikon* and *Synaxarion*.<sup>34</sup> In the disciplinary section we find a brief description of the activities that monks should perform in their cells after Matins and other communal services.<sup>35</sup> In this context there is mention of prayers and readings but not of the minor hours. This raises the possibility that the minor hours were only performed during the three Lenten periods.<sup>36</sup> Lenten practice is described in great detail in the liturgical section, but no reference is made to the inter-hours. These findings suggest that during the time of Patriarch Alexius the claims of the reformers had not yet gained universal acceptance.

However, the picture changes radically when we turn to the *Concise Hypotyposis*, which regulates the private worship of the monks on ordinary days of the year. In this text Prime, Tierce, Sext and None are private devotions, which the monks are expected to perform every day. Moreover, they are all complemented with their inter-hours. A closer look reveals a significant discrepancy in the treatment of the two forms of worship. While Nicetas usually contents himself with brief references to the hours themselves, he sets out the structure and content of the inter-hours in great detail.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the inter-hours are integrated rather clumsily into the daily routine of the monks: the inter-hours of Tierce and Sext are performed during Mass, but seemingly

32. *Typikon* of Alexius the Studite, ed. A. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси*, Moscow 2001, p. 233-420. Cf. also C. FARRIMOND, Founders and refounders: the application of the *Typikon* of Alexios the Stoudite at the Kievan Caves monastery, in *Founders and refounders of Byzantine monasteries*, ed. M. MULLETT, Belfast 2007, p. 273-314.

33. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 444-491. For the date cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, Private vs communal: Niketas Stethatos's *Hypotyposis* for Stoudios, and patterns of worship in 11th-century Byzantine monasteries, in *Work and Worship at the Theotokos Evergetis*, ed. M. MULLETT-A. KIRBY, Belfast 1997, p. 309-328, esp. p. 310.

34. The Stoudios *Typikon* has not survived. It must be reconstructed through comparison of its later adaptations, the *Typikon* of Alexius the Stoudite, which is only extant in a Church Slavonic translation, and several Southern Italian rules, among which the Patirion *Typikon* is the most important. Cf. A. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита*, p. 49-154.

35. *Typikon* of Alexius the Stoudite, ed. PENTKOVSKIJ, *Типикон*, p. 70, where the text is juxtaposed with a virtually identical counterpart in the Patirion *Typikon*.

36. This hypothesis gains credence when we consider that Symeon the New Theologian makes no reference to Prime, Tierce, Sext and None when he describes the daily routine of his monks in his catecheses; cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Private vs communal, p. 326. This regime may have developed after the time of Theodore of Stoudios whose catecheses give the impression as if the hours were sung on ordinary days, too; cf. J. LEROY, Le cursus canonique chez Saint Théodore Studite, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 68, 1954, p. 5-19, repr. in ИДЕМ, *Études sur le monachisme byzantin* (Spiritualité orientale 85), Bégrolles-en-Mauges 2007, p. 81-99.

37. Only Prime is described in detail; cf. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 445<sup>29</sup>-446<sup>65</sup>. The monks are told to start the recitation of Prime on their way back from Matins. For the full descriptions of the inter-hours, cf. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 447-451<sup>70-154</sup>, 454-456<sup>216-274</sup>, 466-467<sup>489-506</sup>.

only when a monk does not receive the Eucharist, and the inter-hour of None is performed before Vespers on the way to church.<sup>38</sup> This suggests that the inter-hours had until then not been part of Stoudite worship and that it was the purpose of the *Concise Hypotyposis* to familiarise the Stoudite monks with them. In his proem Nicetas states that he is trying to set out for the monks 'that ancient practice of the fathers... which is almost hidden in the depths of... forgetfulness' (τὴν παλαιὰν ἐκείνην τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐργασίαν... λήθης βυθοῖς... καλυπτομένην).<sup>39</sup> Such a declaration cannot be taken at face value because in the *horologia* the inter-hours only appear in the 11th century.<sup>40</sup> Rather it must be understood in the context of the reform discourse, where it was claimed that the inter-hours were of an ancient date and that only the monasteries that 're-' introduced them could be considered properly coenobitic houses. This suggests that Nicetas felt forced to write the *Concise Hypotyposis* because he did not want his community to appear lax and old-fashioned.<sup>41</sup> From the text it is evident that Nicetas opted for a partial implementation of the new regime: he made the singing of hours and inter-hours obligatory for all days of the year, but he retained their private character.

When we now return to the Evergetis texts, we can see that their authors Paul and Timothy took a position that is not unlike that of Nicetas. Indeed, comparison shows that they were even less influenced by the new developments than Nicetas was. As we have seen, the Evergetis texts stipulate the full set of hours and inter-hours only during the Lenten periods. Moreover, even then only the hours were performed as communal services. On ordinary days the pattern was even more rudimentary because then only Prime was performed in church and only Prime was followed by an inter-hour sung in the cells. Although they make no mention of it it is inconceivable that the abbots of Evergetis were not aware of the contemporary reform discourse. It rather seems to be the case that they had developed an alternative monastic ideal, which permitted them to reject the claims of the reformers that they

38. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 454<sup>208-209</sup>, 466<sup>488-490</sup>.

39. *Concise Hypotyposis*, ed. PAPPULOV, p. 444<sup>15-17</sup>.

40. Cf. M. SKABALLANOVIČ, *Толковый Типикон. Объяснительное изложение Типикона и историческим введением*, Moscow 2004, p. 381. In the Codex Athous Vatopedi 1248, dated to 1075, the inter-hours are inserted into an existing framework of small hours; cf. S. FRØYSHOV, Часослов без последований Больших Часов (вечерни и утрени): Исследование недавнего изданного Часослова Sin. gr. 864 (IX в.), in *Bogoslovskie Trudy* 43-44, 2012, p. 381-400, esp. p. 400. Cf. also C. LUTZKA, *Die Kleinen Horen des byzantinischen Stundengebetes und ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*, Berlin 2010<sup>2</sup>, p. 46-52 and p. 88-96, with an analysis of a Syro-Palestinian *horologion* of the late 12th century, which is based on a Greek original, and with a general discussion of the inter-hours. Lutzka is more interested in the structure of the inter-hours and in their relationship to the hours than in the historical context of their introduction. Nicen's *Typikon* and the Evergetis *Typikon* are only mentioned in passing. The inter-hours are not discussed in R. TAFT, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West. The Origins of the Divine Office and Its Meaning for Today*, Collegeville (Minnesota) 1993<sup>2</sup>, and in T. POTT, *La réforme liturgique byzantine. Etude du phénomène de l'évolution non-spontanée de la liturgie byzantine* (Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 104), Rome 2000.

41. Cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, Private vs communal, p. 317-320.

were recreating the ‘golden age’ of early monasticism. It is most likely their unusually deep knowledge of the monastic tradition, which was by no means as uniform as the reformers claimed, that gave them the confidence to resist the new discourse.<sup>42</sup>

As is well known the Evergetis *Typikon* became the model of several later monastic rules. This raises the question: how did the authors of these texts respond to the contemporary debate? Did they leave the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* unchanged, or did they make modifications in order to bring their model into line with the predominant current within contemporary monasticism? An answer can only be found through detailed comparison of the texts. I will start with the Phoberos *Typikon*, which draws directly on the Evergetis *Typikon*, and then turn to the rules of the Mamas, Kecharitomene and Machairas monasteries whose relationship with the Evergetis *Typikon* is more complex.

As has often been observed, the Phoberos *Typikon*, which was composed by the abbot John in the early 12th century, is very faithful to the text of its model.<sup>43</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that in the section about daily worship John copies *verbatim* from the Evergetis *Typikon* the passage about Matins, communal Prime and the requisite genuflections. However, after this point the two texts begin to diverge:

## Evergetis

Μετὰ τοίνυν ταύτας τὰς γονυκλισίας ἢ τὰ προσκυνήματα τὴν εὐχὴν ταύτην εἰκὸς ἐκφωνεῖσθαι πᾶσιν ἐν ἐπάρσει τῶν χειρῶν Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος, τὸ ἀναρχον καὶ αἰδίου φῶς, ὁ πάσης κτίσεως δημιουργός, τίθεσθαι τε αὐτίκα μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν πατερικῶν λόγων μικρὰν κατήχησιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ προεστῶτος ἀναγιγνωσκομένην, καθὼς παρὰ τοῦ παμμάκαρος πατρὸς ἡμῶν παρελάβομεν.<sup>44</sup>

## Phoberos

Μετὰ τοίνυν ταύτας τὰς γονυκλισίας ἢ τὰ προσκυνήματα **συνημμένως ψάλλειν τὸ μεσῶριον τῆς πρώτης ὥρας.**

τίθεσθαι τε αὐτίκα καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρικῶν λόγων μικρὰν κατήχησιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ προεστῶτος ἀναγιγνωσκομένην, καθὼς παρὰ τοῦ παμμάκαρος πατρὸς ἡμῶν παρελάβομεν.<sup>45</sup>

Here the Evergetis *Typikon* has a prayer, which is then followed by a short sermon. The Phoberos *Typikon* omits this prayer and puts in its place a stipulation about the inter-hour of Prime. This new stipulation is formulated in such a way that it mirrors the phrase μετὰ τὴν ὀρθρινὴν δοξολογίαν **συνημμένως ψάλλεσθαι ὑφ’ ὑμῶν τὴν πρώτην ὥραν** in the preceding passage, which the author of the Phoberos *Typikon* has borrowed from the Evergetis *Typikon*

42. Such a scenario would have an exact parallel in the debate about proper fasting; cf. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Abbots of Evergetis*, p. 130-134.

43. Cf. JORDAN and MORRIS, *Hypotyposis*, p. 137.

44. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 19<sup>93</sup>-21<sup>98</sup>.

45. Phoberos *Typikon*, 9, ed. A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Noctes Petropolitanae*, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 1-87, esp. p. 20<sup>16-19</sup>.

without any changes.<sup>46</sup> As a consequence a new element has been added to the sequence of communal activities that the monks had to perform each morning. Similar changes can be observed in the chapter about Tierce and Sext:

## Evergetis

Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐκτελεῖν πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισίων..., **τοὺς ἕξ φημι ψαλμούς, τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην**, κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος· τὰς γάρ τοι γονυκλισίας ἐν τῷ ναῷ μόνῳ παραφυλακτέον.<sup>47</sup>

## Phoberos

Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν ἐκτελεῖν ἀκολουθίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ψαλτήρος μετὰ καὶ γονυκλισίων..., **τὴν δὲ γε τρίτην ὥραν καὶ ἕκτην** καὶ ἐνάτην κοινῶς ὀφείλετε ψάλλειν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων αὐτῶν, κρουομένου τοῦ σημάντρου κατὰ τὸ ἔθος· τὰς γάρ τοι γονυκλισίας ἐν τῷ ναῷ παραφυλακτέον μόνῳ.<sup>48</sup>

Here, too, the prayers mentioned in the Evergetis *Typikon* have been suppressed, a clear sign that the author of the Phoberos *Typikon* changed the text of his model in a systematic fashion. However, in this case he did not confine himself to adding a reference to the inter-hours. Since unlike Prime, Tierce and Sext were private devotions in the Evergetis *Typikon*, he created a new sentence containing references to the communal character of the worship and to its location into which he then inserted the original passage about the two minor hours. Furthermore, he added a reference to None. This reference appears out of sequence since None does not precede but follow the Eucharist. The reason for this addition reveals itself when we turn to the later section about None, which is also found in the Evergetis *Typikon*:

## Evergetis

Τὴν δὲ ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρή.<sup>49</sup>

## Phoberos

Τὴν δὲ ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρή.<sup>50</sup>

Here the author of the Phoberos *Typikon* has simply copied his model, which was possible because he had already redefined the character of None in the previous section.

From the comparison between the two texts, it is evident that the author of the Phoberos *Typikon* strove to remain as close as possible to the wording of the Evergetis *Typikon*. However, it is equally obvious that the few changes that he did make have considerable consequences for the daily life of the community. Whereas the monks of Evergetis only came to church for Prime, the brethren at Phoberos assembled there for all the minor hours and their

46. Phoberos *Typikon*, 9, ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 19<sup>36-37</sup>; cf. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 19<sup>75-76</sup>.

47. Evergetis *Typikon*, 5, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-138</sup>.

48. Phoberos *Typikon*, 9, ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 21<sup>16-21</sup>.

49. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 25<sup>195-196</sup>.

50. Phoberos *Typikon*, 12, ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 23<sup>24-25</sup>.

inter-hours: as a consequence Tierce and Sext, their inter-hours, and Mass on the one hand and None, its inter-hour, Vespers and *Pannychis* on the other become two blocks of uninterrupted communal activity in the church of the monastery.

The Phoberos *Typikon* is not the only adaptation of the Evergetis *Typikon* that contains such modifications. We encounter the same phenomenon in the Mamas *Typikon*, which dates to the middle of the 12th century.<sup>51</sup> There the stipulations about Prime are copied from the Evergetis *Typikon* without any change. However, this is not the case with Tierce and Sext:

Evergetis	Mamas
Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐκτελεῖν πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισίων κατὰ τὸν ἀνωτέρω ρηθέντα τύπον, τοὺς ἕξ φημι ψαλμούς, τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην, κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος· τὰς γάρ τοι γονυκλισίας ἐν τῷ ναῷ μόνῃ παραφυλακτέον. <sup>52</sup>	Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν εἰκὸς τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐκτελεῖν πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισίων·  τὰς γάρ τοι γονυκλισίας ἐν τῷ ναῷ μόνῃ παραφυλακτέον. <sup>53</sup>

Here the Mamas *Typikon* contains no elements that are not also found in the Evergetis *Typikon*, but it leaves out the passage referring to the six psalms and to Tierce and Sext. This does not mean, however, that this passage is omitted from the text. In the Mamas *Typikon* the stipulations about genuflections are followed by a reference to an earlier chapter, which has Tierce and Sext as its subject matter. There we find the missing elements:

Evergetis	Mamas
Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐκτελεῖν πᾶσαν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισίων κατὰ τὸν ἀνωτέρω ρηθέντα τύπον, τοὺς ἕξ φημι ψαλμούς, τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην, κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. <sup>54</sup>	Κρουομένου τοίνυν τοῦ συμβόλου κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα συνάγεσθαι δεῖ πάντας ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι καὶ ψάλλειν ὁμοῦ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς εὐχῶν. <sup>55</sup>

The Mamas *Typikon* copies the original phrase τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην *verbatim* but inserts it into a new sentence, which indicates that the monks should sing the two minor hours together in the narthex of the church. The next sentence then specifies that at the end of Sext the monks should

51. Mamas *Typikon*, ed. S. EUSTRATIADIS, Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος, *Ἑλληνικά* 1, 1928, p. 245-314.

52. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-139</sup>.

53. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADIS, p. 298<sup>38</sup>-299<sup>2</sup>.

54. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-139</sup>.

55. Mamas *Typikon*, 31, ed. EUSTRATIADIS, p. 285<sup>25-27</sup>.

enter the church proper in order to celebrate Mass. A further modification is found in the later chapter about None:

## Evergetis

Τὴν δὲ ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρῆ, τοῦ συμβολικοῦ κρούματος ἐπὶ ταύτην ὑμᾶς καλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος.<sup>56</sup>

## Mamas

Τὴν μέντοι ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρῆ **ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι**, τοῦ μικροῦ συμβόλου κρουομένου ἐπὶ ταύτη καὶ ἡμᾶς καλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος.<sup>57</sup>

Here the changes are less noticeable than before. The author contents himself with slightly rephrasing the concluding part of the sentence and adding a reference to a location. It is evident that like their counterparts in the Phoberos *Typikon*, the passages in the Mamas *Typikon* remain very faithful to the text of the Evergetis *Typikon*. Yet here, too, the modifications result in a complete reorganisation of daily life within the monastery. Instead of being private devotions, Tierce, Sext and None are now defined as communal services. There can be no doubt that the authors of the two later rules made the changes independently from each other. As we have seen the Phoberos *Typikon* adds a reference to None to the earlier chapter about Tierce and Sext and as a consequence does not change the stipulation about None itself. Thus we can conclude that the passages in the Phoberos *Typikon* and in the Mamas *Typikon* are independent responses to the discourse of monastic reform that was conducted in the capital in the late 11th and 12th century. Indeed, comparison of the adaptations of the Evergetine chapter about the midnight service suggests that they directly respond to each other:

## Evergetis

Κρούσας τε τηνικαῦτα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τὸ σύμβολον καὶ φῶτα πᾶσι διαδούς, ἐξεγερεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ὑμᾶς τῆς μεσονυκτίου ἀκολουθίας, ἣν δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ψαλεῖται πάντως.<sup>58</sup>

## Phoberos

Κρούσας τε τηνικαῦτα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τὸ σήμαντρον καὶ φῶτα πᾶσι διδούς, ἐξεγερεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ὑμᾶς τῆς μεσονυκτίου ἀκολουθίας **ἐν τοῖς κελύουσιν ὑμῶν ψαλλομένης** (ἔστι δὲ τὰ τρία καθίσματα, τὸ ἕνατον, τὸ ἐξκαιδέκατον καὶ τὸ ὀκτωκαιδέκατον), ἣν δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ψαλεῖται πάντως.<sup>59</sup>

## Mamas

Κρούσας τε κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τὸ μικρὸν σύμβολον τηνικαῦτα ἐξεγερεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ὑμᾶς τῆς μεσονυκτίου ἀκολουθίας **τῆς ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι ψαλλομένης**, ἣν δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ψαλεῖται πάντως.<sup>60</sup>

56. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 25<sup>195-196</sup>.

57. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 299<sup>10-12</sup>.

58. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 27<sup>216-218</sup>.

59. Phoberos *Typikon*, 12, ed. PAPANOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 24<sup>12-16</sup>.

60. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 299<sup>34-37</sup>.

Here the version in the Mamas *Typikon* includes another reference to the narthex, which turns the midnight prayers into a communal service. By contrast, the Phoberos *Typikon* not only keeps the stipulation of the Evergetis *Typikon*, but adds a further clarification that this devotion is indeed performed in private. This suggests that at the time when the two passages were written it had become the subject of a debate whether the midnight service should be performed in private or together with other members of the community and that the two passages represent the two different stances in this debate.

As we have already seen, there is one further difference between the two texts. Whereas the Phoberos *Typikon* consistently adds the inter-hours, we find no references to these new communal services in the Mamas *Typikon*. Thus one could argue that in this case the Mamas *Typikon* is more conservative and that its stipulations reflect an intermediate stage in a process of communalisation that then found its culmination in the Phoberos *Typikon*. However, matters are not as straightforward because unlike the Phoberos *Typikon*, the Mamas *Typikon* is not a direct adaptation of the Evergetis *Typikon*. This can be concluded from the fact that it contains a substantial amount of non-Evergetine material, which is also found in two other surviving rules, the Kecharitomene *Typikon* from the early 12th century and the Machairas *Typikon* from the late 12th century.<sup>61</sup> This shows clearly that the three texts go back to a common model where passages from the Evergetis *Typikon* were already combined with new stipulations. The most likely candidate for this common model is the rule of the Philanthropos monastery, the sister foundation of the Kecharitomene convent. There can be no doubt that the Philanthropos *Typikon* was based on the Evergetis *Typikon*, because we still have copies of the Evergetis *Synaxarion* and of Paul's *Katechetikon* that were made for the Philanthropos monastery.<sup>62</sup> However, the hypothesis that the later texts depended on this rule has not yet been substantiated because so far no detailed comparison has been made in order to establish their relationship with each other.

Therefore we are confronted with a twofold task: to establish whether the version of the Mamas *Typikon* represents the common model and to determine whether this common model was indeed the Philanthropos *Typikon*. I will start the discussion with the passage about the communal singing of Tierce and Sext. As I have said before, this passage in the Mamas *Typikon* has no counterpart in the Evergetis *Typikon*. However, it is also found in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon*. In fact, the versions in the Mamas *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon* are virtually identical. For this reason I will only quote the former text and give variant readings in the latter text in brackets, italicising the elements where the two texts differ:

61. A. BANDY, 32. *Mamas: Typikon* of Athanasios Philanthropenos for the Monastery of St. Mamas in Constantinople, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, III, p. 990.

62. Cf. JORDAN and MORRIS, *Hypotyposis*, p. 4, 6, 140-141.

Evergetis	Mamas (Machairas)	Kecharitomene
<p>[Ἀπιόντας δὲ ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἐκτελεῖν πάσαν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων εὐχῶν καὶ γονυκλισιῶν...] τοὺς ἕξ φημι ψαλμούς, <b>τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην, κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος.</b><sup>63</sup></p>	<p>Κρουομένου τοίνυν τοῦ συμβόλου κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα συνάγεσθαι δὲ πάντας ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι <b>καὶ (κάκεισε) ψάλλειν ὁμοῦ τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς εὐχῶν (μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων).</b><sup>64</sup></p>	<p>Καταλαμβανούσης δὲ τῆς προσηκούσης ὥρας, κρουσθήσεται τὸ ξύλον <b>κάκεισε ψαλεῖτε</b> τὰ μεσῶρια τῆς πρώτης, <b>τὴν τε τρίτην καὶ ἕκτην ὥραν μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων, τῶν εὐχῶν καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν, ἔνθα ἂν ἡ καθηγουμένη βουληθῆ, εἴτε ἐν τῷ κοιμητηρίῳ, εἴτε ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξωνάρθηκι.</b><sup>65</sup></p>

The close resemblance of the versions in the Mamas *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* shows clearly that they are derived from the same model. When we turn to the text in the Kecharitomene *Typikon*, we find that it shares a number of features with the common model for the two other texts, which are absent from the Evergetis *Typikon*: the genitive absolute καταλαμβανούσης δὲ τῆς προσηκούσης ὥρας corresponds to the prepositional phrase κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν προσήκοντα and ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξωνάρθηκι has a parallel in ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι. Even more striking is the resemblance between κάκεισε ψαλεῖτε and κάκεισε ψάλλειν in the Machairas *Typikon*. This leaves no doubt that the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is in this instance not based directly on the Evergetis *Typikon*, but is rather a further modification of an earlier adaptation of this text. This argument can be further strengthened when we consider a discrepancy between the Machairas *Typikon* and the Kecharitomene *Typikon*: in the former case the adverb κάκεισε has a clear referent because the narthex is mentioned immediately before, whereas in the latter text it is meaningless because there a location is specified only at a later point. This suggests that the author of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* somewhat inexpertly modified his model by moving the locations to the end of the sentence, undoubtedly because he had to accommodate an alternative, the common sleeping-quarters of the nuns. If he had inserted this further feature into the middle of the sentence, the syntax would have become very convoluted indeed.

At this point we can conclude that the common source for the three extant rules must have been the Philanthropos *Typikon*, which was drawn up at the behest of Empress Irene Doukaina. This now lost text was then further modified when Irene Doukaina founded the Kecharitomene convent and needed a rule for this house as well. Moreover, it was later adopted by the former steward of the Philanthropos monastery, Athanasius, when he became abbot of St Mamas.<sup>66</sup> And lastly it provided the inspiration for the Cypriot bishop Nilus when he

63. Evergetis *Typikon*, 5, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-138</sup>.

64. Mamas *Typikon*, 31, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 285<sup>25-27</sup>; Machairas *Typikon*, 35, ed. I. TSIKOPOULLOS, *Κυπριακὰ τυπικά*, Nicosia 1969, p. 19<sup>25-20</sup>.

65. Kecharitomene *Typikon*, 33, ed. P. GAUTIER, *Le typikon de la Théotokos Kécharitôméné*, *REB* 43, 1985, p. 5-165, esp. p. 81-83<sup>1132-1136</sup>.

66. Cf. Mamas *Typikon*, proem., ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 259<sup>3-6</sup>.

composed the Machairas *Typikon*, either directly or through the mediation of further adaptations. From the comparison it is evident that the author of the Philanthropos *Typikon* had already turned the originally private devotions of Tierce and Sext into communal services, which took place in the narthex of the church. In order to achieve this aim, he did not compose an entirely new text but lifted the accusative objects τὴν τρίτην ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἕκτην and the genitive absolute κρουομένων τῶν συμβόλων from the original sentence and created a new context for them. However, did the Philanthropos *Typikon* also include a reference to communal inter-hours? At first, this seems to be the case because both the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* contain the prepositional phrase μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων. Thus one could conclude that the alternative μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς εὐχῶν in the Mamas *Typikon* is the result of a later modification, introduced to tone down the rigour of the original text. This argument seems further strengthened when we consider how the passages under discussion are arranged in the Mamas *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon*. In order to facilitate the comparison I will summarise the content of the passages and only reproduce the transitions in full:

Evergetis	Mamas	Machairas
[Monks go to cells; worship in cells, including Tierce and Sext; no genuflections in cells when ‘God is Lord’ is performed and during festal periods. <sup>67</sup> ]	[Monks go to cells; worship in cells; no genuflections in cells when ‘God is Lord’ is performed and during festal periods. <sup>69</sup> ]	[Lacuna (index: Περί τῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῦ κελλίου); no genuflections in cells when ‘God is Lord’ is performed and during festal periods. <sup>73</sup> ]
	Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς τρίτης καὶ ἕκτης ὥρας καὶ πρώτης ἐν ταῖς ἀπολελυμέναις ἡμέραις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὧδέ πως ἐχέτω τὰ δὲ περὶ τῆς τρίτης καὶ ἕκτης προεγράφη ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας κεφαλαίῳ. <sup>70</sup>	
	[Tierce and Sext are sung in the narthex; in the meantime the church is prepared for the Eucharist. <sup>71</sup> ]	[Tierce and Sext are sung in the narthex; in the meantime the church is prepared for the Eucharist. <sup>74</sup> ]
Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς τρίτης καὶ ἕκτης ὥρας καὶ πρώτης ἐν ταῖς ἀπολελυμέναις ἡμέραις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὧδέ πως ἐχέτω. Ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας. <sup>68</sup>	Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τῆς τρίτης καὶ ἕκτης ὥρας ὧδέ πως ἐχέτω ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας. <sup>72</sup>	Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τῆς τρίτης καὶ ἕκτης ὥρας ἐν ταῖς ἀπολελυμέναις ἡμέραις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὧδέ πως ἐχέτω ῥητέον δὲ ἄρα καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας. <sup>75</sup>

67. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>135-145</sup>.

68. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>145-151</sup>.

69. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 298<sup>38-299</sup>7.

70. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 298<sup>7-9</sup>.

71. Mamas *Typikon*, 31, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 285<sup>25-31</sup>.

72. Mamas *Typikon*, 31, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 285<sup>31-36</sup>.

73. Machairas *Typikon*, 34-35, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 19<sup>11-28</sup>.

74. Machairas *Typikon*, 35, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 19<sup>25-20</sup>5.

75. Machairas *Typikon*, 36, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 20<sup>7-9</sup>.

As I have said before, in the Mamas *Typikon* the two passages about private worship in the cells and about the communal singing of Tierce and Sext are found in different parts of the texts but are linked to one another through a cross-reference. This cross-reference is not an entirely new creation since it contains material from the concluding sentence of the chapter in the Evergetis *Typikon*, which is now reduplicated. This suggests that the author of the Mamas *Typikon* reorganised an older text where the two passages followed each other. That this is indeed the case becomes apparent when we extend the discussion to the Machairas *Typikon* where we find just such an arrangement. There can thus be no doubt that the Machairas *Typikon* has preserved the disposition of the Philanthropos *Typikon* where the additional passage about communal Tierce and Sext was simply inserted into an existing chapter.

However, this does not necessarily mean that the reference to the inter-hours was already part of the Philanthropos *Typikon*. First of all, it can be shown that the Machairas *Typikon* follows the text of its model much less closely than the Mamas *Typikon*. A case in point is the passage about private worship in the cells in the Evergetis *Typikon*. As we have seen, the Mamas *Typikon* reproduces this passage without changes and merely omits the reference to Tierce and Sext. Unfortunately, the corresponding chapter in the Machairas *Typikon* is lost, but the concluding words καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἔργοχειροῦ ἢ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἐπιμέλειαν, which have survived, have no counterpart in the Evergetis *Typikon*. This suggests that this passage had been substantially modified. Moreover, the references to the inter-hours in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon* are not as close as it first appears. As we have seen, the Kecharitomene *Typikon* makes mention not only of the inter-hours of Tierce and Sext but also of the inter-hour of Prime. By contrast, no such reference is found in the Machairas *Typikon*. Here the inter-hour of Prime appears in the section about the genuflections where the Kecharitomene *Typikon* has an undeveloped text:

Machairas	Kecharitomene
πρὸς δέ, (sc. φυλαζόμεθα τὸ γονυκλιτεῖν ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις) τὸ δωδεκάημερον τῶν Χριστουγέννων καὶ τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἅπασαν, ... καὶ τὸ ψάλλειν τὰ μεσῶρια ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἀγίαν Πεντηκοστὴν φυλαζόμεθα. <sup>76</sup>	οὔτε (sc. ποιήσετε μετάνοιαν ἐν τῷ κοιμητηρίῳ ὑμῶν) κατὰ τὸ δωδεκάημερον, οὔτε κατὰ τὴν ὅλην Πεντηκοστὴν. <sup>77</sup>

It is evident that the author of the Machairas *Typikon* has taken as his starting point the sentence about genuflections during the Pentecostal period. He has then reduplicated the structure of this sentence but with the inter-hour of Prime as new subject matter. In this way he has succeeded in a roundabout

76. Machairas *Typikon*, 34, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 19<sup>18-22</sup>.

77. Kecharitomene *Typikon*, 33, ed. GAUTIER, p. 83<sup>1137-1139</sup>.

way to indicate that the inter-hours should be sung on all other days of the year.

I would therefore argue that the appearance at the same point of the prepositional phrase *μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων* both in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and in the Machairas *Typikon* is a coincidence. After all, the most opportune place for adding such a reference to the existing sentence would have been right after the reference to Tierce and Sext. That such changes could be made independently is confirmed by the fact that we find the same stipulations in the Phoberos *Typikon*. Accordingly, the alternative phrase *μετὰ τῶν σὺν αὐταῖς εὐχῶν* in the Mamas *Typikon* would represent the text of the Philanthropos *Typikon*.

The interpretation that has been proposed here can be further confirmed when we turn to the passage about None. Here the Machairas *Typikon* has an entirely different text, a lengthy description of the ritual for the inter-hour of None.<sup>78</sup> By contrast, the version in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is an elaboration of the text that we find in the Mamas *Typikon*:

Evergetis	Mamas	Kecharitomene
Τὴν δὲ ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρῆ, τοῦ συμβολικοῦ κρούματος ἐπὶ ταύτην ὑμᾶς <b>καλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος.</b> <sup>79</sup>	Τὴν μέντοι ἐνάτην κατὰ τὰς προλαβούσας ὥρας ψάλλεσθαι χρῆ <b>ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι</b> , τοῦ μικροῦ συμβόλου κρουομένου ἐπὶ ταύτη καὶ ἡμᾶς <b>καλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος.</b> <sup>80</sup>	Ἐσαύτως καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐνάτης ὥρας μεσῶρια <b>ἐν τῷ κοιμητηρίῳ ὑμῶν</b> ψάλλεσθαι βουλόμεθα τοῦ μικροῦ συμβόλου κρουομένου. Τὴν γε μὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ψάλλειν ὑμᾶς δεῖ καθὼς καὶ τὰς προδιαληφθείσας ὥρας μετὰ τε τῶν μεσωρίων αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν, τοῦ σημαντήρος πάσας <b>συγκαλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος.</b> <sup>81</sup>

In this case the author of the Mamas *Typikon* reproduces the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* with only minor changes, but he inserts a reference to the narthex, which turns None from a private into a communal service. By contrast, the version in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is much more complex. It

78. Machairas *Typikon*, 42, ed. ΤΣΙΚΝΟΠΟΥΛΛΟΣ, p. 22<sup>9-21</sup>: Τὴν μέντοι ἐνάτην ὥραν καὶ τὸ ταύτης μεσῶριον οὕτω ψαλτέον· μετὰ τὸ διαναστήναι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ κοινῇ τραπέζῃ ἐστίασεως τοῦ Ἐλεήμων καὶ οἰκτίρων ὁ κύριος, τροφὴν ἔδωκε τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν, τρίς παρὰ τῆς ἀδελφότητος ψαλλομένου, καὶ τοῦ συνήθους σὺν αὐτῷ τρισαγίου, τοῦ ἱερέως τε τὴν εὐχὴν ἐπιλέγοντος ταύτην, Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ τρέφων ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεότητος ἡμῶν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ πάντοτε, εὐθὺς ἀρχόμεθα τοῦ ρκα΄ ψαλμοῦ, Ἡὐφράνθη ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρηκόσι μοι, εἰς οἶκον κυρίου πορευσόμεθα, καὶ τοῦτον ψάλλοντες ἐξερχόμεθα τὸ ἀριστήριον μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης εὐκοσμίας καὶ καταστάσεως, καὶ ἀπερχόμεθα εἰς τὸν νάρθηκα τοῦ ναοῦ, κάκεισε, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐκπληροῦντες ψαλμόν, ἀρχόμεθα τοῦ τρισαγίου καὶ ψάλλομεν τὴν ἐνάτην. Only the first three words have a counterpart in the other texts.

79. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 25<sup>195-196</sup>.

80. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADES, p. 299<sup>10-12</sup>.

81. Kecharitomene *Typikon*, 35, ed. GAUTIER, p. 85<sup>1188-1192</sup>.

not only includes a reference to the inter-hour in the passage that it shares with the other two texts, but prefaces this passage with an entirely new sentence where the inter-hour is mentioned together with a location. Detailed comparison again reveals that the version in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is developed out of the text in the Mamas *Typikon*. Both texts have the characteristic phrase τοῦ μικροῦ συμβόλου κρουομένου where the Evergetis *Typikon* has τοῦ συμβολικοῦ κρούματος. Moreover, the author of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* has adopted the two phrases τοῦ μικροῦ συμβόλου κρουομένου and ἡμᾶς καλοῦντος ὡς ἔθος in such a way that the first element is moved to the new first passage. It is evident that the appearance of the inter-hours in the Kecharitomene *Typikon* is closely linked to these secondary modifications.<sup>82</sup> This confirms our previous conclusion that the Mamas *Typikon* does indeed represent the text of the Philanthropos *Typikon*.

The discussion so far has shown time and again that the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon* are much more developed than the Mamas *Typikon*, which remains very close to the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* and therefore also to the text of its immediate model, the Philanthropos *Typikon*. This leaves no doubt that the Philanthropos *Typikon* itself was very faithful to the Evergetis *Typikon*, a characteristic that it shared with the contemporary Phoberos *Typikon*, despite the fact that the two texts are not directly related to one another. The different nature of the rules is clearly visible in the passage about the Midnight service:

Evergetis (Phob., Phil.)	Kecharitomene	Machairas
<p>... ἄχρις ἂν ὁ τοῦ ὥρολογίου φροντίζων, τὴν ἀρμόζουσιν ἐκεῖθεν ὥραν μαθῶν τῷ τε προεστῶτι προσελθῶν καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐξ ἐκείνου λαβὼν εὐχὴν, εἶτα καὶ γεγωνοτέρᾳ φωνῇ τὸ Εὐλόγεῖτε ἅγιοι εὐρύθμως ἐκκεκραγώς, κρούσας τε κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τὸ μικρὸν σύμβολον τηνικαῦτα ἐξεγερεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ὑμᾶς τῆς μεσονυκτίου ἀκολουθίας (add. Phoberos: ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν ψαλλομένης..., add. Philanth.: τῆς ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι ψαλλομένης), ἦν δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ψαλεῖται πάντως.<sup>83</sup></p>	<p>Ἐν καιρῷ δὲ τῷ προσήκοντι, τῆς τελούσης τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησιαρχίας διακονίαν μετάνοιαν τῇ καθηγουμένῃ βαλλούσης καὶ τὸ ξύλον κρουσάσης, τὴν μεσονύκτιον ἀκολουθίαν ἐν τῷ ἄρθηκι τῆς ἐκκλησίας παραγενομένοι ἐκτελέσετε, οὐδὲ αὐτῆς τῆς διυπνισάσης ὑμᾶς ἀπολιμπανομένης, ἀλλ' ἅμα τε σὺν ὑμῖν ψαλλούσης.<sup>84</sup></p>	<p>... ἄχρις ἂν ὁ τε κανδηλάπτης καὶ ὁ ἐπιστημονάρχης, τὴν προσήκουσαν ὥραν ἐκ τοῦ ἐκκλησιάρχου μαθόντες, τῷ προεστῶτι προσέλθοιεν, καὶ τὴν συνήθη λαβόντες ἐξ ἐκείνου εὐχὴν, ὁ μὲν ἀπέλθῃ κρούσων τὰς βαρέας, ὁ δὲ τὸ Εὐλόγησον πάτερ ἅγιε τὸ μεσονυκτικὸν προσηνεῖ καὶ ἠπία φωνῇ ἐξειπὼν, παραδεύσῃ τὰ κελλία τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τὸ Εὐλόγησον πάτερ τὸ μεσονυκτικὸν ὡσαύτως λέγων, ἐξεγερεῖ πρὸς λειτουργίαν ὑμᾶς τῆς μεσονυκτίου ἀκολουθίας, ἦν δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ψαλεῖται πάντως καὶ ὁ κανδηλάπτης.<sup>85</sup></p>

82. It is also worth noting that the phrase μετὰ τε τῶν μεσωρίων αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν is clearly based on the model of its counterpart μετὰ τῶν μεσωρίων, τῶν εὐχῶν καὶ τῶν μετανοιῶν in the section about Tierce and Sext.

83. Evergetis *Typikon*, 6, ed. GAUTIER, p. 27<sup>213-218</sup>; Phoberos *Typikon*, 12, ed. PAPAPOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 24<sup>9-16</sup>; Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSTRATIADIS, p. 299<sup>32-37</sup>. I have reproduced the

Both the Phoberos *Typikon* and, as we can now say, the Philanthropos *Typikon* copy the text of the Evergetis *Typikon* without change, confining themselves to brief additional comments that specify whether the service should be private or communal. As I have said before, the two texts may respond directly to one another and reflect a contemporary discussion about the nature of the midnight service in which their authors took diametrically opposed positions. The later adaptations of the Philanthropos *Typikon* for the Kecharitomene convent and the Machairas monastery are based on the text of their model. However, they introduce many secondary changes into this text, which in the case of the Kecharitomene *Typikon* almost obscure its ultimate dependence on the Evergetine rule.

From the discussion so far it is evident that the two direct adaptations of the Evergetis *Typikon* from the beginning of the 12th century, the Phoberos *Typikon* and the Philanthropos *Typikon*, modify independently of one another the text of their model in such a way that it reflects the vision of 'proper' coenobitic worship that was promoted at the time by the proponents of the monastic reform movement. Like Nicetas Stethatos, their authors clearly felt the pressure of the reform discourse, which made older practice seem insufficient. However, we have also seen that the reform agenda was not immediately implemented in its entirety. Firstly, while the Philanthropos *Typikon* turns the midnight prayers into a communally performed service, the Phoberos *Typikon* insists that they remain a private devotion; and secondly while the Phoberos *Typikon* stipulates that both hours and inter-hours should be performed communally, the Philanthropos *Typikon* speaks only of communal hours without mentioning the inter-hours. Yet in the end the authors of the Phoberos and Philanthropos rules could not stem the tide of reform. This can be concluded from the Kecharitomene and Machairas rules. As we have already noted the redactors of these texts not only retained the communal midnight service, but also introduced communal inter-hours, with the result that virtually no time was left for private worship. It is evident that the Phoberos *Typikon* and the Philanthropos *Typikon* play a crucial role in the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the Evergetine rule. Both texts stand out through their faithfulness to the model, which is in marked contrast to the much freer adaptations in the two later texts. This suggests that their authors were in close contact with the Evergetis monastery. Indeed, in the case of the Philanthropos monastery the first abbot might even have been a former member of the community of Evergetis. This makes it all the more striking that they felt the

text of the Evergetis *Typikon* without indicating several minor discrepancies. The most important of these are the following. In the Phoberos *Typikon* the participle *προσελθών* is missing, which is evidently a straightforward scribal mistake. The Mamas *Typikon* leaves out *εἶτα καὶ γεγωνοτέρᾳ φωνῇ τὸ Εὐλογεῖτε ἅγιοι εὐρύθμως ἐκκεκραγώς*. However, this phrase must have been part of the Philanthropos *Typikon* because it appears in slightly changed form in the Machairas *Typikon*.

84. Kecharitomene *Typikon*, 38, ed. GAUTIER, p. 87<sup>1213-1217</sup>.

85. Machairas *Typikon*, 45, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 23<sup>27</sup>-24<sup>2</sup>.

need to deviate so radically from the Evergetine monastic vision with its strong emphasis on private worship.

So far this article has focused on the minor hours and inter-hours. However, we can observe the processes of change and adaptation in other contexts as well. A case in point is the stipulation about the genuflections that monks should make in their cells. The versions of this passage in the Evergetis and Phoberos rules read as follows:

Evergetis	Phoberos
Φυλαξόμεθα δὲ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ γονυκλιτεῖν) κὰν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν ὅταν ἀγρυπνία ἦ διὰ τὸν ἐξ ἐκείνης κόπον, πρὸς δὲ κατὰ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον τῶν Χριστουγέννων <b>καὶ τὴν διακαινήσιμον ἑβδομάδα.</b> <sup>86</sup>	Φυλαξόμεθα δὲ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ γονυκλιτεῖν) κὰν τοῖς κελλίοις, ὅταν ἀγρυπνία ἦ διὰ τὸν ἐκείνης κόπον, πρὸς δὲ κατὰ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον καὶ <b>τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν πᾶσαν.</b> <sup>87</sup>

From the juxtaposition it is evident that at the Evergetis monastery genuflections were only forbidden during Easter week whereas in the Phoberos monastery this prohibition was extended to the whole Pentecostal period. The reason for this change is given in the following paragraph of the Phoberos *Typikon*: it is the influence of canon law, which in the Evergetis *Typikon* did not yet play a role.<sup>88</sup> When we turn to the rules for the Mamas, Kecharitomene and Machairas monasteries we are again confronted with a more complex picture:

Evergetis	Mamas	Kecharitomene	Machairas
Ἐπὶ τοίνυν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν αἰεὶ τὸ γόνυ κλιτέον εὐχομένους. Φυλαξόμεθα δὲ τοῦτο κὰν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν ὅταν ἀγρυπνία ἦ διὰ τὸν ἐξ ἐκείνης κόπον, πρὸς δὲ κατὰ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον τῶν Χριστουγέννων <b>καὶ τὴν διακαινήσιμον ἑβδομάδα.</b> <sup>89</sup>	Ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν αἰεὶ γονυκλιτέον εὐχομένους. Φυλαξόμεθα δὲ τοῦτο κὰν τοῖς κελλίοις ὑμῶν ὅταν ἀγρυπνία ἦ διὰ τὸν ἐκ ταύτης κόπον, πρὸς δὲ κατὰ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον τῶν Χριστουγέννων <b>καὶ τὴν διακαινήσιμον ἑβδομάδα, ἢ καὶ ὅλην τὴν Πεντηκοστήν · οἱ δὲ προαιρούμενοι γονυκλιτεῖτωσαν μετὰ τὴν διακαινήσιμον.</b> <sup>90</sup>	Ἵστε μέντοι γίνεται ἀγρυπνία, οὐ ποιήσετε μετάνοιαν ἐν τῷ κοιμητηρίῳ ὑμῶν διὰ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀγρυπνίας κόπον, οὔτε κατὰ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον, <b>οὔτε κατὰ τὴν ὅλην Πεντηκοστήν...</b> οὐ κατὰ <b>πᾶν σάββατον.</b> <sup>91</sup>	Ἐπὶ τοίνυν τοῖς κελλίοις ἡμῶν αἰεὶ τὸ γόνυ κλιτέον εὐχομένους, <b>παρὲξ σαββάτου καὶ κυριακῆς.</b> Καὶ ὅταν δὲ ἀγρυπνία ἦ, φυλαξόμεθα τὸ γονυκλιτεῖν ἐν τοῖς κελλίοις, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δωδεκαήμερον τῶν Χριστουγέννων <b>καὶ τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἅπασαν.</b> <sup>92</sup>

86. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>141-143</sup>.

87. Phoberos *Typikon*, 10, ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 21<sup>26-28</sup>.

88. Phoberos *Typikon*, 10, ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, p. 21<sup>8-22</sup><sup>16</sup>, with excerpts from several canonical texts. On this phenomenon in general cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *The Athonite*

Comparison shows that the Mamas *Typikon* remains much closer to its model than the Phoberos *Typikon*: it alone retains the reference to the Easter week and mentions the Pentecostal period only as an option, which is not binding for the individual practitioner. By contrast, the Machairas *Typikon* and the Kecharitomene *Typikon* only refer to the Pentecostal period just as the Phoberos *Typikon* does. Moreover, in these two texts we find the stipulation that one should not make genuflections on Saturdays, which is absent from the Mamas *Typikon*. The fact that this elaboration is found in both texts does not mean that they are directly related to each other. Rather their authors responded independently from one another to further developments within the reform discourse. The similarity with the treatment of hours and inter-hours is striking. As we have seen there, too, the stipulations of the Kecharitomene and Machairas rules about the inter-hours correspond to those in the Phoberos *Typikon* although there is no sign of a direct influence. Moreover, the inter-hours are mentioned in both texts in the same sentence, but are absent from the Mamas *Typikon*. This parallel strengthens our previous argument that the Mamas *Typikon* is a faithful copy of the Philanthropos *Typikon* whereas the Kecharitomene and Machairas rules introduced the same modifications without being directly influenced by one another. As a result the Philanthropos *Typikon* again stands out as a text whose author implemented the demands of the reform movement only grudgingly and strove to remain as close as possible to the Evergetis *Typikon*.

I have suggested before that the redactor of the Philanthropos *Typikon* was the first abbot of the monastery who had previously been a member of the Evergetine community. If this were indeed the case, the changes introduced into the Philanthropos *Typikon* would be even more significant because they would show that even an Evergetine monk could not completely resist the growing influence that the reform discourse exerted on Constantinopolitan monasticism. This raises the question: how did the community of Evergetis itself respond to the same challenge? After the death of the founder abbots one might have expected that their successors felt the need to update the rule that they inherited. However, this is not the case. When at the end of the 12th century Sabas of Serbia had the Evergetis *Typikon* translated into Church Slavonic for the monastery of Chilandar, its content was still unchanged.<sup>93</sup> Of

monastic tradition during the 11th and early 12th centuries, in A. BRYER and M. CUNNINGHAM (ed.), *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism*, Aldershot 1996, p. 57-65.

89. Evergetis *Typikon*, 4, ed. GAUTIER, p. 23<sup>140-143</sup>.

90. Mamas *Typikon*, 47, ed. EUSRATIADES, p. 299<sup>2-7</sup>.

91. Kecharitomene *Typikon*, 33, ed. GAUTIER, p. 83<sup>1136-1142</sup>.

92. Machairas *Typikon*, 34, ed. TSIKNOPOULLOS, p. 19<sup>14-18</sup>.

93. Cf. D. BOGDANOVIĆ, *Hilandarski tipik: rukopis CHIL AS 156*, Belgrade 1995, esp. p. 62<sup>11-14</sup>: А који иду у ваше ћелије, треба на подобно сврше сву службу после уобичајених молитава и коленопоклоњења, по више реченом закону, то јест шес псалама и трећи час и шести. The Hilandar *Typikon* also follows its model in the following section about genuflections. Like the Evergetis *Typikon* it stipulates that genuflections should not be made in the week after Easter, rather than during the whole Pentecostal period, as we find in the other adaptations.

possibly even greater significance is Isaac Komnenos' *Kosmosoteira Typikon* from the middle of the 12th century. This rule is the only adaptation of the Evergetis *Typikon* by a Byzantine founder that faithfully reproduces the text of its model and does not introduce any liturgical innovations.<sup>94</sup> Such conservatism is in need of explanation, especially since the founder's mother Irene Doukaina had taken a radically different approach. At this point it is worth considering that the *Kosmosoteira Typikon* is also the only adaptation of the Evergetis *Typikon* that openly acknowledges its debt to the older text. In the introductory section to the liturgical and dietary stipulations Isaac Komnenos states: 'What then the aforementioned rule of Evergetis stipulates with the help of God about the condition of the monks in the hymnody and in the other devotions, is this' (ὃ μὲν οὖν τὸ προαναφωρηθὲν τυπικὸν τῆς Εὐεργέτιδος ἐν ταῖς ὑμνωδίαις τῶν μοναχῶν καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἀκολουθίᾳ σὺν θεῷ διατάσσεται ταῦτά ἐστιν).<sup>95</sup> This is in stark contrast with his mother's *Kecharitomene Typikon* where we read instead: 'What then has been stipulated by us about this sheepfold that is sacred to you and about the condition of those in it, is this' (ὃ δὲ δὴ περὶ τε τῆς ἱερᾶς σοι μάνδρας καὶ τῆς τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ἡμῖν διατετύπωνται καταστάσεως ταῦτά ἐστιν), which gives the impression as if the text were an original creation.<sup>96</sup> Significantly, Isaac then explains that he has 'rubbed off what was written on the tablet through divine inspiration and transferred it word for word to the present little tablet' (τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα τῇ δέλτῳ θεολήπτως ἀπομορξάμενοι καὶ μεταγράψαντες τῷ παρόντι δελταρίῳ κατ' ἕπος).<sup>97</sup> This statement elevates the Evergetis *Typikon* to a religious document of the first order, inspired by God in the same way as Moses' tablets were. As a consequence any deviation from the original would amount to an adulteration of divine revelation. It is evident that this makes it impossible for the text to be updated in the same manner as all the other adaptations were. At this point we must ask: why would a lay founder like Isaac have made such a statement? I would suggest that he was closely connected to the community of Evergetis. Indeed, the only parallel for an explicit acknowledgement of a source in Byzantine rules is found in the *Petriziotissa Typikon* of Gregory Pakourianos who presents himself in the text as a friend of the community of Panagios whose rule he adopts.<sup>98</sup> Thus one could argue that the monks of Evergetis had a hand in the production of the *Kosmosoteira Typikon*. Indeed, the remark that the *Kosmosoteira Typikon* is only one of a number of such

94. Cf. N. SHEVCHENKO, 29. *Typikon of the sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira near Bera*, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, III, p. 784, with reference to chapters 13-29, which deal with worship and with diet: 'These transcriptions are usually verbatim or nearly so.'

95. *Kosmosoteira Typikon*, 13, ed. G. K. ΠΑΠΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ, *Τυπικὸν Ἰσαακίου Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ τῆς μονῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς Κοσμοσωτείας*, Komotene 1994, esp. p. 52<sup>293-294</sup>.

96. *Kecharitomene Typikon*, prologue, ed. GAUTIER, p. 29<sup>171-173</sup>.

97. *Kosmosoteira Typikon*, 8, ed. ΠΑΠΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ, p. 43<sup>144-44</sup>146.

98. For a comparison, cf. D. KRAUSMÜLLER, *Saints' Lives and Typika: the Constantinopolitan monastery of Panagiu in the Eleventh Century*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen's University Belfast 2001, esp. p. 137-138.

texts may suggest that the monks of Evergetis made a special edition of their rule, consisting of the stipulations about worship and diet, which could be used by several founders.<sup>99</sup> If this interpretation is correct, they would have responded to the uncontrolled proliferation of adaptations with an attempt to safeguard not only the letter but also the spirit of the Evergetis *Typikon*.

To conclude: Within the discourse of coenobitic reform that came to dominate the monastic milieu of 11th- and 12th-century Constantinople the monastery of Evergetis had the status of an outsider. While the authors of the Evergetis *Typikon* promoted a coenobitic regime they did not wish to subordinate the individual to the community in quite such a radical way as other contemporary texts intended. This is already evident in the debate about proper fasting where the Evergetine texts permit individual monks to eat less than their brethren, an attitude that is in stark contrast to the emphasis on complete conformity in the Panagios *Typikon* and in the *Testament* of John the Faster for the Petra monastery. Yet it can also be seen in the debate about monastic worship. From the middle of the 11th century onwards the adoption of a new liturgical element, the inter-hours, and the communal performance of both hours and inter-hours on all days of the year were promoted as the hallmarks of monastic reform. The force of the new discourse can be gauged not only from texts that fully implemented its tenets such as the *Typikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain and the Eleousa *Typikon*, but also from more half-hearted responses such as the *Concise Hypotyposis* of Nicetas Stethatos who attempted to introduce the inter-hours as private devotions in the Stoudios monastery. By contrast, the abbots of Evergetis made very few concessions to the reformers. Detailed analysis of the Evergetis *Typikon* and *Synaxarion* reveals that on ordinary days of the year only Prime was sung in the church whereas the other minor hours were performed in the cells and that only Prime was complemented with an inter-hour, which was also performed in the cells. This reluctance finds its most likely explanation in the wish of the authors to preserve a balance between private and communal worship and to leave space for individual expressions of worship. However, the pull of the reform discourse clearly made it difficult to maintain such a position. This can be seen from two rules that are directly based on the Evergetis *Typikon*, the Phoberos *Typikon* and the lost Philanthropos *Typikon* whose text is preserved in the later Mamas *Typikon*. These two texts, which were written independently from one another in the early 12th century, remain very close to their model but they introduce a number of modifications which affect patterns of worship within the community. The Philanthropos *Typikon* turns the hours from private into communal devotions and the Phoberos *Typikon* goes one step further and stipulates the communal performance of the inter-hours as well. Significantly, the partial implementation of the reform agenda in the Philanthropos *Typikon* was later considered insufficient since two adaptations, the Kecharitomene *Typikon* and the Machairas *Typikon*, add the communal

99. Kosmosoteira *Typikon*, 8, ed. PAPAZOGLU, p. 43<sup>137-144</sup>.

performance of the inter-hours to the text of their model. This makes it all the more surprising that the Evergetis monastery continued to stem the tide. There is no indication that the Evergetis *Typikon* was ever revised. Indeed, the monks of Evergetis may even have launched a counter-attack by creating a special edition of the Evergetis *Typikon* for the use of monastic founders in order to regain the ownership of its monastic tradition and to promote its specific vision of the ideal monastic life.

Dirk KRAUSMÜLLER  
Mardin Artuklu University