

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL
OF
BYZANTINE
AND
MODERN GREEK STUDIES

- 9 *AnnaLinden Weller*
Narrative & Verisimilitude in Byzantium – an Introduction
- 15 *Baukje van den Berg*
‘The Excellent Man Lies Sometimes’: Eustathios of Thessalonike on Good Hypocrisy, Praiseworthy Falsehood, and Rhetorical Plausibility in Ancient Poetry
- 37 *Stanislas Kuttner-Homs*
L’historien comme témoin: le “je” historiographique est-il le garant de la vraisemblance dans l’Histoire de Nicétas Chôniatès?
- 61 *Markéta Kulhánková*
Scenic narration in the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* of spiritually beneficial tales
- 81 *Jonas J. H. Christensen*
I was there. Constantine Akropolites’ Typikon
- 95 *Jakov Đorđević*
Experiencing Resurrection: Persuasive Narrative of the Pictorial Program in the Ossuary of the Bachkovo Monastery
- 125 *David Konstan*
Sin: The Prehistory
- 141 *Adam Goldwyn*
Theory and Method in John Tzetzes’ *Allegories of the Iliad* and *Allegories of the Odyssey*
- 173 Book Reviews

Editorial

In this third volume of the Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, we are happy to welcome a guest-editor, Dr AnnaLinden Weller, who has edited five articles from a conference that she organized at Uppsala University in 2016 within the frame of the ‘Text and Narrative in Byzantium’ research network. The articles are written by Baukje van den Berg, Stanislas Kuttner-Homs, Markéta Kulhánková, Jonas J. H. Christensen and Jakov Đorđević, provided with an introduction by AnnaLinden Weller. In addition, the journal includes two more articles – one by David Konstan, based on his 2016 lecture in memory of Professor Lennart Rydén, and one by Adam Goldwyn – and two book reviews.

In October 2018, Modern Greek Studies in Lund will organise the 6th European Congress of Modern Greek Studies, and according to the number of submitted abstracts it promises to be an interesting event for scholars from many countries around the globe to come together.

The journal is open for unpublished articles and book reviews related to Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies in the fields of philology, linguistics, history and literature. It is published in collaboration with Greek and Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University and we welcome contributions not only from Scandinavian colleagues, but from scholars all around the world.

Vassilios Sabatakakis
Modern Greek Studies
Lund University

**Instructions for contributors to
SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL
OF
BYZANTINE
AND
MODERN GREEK STUDIES**

SJBMGS encourages scholarly contributions within Byzantine and Modern Greek philology and history.

Manuscripts of articles to be considered for publication should be sent to Marianna.Smaragdi@klass.lu.se or Marianna Smaragdi, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, Box 201, 22100 Lund, Sweden.

Your article will be refereed. If it is accepted for publication, you will be asked to supply a final version on e-mail. Authors will receive five copies of the journal volume.

The SJBMGS is a nonprofit venture to be distributed on an exchange basis to scholars and libraries.

Copyright: The authors and the editor.

Editorial Board:

Panagiotis Agapitos, professor, University of Cyprus

Demetrios Agoritsas, PhD

Christoforos Charalambakis, professor, University of Athens

Eric Cullhed, PhD, researcher, Uppsala University

Olof Heilo, PhD, deputy director, The Swedish Research Institute, Istanbul

David Holton, professor emeritus, University of Cambridge

Christian Høgel, professor wso, University of Southern Denmark

Ingela Nilsson, professor, Uppsala University

Staffan Wahlgren, professor, NTNU, Trondheim

Editor-in-chief:

Vassilios Sabatakakis

vassilios.sabatakakis@klass.lu.se

I was there. Constantine Akropolites’ *Typikon*

Jonas J. H. Christensen

Constantine Akropolites wrote an appendix to the typikon for the Church of our Lord’s Resurrection in Constantinople, rebuilt by his father, George (1217-82). The typikon was written sometime between 1295 and Constantine’s own death in 1324, on the occasion of his dedication of a chapel to St. Lazaros. The church, together with the rest of the foundation, was probably combined through the instrument of *henosis* with the older foundation of the Asiatic foundation of St. Lazaros on Mt. Galesios during the time of the two Akropolitai, reflecting the rapid loss of territorial control and monasteries in Asia Minor.¹ Constantine’s father, George, the well-known historian and grand logothete under Michael VII Palaiologos, was himself not the original founder of the Church of the Resurrection, but carried out a restoration that put him on a par with the original.² Poor or defunct foundations would often be brought under the charge of wealthy Byzantines and as the original founders were often completely forgotten or simply mythical, there was nothing to stop the sponsor from attaining the title of ‘new founder’ or simply ‘founder’.³ As we shall see, this usage of the term was stretched to new limits in the case of Constantine’s typikon.

Constantine mentions⁴ a previous document that must have been drawn up by George Akropolites, but only Constantine’s later typikon survives. It is important for the following that Constantine points out

¹ On the loss of territory in the context of the political changes in Constantinople, see e.g. Korobeinikov, 2014.

² See Thomas & Hero, *BMFD*, 1374-1382.

³ See *BMFD*, 202-3.

⁴ See below.

that the typikon applies only to the chapel that his father, and to a lesser degree himself, founded, though it in some ways takes the place of a typikon for the whole foundation. Moreover, the typikon has the title and takes the form of a λόγος, a speech, on the occasion of the renovation. This does not influence structure and contents as much as the general style of the text, which clearly reflects the educated background of the author.⁵ The typikon is as a consequence highly rhetorical.

Two concerns dominate the typikon for the Church: the right of the deceased father, George, to be counted as second founder through the expenses used on restoring the monastery, and the title of founder to be applied to the son and author as well.

Chapter one contains praise of the gifts coming from God and what man can give in return, a naturally popular subject for founders of consecrated institutions. The following chapter starts with an account of the earlier fate of the church, and Constantine begins with a declaration of the age and importance of the Church of the Resurrection and its venerable builder, and contrasts it with the derelict state it was found in:

(ch.2) For this reason we have indeed thought about these matters and the rebuilt church bearing the name of our Lord and Saviour's resurrection, originally built from the foundations by Helen, renowned for things holy, the famous among emperors and equal to the apostles, Constantine's mother. Shaken by all-mastering time, and again rebuilt and indeed strengthened by imperial hands, it was ruined and down-cast almost completely after the conquest of the City of Constantine by the Italians, so that there was no recovery to be expected. We did not, thus, deem it right to overlook it: When most of those below and even above us in honour and fortune did not dare to lay hands on it, we threw ourselves entirely and wholeheartedly at the task of renewal or, rather (ἢ μάλλον), rebuilding and spared no expense. For most have been given us from the right hand of the wealth-providing God, from whom we have had the higher of knowledge and wisdom – others might maybe say reputation (εὐδοκίμησιν); I myself on the other hand call it desirable learning and honourable pursuit [of knowledge and wisdom]. And now that we have used up much and have raised the fallen parts of the holy house and the roof – ex-

⁵ On the state of education, see Constantinides, 1982.

pected to but not yet fallen, resting as it were on shaky foundations, so that I might myself say the saying with him who said that on the unmovable all moves (ἐπ' ἀκινήτῳ τὸ πᾶν κινεῖσθαι) – we made fast as necessary and made a lasting roof. And let the sight of these things be the teacher and let the works be irrefutable witnesses to the said. I will describe briefly the church as it stands or rather (ἢ μᾶλλον) the monastery of today.⁶

The usual topoi of God as the real giver of the gifts and the prosperity needed for the restoration is first touched upon in this chapter, but saved for the following chapter. Instead the chapter quickly gives way to a presentation of the merits of the author. With the use of a dubious contradiction between his fame (εὐδοκίμησιν) and his academic pursuit, he establishes himself as both a well-known and sincere scholar, and with his pun on the philosophical concept of a prime cause (ἐπ' ἀκινήτῳ τὸ πᾶν κινεῖσθαι) establishes himself as conversant with higher learning. The care put into describing the refurbishing of a roof is indicative of the rhetorical style of the whole document. Apart from placing himself

⁶ Delehaye 1933. Ταύτη τοι καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς νοῦν τὰ τοιαῦτα βαλλόμενοι, τὸν ἐπ' ὄνοματι τῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσεως ἐκ μὲν βάθρων τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν ἀγίαις περιωνύμου Ἑλένης, τῆς τοῦ ἐν βασιλεῦσιν αἰδιμίμου καὶ ἰσαποστόλου Κωνσταντίνου μητρὸς, ἀνεγερθέντα νεῶν, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ πανδαμάτορος διασαλευθέντα χρόνου, καὶ ὑπὸ βασιλικῶν αὐθις ἀνακαινισθέντα τε καὶ στηριχθέντα χειρῶν, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν τῆς Κωνσταντίνου ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰταλῶν ἄλωσιν ἐρειπωθέντα τε καὶ καταβληθέντα σχεδὸν τέλεον, ὡς μηδὲ προσδοκίαν ἔχειν ἐγέρσεως, μὴ περιδεῖν ἡγησάμενοι δεῖν, πλείστων ἄλλων τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς τὴν ἀξίαν τέ φημι καὶ τὸν ὄλβον χεῖρα μὴ τολμησάντων ὅλως ἐπιβαλεῖν, τῇ τοῦδε ἀνακαινίσει ἢ ἀνοικοδομήσει μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν, ὀλοσχερῶς τε καὶ ὀλοψύχως ἐπεβαλόμεθα καὶ χρημάτων οὐκ ἐφεισάμεθα. Πλείστα γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πλουσιοπαρόχου Θεοῦ δεξιᾶς κεχορήγητο, παρ' οὗ καὶ τὸ μείζον ἐσχίκαμεν τὴν περὶ λόγους καὶ σοφίαν, ἄλλοι μὲν ἂν ἴσως εἴποιεν εὐδοκίμησιν, παιδείαν δὲ φαῖν ἔγωγε ἐραστὴν καὶ σεμνὸν ἐπιτήδευμα. Τοῖνυν καὶ ἀνηλωκότερες συχνὰ τὰ τε πεσόντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ δόμου ἡγεῖραμεν καὶ τὸν ὄροφον ἐπ' ἀστηρίκτοις ὡσπερὶ στηριζόμενον, ἵνα τι καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ εἰπόντι ἐπ' ἀκινήτῳ τὸ πᾶν κινεῖσθαι φαῖν παρόμοιον, καὶ προσδόκιμον ὅσον οὕτω πεσεῖσθαι τυγχάνοντα, ὡς τὸ εἰκὸς ἐστηρίξαμεν καὶ μένειν ὄροφον ἐποίησαμεν· καὶ τούτων ὅψις ἔστι διδάσκαλος καὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν λεγομένων μάρτυρες ἀπαράγραπτοι. Διὰ βραχέος ὡς εἶχεν ὁ ναὸς ἢ μᾶλλον ἢ νῦν μονὴ γνωριῶ.

within an intellectual and social context in this chapter, Constantine subtly changes the scope of the *typikon*: the title, Λόγος εἰς τὴν ἀνακαίνισιν τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσεως διαθητικός, very clearly states renovation and church, but with two parallel movements in the text, both heralded by ‘or rather’, ἢ μᾶλλον, Constantine changes the subjects: first from renovation to rebuilding, and then from church to monastery. It is not unusual for a second founder to emphasize the derelict state of the foundation and a certain amount of ruin is to be expected in the descriptions, if the second founder is to be able to lay any claim to the title. Here, however, as elsewhere, Constantine moves the borders or limits of the subjects and of his own involvement by gradually changing the words.

Constantine also effects a subtle change by giving an account of not only his own part in the renovation of the church, but also what took place before. In the following chapter, Constantine goes into some detail about his own expenses as well as his father’s in the original work. The restoration was carried out by means of the Akropolitai’s wealth, and such expenses were a central part of being a second founder. The author consequently has no reason to talk down or excuse his lavishness, and instead gives a clear and accurate account of the money that went into the project:

(ch.3) We gave a thousand gold coins, counted and weighed, to those removing the soil and cleansed both the ground of the sanctuary and that around it. I will leave alone that we also contributed with our services, and talk of something else and provide something of greater proof for the narrative. Accountants kept count in ledgers of the gold that was handed over to the overseers of the work, as is the custom of those who embark upon great ventures. And they calculated the [expenses] for each month, and when a year had gone, they computed the expenses. When, thus, the overseers disclosed that they had used up sixteen thousand gold coins, my father answered, saying: “I do not want the remaining spending to be brought to account: For I do not give to a human there – I offer to God what he has given. As he keeps account of what you take and spend and how much you were given and have used. The result itself will show [Plato, *Theaetetus*, 200e].”⁷

7 Χίλιοστὸν χρυσίνων τοῖς τὸν κοῦν ἐκφορήσασι καὶ τῶν συγχωσμάτων τό τ’ ἐμβαδὸν

With the use of direct quotation, Constantine begins a narrative flow that emerges full-fledged later on. Here it is significant that for all his insistence upon the work being undertaken solely by his father, he uses the plural in the beginning. This might very well be an original phrase from an earlier *typikon* written by the father. Majestic plural of course reflects common literary use in texts in the high register, and is furthermore natural in an official and public document as a *typikon*. In the context, however, the expenses come from a common source that is later branched out into ‘him’ and ‘I’. On the other hand, the discrepancy between the expenses incurred by ‘we’ is on a different scale than those presented to ‘him’, the father, by the overseers. Constantine insists on putting his own expenses first, when in fact his father’s were of a much higher order, and logically must have taken place before. This creates a tension between his own book-keeping and the emphasis on the exact amount, counted and weighed, and his father’s indifferent reply to the overseers on the account of the sixteen thousand gold coins. To me this indicates that the narrative concerns two different periods of construction, the renovation of the church and the construction of the chapel, which are here conflated into one chapter on expenses. Constantine seems aware that the complexity of the passage might confuse or provoke the audience and ends the passage with an explanation of sorts:

(ch.3 cont.) But to what end I have proceeded with the narrative in this manner and have lifted me with my [work] to the level of the illustrious work of my father, and said that I would make common cause with him in the great work, and that it was not out of place for

τούς τε θεμέθλους καὶ τὰ κύκλω τούτων ἀποκαθάρασιν εἰς μισθὸν ἀριθμηθεῖσαν ζυγισταθηεῖσαν δεδώκαμεν. Ἐγὼ γάρ ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἡμετέροις συνεξεφοροῦμεν θεράπουσιν. Ἐρῶ τι καὶ ἕτερον καὶ τῷ λόγῳ πίστιν μᾶλλον παρέξομαι. Τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιστάταις τοῦ ἔργου ἐγχειριζομένους χρυσοῦς, ὡς γε δὴ τοῖς μεγάλοις ἐπιβάλλουσιν ἔργοις ποιεῖν εἴθισται, ὑπογραμματεῖς ἀποταχθέντες χάρταις ἀνά μέρος ἐνεσημαίνοντο. Καὶ τὸ διὰ μὴνός λογιζόμενοι, ἐνιαυτοῦ παρεληλυθότος συνελόγισαντο τὸ ἀναλωθέν· ἕξ οὖν πρὸς ταῖς δέκα χιλιοστέας χρυσίνων τῶν ἐπιστατῶν δεδηλωκότων ὡς ἀνηλώκεσαν, ὁ ἐμὸς ὑπολαβὼν πατήρ ἔφησε· «Μὴ τοῦ λοιποῦ γραμματεῖῳ σημειοῦσθαι τὰ ἀναλούμενα βούλομαι· οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ ταυτὶ δίδωμι· τῷ δεδωκότι προσφέρω Θεῷ. Ὡς οὖν ἐφορῶντος αὐτοῦ ὁ λαμβάνετε ἀναλίσκετέ τε ὅποσα δ’ ἐδόθησάν τε καὶ ἀνηλώθησαν, ὅ φασιν αὐτὸ δεῖκνυσιν.»

me to do it, I will explain. For it is clear that of what was added in his time, he was responsible, and that which is described [here] was completed by him alone. For I was still a child when the [project] was completed.⁸

Here he states what is obviously at the core of his confusing account: he was only a child when the restoration was set in motion. So his father must have been responsible for the repairs on the roof, and the expenses Constantine mentioned in the beginning must have been those that went into the purchase and cleaning of the chapel, not those that went into the renovation of the church. What is also interesting in this part is that there is no indication of a change of speaker from the ‘I’ of the quote to the ‘I’ of the metanarrative. The *typon* takes, as said, the form of a speech, and thus the original speaker must be Constantine. It is, however, clear that he is also describing events as they happened by the agency of George. Consequently, there is a strange confusion of time and a sort of paradoxical autobiographical conflation of persons.

A little later he gives, as promised above, his reasons for the way he narrates the events and deeds, this time in more detail. Characteristically, Constantine preserves the agency for himself and instead of being merely the heir to his father’s work, he makes an active choice to take part in the work and again changes the premise of what has just been said:

(ch.4) “So I involved myself with this work and made his personal work common to [us] both, not because I was born from him, nor because I happened to be the eldest of his sons, even if this did also contribute a little to my [decision], but because he had decided to will more to me, as firstborn, than to the others.”⁹

⁸ Ἄλλ’ ὅπως οὕτω τὸν λόγον προήνεγκα καὶ με τῷ ἐμῷ ἐπὶ τῷ περιφανεῖ τῷδ’ ἔργῳ συνεῖρα πατρὶ καὶ τῆς μεγαλοουργίας ταύτης γενέσθαι οἱ κοινῶν εἶρηκα, καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἀπεικότως τοῦτο πεποίηκα, γνωριῶ. Δῆλον μὲν γὰρ ὡς τῶν ἑαυτῷ προσόντων ἐκεῖνος ἦν κύριος καὶ ὅσον ἐστὶ τε καὶ δείκνυται, ὑπ’ ἐκείνου μόνου τετέλεσται. Ἐγὼ δὲ παῖς ἦν ἔτι καὶ πέρας ταῦτ’ εἴληφε.

⁹ Τῷ γοῦν ἔργῳ συνεπεισῆγαγον ἑμαυτὸν καὶ κοινὸν ἀμφοῖν ἐποιησάμην τὸ ἐκείνου καθαρῶς ἴδιον, οὐχ ὅτι γε ἔφυν ἐξ ἐκείνου, οὐδ’ ὅτι πρωτότοκος τούτῳ τῶν υἱέων ἐτύγχανον ὄν, εἰ καὶ μὴ μικρά μοι πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦτο συμβάλλεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι μοι ὡς

So far it is difficult to understand the text otherwise than Constantine actively participated in the work on the church because it was his due and duty as eldest son. In the continuation of the chapter, however, it is again made clear that Constantine was a minor at the time of the construction for, (ch.4 cont.)

“When the work had been completed, he enlarged my inheritance beyond that of the others: (...)”¹⁰

It thus appears that he means something else when he says that he took it upon himself to involve himself with the building. What that is emerges yet later in the text, but in the present chapter the narrative changes character almost in midsentence and develops into a narrated episode:

(ch.4 cont.) For as he stood before [the Church of] the Lord and Saviour, after whom the church was named, he told this to me alone. [It was the time] when I was working with the Muses, as he had seen to, handing me over to teachers and engaging tutors for me, learning the curriculum and visiting him in between. (ch.5) And once I left the lesson and went to him, because I had heard that he could be found in the monastery, overseeing the affairs. I was nervous and filled by fear of what would transpire, for I believed that I would be asked some of the usual [questions], such as ‘what did you learn during the week?’ ‘About whom yesterday?’ ‘About whom the day before yesterday?’ He, however, said nothing of this, but took me by the hand and went into the church and gazed intently at the icon of our God and Saviour.¹¹

πρωτογενεῖ πλείω τῶν ἄλλων εἰς κληῖρον δοῦναι βεβούλητο.

¹⁰ Τοῦ δ’ ἔργου γενόμενος, ἐμοὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐμείωσε.

¹¹ Πρὸς γὰρ ἐμὲ μόνον τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, οὐπὲρ ἐπώνυμος ὁ νεῶς, στήσας ἐπίπροσθεν, τοῦτ’ εἶρηκεν, ἐπειδὴ με — καὶ γὰρ παιδευταῖς ἐνεχείρισε καὶ παιδαγωγούς ἐπέστησε — τοῖς μουσείοις ἐνδιέτριβον ὡς ἐπέσκηψε, τὴν ἐγκύκλιον παιδευόμενος κακὰ διαλειμμάτων ἐκείνῳ παραγινόμενος. (5.) Καὶ γοῦν ποτε τῆς μαθήσεως ἀφεθείς καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἰών, ὡς ἐν τῇ μονῇ πυθοίμην εὐρίσκεσθαι, τὰ καθ’ ἐκείνην ἐπισκεπτόμενον, παρέστην φροντίδος τε καὶ δέους τυγχάνων ὑπόπλευς· ὄμνην καὶ γὰρ τῶν τί με τῶν συνήθων ἐρέσθαι. Τὰ δ’ ἦν· Τί διὰ τῆς ἑβδομάδος δεδίδαξαι, περὶ τίνος ἠκροάσω τὴν θές, περὶ τίνος τὴν πρότριτα; Ὁ δ’ οὐδὲν περὶ τούτων εἰπών, τῆς δὲ χειρὸς με λαβόμενος καὶ τὸν νεῶν εἰσιών, τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐνατενίσας εἰκόνι.

The affectionate tone enlivens the portrait of the father as stern and somewhat otherworldly, almost wholly absorbed in his pious work and in his scholarly way of life. Much of the action is placed with the young boy who goes straight from class to see his father, even though he fears his questions. George Akropolites, on the other hand, is completely absorbed in the process of renovating the church. We might see here a topos of the spiritual and intellectual man,¹² who quotes freely from the ancients. While the two persons, Constantine and George, were difficult to discern in the former chapter, they take on a distinct corporeality in this chapter.

(ch.5 cont.) “It is He,” he said, “who provides for the beings, the Choir-Leader of life for the living, the Creator of absolutely all. Thus it is He who brings forth everything from non-being, and He who arranges the whole. (...) Through Him I have become famous and happy, providing most for those of my blood. I will leave aside that I even helped, as possible, strangers in need. And now over these and because of that I have endeavoured on this the greatest of works and I have spent much money and decided to spend [more]. Accordingly, I plan to make your inheritance less sufficient. I intended to give you

¹² Compare with the description of Nikephoros Blemmydes by Gregory of Cyprus: “*He learned that Blemmydes was living in the neighborhood. As he was said to be the wisest not only of the Greeks of our time, but of all men, he was eager to make his acquaintance. The Ephesians nevertheless stopped him, saying, as was the truth, that not only would the philosopher refuse to see him as he was young, stranger, and poor, but moreover his entourage/circle would not allow him to approach their monastery. For, as they said, those around him were like him: Inaccessible, unmoved, remote, and not in the least moved by mean matters; his circle was inapproachable and the disciples themselves were very hostile. Before all other of their master’s lessons, this one they had learned first.*” (my translation from Lameere, 1937, 181: “Ἐνθα καὶ ὡς ἐν γειτόνων οἰκῶν εἶη ὁ Βλεμμύδης, πυθόμενος, ἀνὴρ ὡς ἐλέγετο οὐ μόνον Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐφ’ ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων σοφώτατος, πολὺς γίνεται πρὸς αὐτὸν κατὰ θέαν πορεύεσθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ. Ἐπέσχον δὲ ὁμοῦς ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι τῆς ὁρμῆς, εἰρηνικότες, ὅπερ καὶ ἦν ἀληθές, ὡς οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν ἀπαξιώσειεν ἰδεῖν ὁ φιλόσοφος, νέον ὄντα καὶ ξένον καὶ πένητα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ περὶ αὐτὸν χορὸς τῷ σφῶν μοναστηρίῳ προσπελάσαι οὐκ ἂν συγχωρήσαιεν. Τοῖς γὰρ κατ’ αὐτὸν ἐπ’ ἴσης, ὅτ’ ἀνὴρ ἀπρόσιτος, ἔφασαν, ἀκλινῆς ὢν καὶ μετέωρος καὶ ἥκιστα εὐτελείας ἐπιστρεφόμενος, ὃ τε χῶρος ἀνεπίβατος καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ γε αὐτοῖς ὡς λίαν δυσέντευκτοι, ἀντ’ ἄλλου παντὸς μαθήματος τοῦτο πρὸς τοῦ καθηγεμόνος παρειληφότες.)

more, but more was needed. In addition to the half remaining, I remove a seventh, and testate the remainder to you (he had intended to give me 7000). If you should ever, as I pray you will not, experience need of money, come to this [church] and say this, gazing earnestly, to the Lord Christ: ‘Benevolent Lord, as You know well, my father used up the larger part of my inheritance on your church. And now I am in want and lack the things necessary. Do not allow me to become further impoverished in my need, Provider of riches.’ And trust the unutterable pity of the transcendently good Christ, my most longed for child, that He will not allow you to be without knowledge of the future, but what you might happen to be in need of, He will give you by unexpected means.”¹³

It is worth bringing attention here to the theatrical setting of the authorial voice of the son addressing himself as a young boy through the person of his dead father in front of an audience that might actually be looking daily at the very icon mentioned. The circularity is complete, when he finally has his father saying, what Constantine should say to the icon in the future.

Constantine presents the case that he in a way not only inherited the foundation because his father spent part of his inheritance on it, but that he also took part in the construction by contributing the part of the inheritance that his father spent. The argument takes the form that Constantine’s inheritance was spent on the monastery, thus equalling a sort of

¹³ «Οὗτός ἐστιν, ἔφησεν, ὁ τοῦ εἶναι τοῖς οὖσι παροχεύς, ὁ τοῖς ζῶσι τῆς ζωῆς χορηγός, ὁ τῶν ὄλων καθάπαξ δημιουργός. Οὗτος οὖν ὁ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων τὰ πάντα παραγαγών, οὗτος καὶ τὰ σύμπαντα διοικεῖ. (...) δι’ ὃν καὶ γεγωνός περιδοξός τε καὶ ὄλβιος, πλείστοις τῶν καθ’ αἶμα προσηκόντων ἐπήρκεσα· ἐῷ γὰρ ὡς καὶ ἀλλοτρίους τὰ τῆς ἐνδείας ὡς ἐνὸν ἐθεράπευσα. Καὶ νῦν ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ διὰ ταῦτα τῷ μεγίστῳ τῷ δ’ ἔργῳ ἐπικεχείρηκα καὶ χρημάτων πλῆθος ἀνήλωκα καὶ ἀναλώσειν βεβούλημαι· τοιγάρτοι καὶ τὸν σὸν κληρὸν οὐ μετρίως μειῶσαι σκοπῶ· πλείω μὲν γὰρ προέταξα δοῦναί σοι· πλείονων δ’ ἐν χρεῖα γενόμενος, πρὸς τῷ τοῦ ἔλλειφθέντος ἀφελῶν ἡμίσει τὸ ἔβδομον, κληροδοτήσω σοι τὸ λοιπόν. (Ἦν δ’ ὁ γε οἱ προδέδοκτο δοῦναί μοι χιλιοστές χρυσίνων ἐπτά.) Σοὶ δ’ εἰ πῶς ποτε, ὅπερ ἀπέυχομαι, ζυμβήσεται τῶν χρειωδῶν ἐνδεία, τῆδε παραγινόμενος τάδε πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην ἀτενίζων λέγε Χριστόν· «Φιλάγαθε κύριε, ὁ ἐμὸς ὡς οἴσθα, πατήρ τὸ πλεῖον τῆς ἐμῆς κληρονομίας τῷ σῷ προσανηλώκα νεῶ· καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς ὑστεροῦμαι καὶ τῶν ἐν χρεῖα προσδέομαι· μὴ γοῦν ἐάσης ἐπὶ πλείον με προσταλαιπωρεῖν ἐνδεία, πλουσιοπάροχε.» Καὶ πέποιθα τοῖς ἀφάτοις οἰκτιρμοῖς τοῦ ὑπεραγάθου τούτου Χριστοῦ, τέκνον μοι ποθεινότατον, ὡς οὐκ ἐάσει σε ἀπρομήθευτον· ἀλλ’ ὣν ἂν ἐν χρεῖα τυγχάνων εἶης, ἀπροσδοκῆτους σοι τοὺς πόρους παρέξεται.»

divine credit or savings. The line of thought approximates the sentiments displayed in *typika* stipulating a privileged life for family, should they choose the monastic life. It is, however, unlikely that George, or Constantine through him, is thinking of material help from the monastery as if from a kind of trust.¹⁴ It is, more likely, a different currency he expects to be repaid in, as will become clear in the chapter that follows (ch.6). It is quite interesting here that Constantine either adapts a phrase from the third chapter of the *typikon*, “I will leave aside that (...)” (ἐῶ γὰρ ὡς καὶ ...), almost verbatim from his father’s speech, or provides the speech with the same phrase. As it is quite inconceivable that an able writer such as Constantine should be unaware of the parallels in his own text, he must in the former case be consciously emulating his father; in the latter he is manipulating or fabricating elements of his father’s speech, which, it should be said, would hardly have been unusual or cause for censure. Either way it serves to blur the distinction between the two *Akropolitai*.

Constantine leaves the narrative in the next chapter and concludes on the narrative (ch.6) “It is fair to say that I was also this monastery’s founder, or rather (ἢ μᾶλλον) its renovator, (...)”¹⁵ Constantine was obviously concerned with his audience’s acceptance of his claim to be founder, the claim being fair and he not lying, and his decision to digress in the previous chapters and dramatize his reasons shows that he himself was aware of the extraordinariness of the claim. For once ἢ μᾶλλον is used to downplay the subject, taking the edge of Constantine’s claim to be a founder. The apparent modesty is, however, immediately challenged in the continuation of the text:

(ch.6 cont.) And it stands to reason that I have gained the founder’s honour twice. For when my spouse paid the inevitable [debt], I buried her body in the monastery. And I bought the chapel, [situated] in a place close to the large church, and the monks can tell of the amount of gold that I gave to be spent paying for it, the debt of which I wish to be used completely for my memorial. For [the commemoration] of me and my children and their descendants ought to be celebrated in the large church. But I also want and beseech that special [feasts] be

¹⁴ *Pace* Alice-Mary Talbot, *BMFD*, 1375.

¹⁵ Ἦν οὖν ἐξ εὐλόγου τῆς μονῆς ταύτης κτήτωρ κἀγώ, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν ἀνακαινιστῆς (...).

celebrated there, and for this reason I provided 300 golden staters and has ordered that another [payment] shall be provided the next year.¹⁶

Here Constantine does not stop at calling himself founder, but rather emphasizes his claim by drawing attention to what he had actually himself contributed to the foundation in implicit comparison with his father. It is interesting to follow the argument that Constantine is to be regarded as double founder. Here his role in the restoration of the foundation is left in the background and instead he claims his founder's due because he interred his wife in the foundation and because he added a chapel to the church. Interment and commemoration is the prerogative of a founder, but the argument runs backwards: By burying his wife he demonstrates his status as founder.

The chapel he bought was to play a pivotal role in the liturgical life prescribed in the *typikon*, but it is clear from both the narrative and the non-narrative parts that this text is about the foundation as a whole. By creating a background story for the monastery, both a mythical and a practical, this text must at least have supplemented the *typikon* for the whole foundation. Given how foundation documents often grew from a core of prescriptions through the addition of deeds, testaments, and foundation histories,¹⁷ it is not hard to imagine how this narrative could in time have become part of the *typikon* for the foundation itself.

As is to be expected, a document such as this concerns itself to a high degree with property and land. In this as in other *typika*,¹⁸ two tex-

¹⁶ Κάκ τοῦ δικαίου μοι διπλῆ τὰ τῶν κτητόρων ἐπόφλητο. Ὡς δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ σύζυγος τὸ χρεῶν ἀπέτισε, καὶ τὸν ἐκείνης ἐν ταύτῃ κατεθέμην νεκρόν. Καί γε τὸν εὐκτήριον ιδιωσάμην σηκὸν ἐχόμενα τοῦ μεγάλου παρεντεθέντα νεώ, τοὺς χρυσίνοισι, ὅσους τῇ ἀπαρτίσει τοῦδε ἀναλωθῆναι συνέφασαν οἱ μονασταί, δεδοκῶς, οὗ τὸ ἀπλῶς ὀφειλόμενον εἰς ἐμὴν ἐνεργεῖσθαι μνεῖαν ἐθέλω. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ πληροῦσθαι νεῶ ὄφληται ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τε καὶ παιδῶν ἐμῶν καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν· ἀλλ' ἰδιόττα τελεῖσθαι ἐν τούτῳ καὶ βούλομαι καὶ ζητῶ. Τοῦτου γὰρ εἵνεκα καὶ στατήρων χρυσῶν ἑκατοντάδα παρεσχόμεν τριτην καὶ προσεπιδοῦναι ἐπηγγελιάμην τοςαύτην ἄλλην εἰς νέωτα.

¹⁷ For a general description, see Galatariotou 1987, 82-83. A good example is Neophytos the Recluse's multi-layered foundation document(s) for the hermitage of the Holy Cross, *BMFD*, 1338-1373.

¹⁸ E. g. Christodoulos of Patmos for the monastery of St. John the Theologian, Neo-

tual phenomena intersect: descriptions of the possessions, and autobiographical narrative.¹⁹ By narrating the process of renovating that lead to the re-establishment of the foundation and introducing physical edifices into the narrative, the author provides the here-and-now document with a past. The past places the parts of the foundation in context and in doing so shows it to be unique. When this technique of writing things into being, or rather painting a mental picture of the foundation in the minds of the audience, is combined with the active agency of the author, a very strong narrative axis emerges. Constantine's document is a prime example of this geographic anchoring through autobiographical narrative. The amount of detail is in inverse proportion to the scope of the document, which is the addition of a chapel to a church of an existing foundation. The way the childhood and the actual toil of construction are told interweaves the life of the author with that of the foundation down to the fact that much of his inheritance went into the construction.

In his highly sophisticated narrative, Constantine Akropolites places his father at the site and evokes a picture of himself visiting George and being as much introduced to the icon as being presented before it. Constantine in effect describes his initiation into intimate relationship between a founder and the patron saint, here Christ himself. As if this evocation of the physical connection between the creation of the foundation and the author himself was not enough, he adds the detail about the interment of his wife on the land of the foundation. This is far less sophisticated than his autobiographical narrative, but very assertive in its claim for this prerogative of the founder.

The literary nature of Constantine's *typikon* is clear to see. The narrative parts take up half of the text, and even though the detailed descriptions of the services and the amounts runs against the grain and

phytos for the hermitage of the Holy Cross and Michael VIII Palaiologos for the Monastery of St. Demetrios of the Palaiologoi-Kellibara and for the Monastery of the Archangel Michael on Mount Auxentios, *BMTD*, 564-606; 1338-1373; 1207-1263 respectively. See also Angold, (1998), 225-57, 243, and Hinterberger, 1999, 201.

¹⁹ The resulting text might be seen as an aggregate texts as outlined by Fowler, 1982, 3-6, where he opens an interesting discussion of literature as not confined by category but by cultural instantiation.

reveal the underlying non-literary document, the transformation is almost complete.²⁰ It shows the potential of the foundation document as a textual base to be shaped into narrative and for the narrative itself to address the issues connected to foundation documents. In all the typika in this chapter, the creation of a strong authorial ‘I’ guides the readers or listeners through the text and the arguments as the authors wants them to, but Constantine creates a second voice to carry his argument further. Constantine might have had a weak claim to the fame of second founder for the foundation,²¹ so instead of expounding in length on his own merits, he introduces his famous father into the typikon to present the case. It is in its way a logical development of the autobiographical typikon, but also one that in several places changes the narrative form from autodiegetic to homodiegetic and places the author in the narrative role of the witness. In this sense, Constantine wrote an eccentric typikon. It is eccentric as a typikon because he lets the autobiographical narrative transform almost the whole document, without leaving the functional framework. Though it is a specimen of high literature, the text has a clearly defined use in regulating and defining the foundation. The literary nature in itself serves a clear function: To make Constantine’s claim ring true. To do this Constantine organizes both text and events in a way that reveals his own participation and conceals what he himself admits to be a tenuous claim to be ranked along his father.

²⁰ The question of literary and non-literary texts in Byzantium is complicated. In his influential article, Michael Angold identified the typikon as the primary vehicle for autobiographical narrative in Byzantium (Angold 1998, 243) but also, in another article, classified typika as a non-literary class of writings (Angold 1993, 46-70). In his *History of Byzantine Literature (650-85)*. Alexander Kazhdan used the distinction between *Literatur* and *Schrifttum*, between texts of the latter kind in which the idea is formulated “with maximal clarity,” and the former type of texts “not only loaded with conceptual intention, but (...) composed of language transfigured by the play of form”. I think that this definition fits the present text well.

²¹ Cf. *BMFD*, 1375.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Delehaye, H. 1933. "Constantini Acropolitae hagiographi byzantini epistularum manipulus," *Analecta Bollandiana*, 51, 263-284.
- Lameere, William. 1937. *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Cyphre patriarche de Constantinople (1283-1289)*. Bruxelles/Rome.
- Thomas, John & Hero, Angela Constantinides (eds. with Constable, Giles). 2000. *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, Washington, D.C. (BMFD).

Secondary Sources

- Angold, Michael. 1998. "The Autobiographical Impulse in Byzantium". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 52, 225-257.
- Angold, Michael. 1993. "Were Byzantine Monastic Typika Literature?", in Beaton, Roderick and Roueché, Charlotte (eds.), *The Making of Byzantine History. Studies dedicated to Donald M. Nicol*. Aldershot.
- Constantinides, C. N. 1982. *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204- ca.1310)*. Nicosia.
- Fowler, Alastair. 1982. *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford.
- Galatariotou, Catia. 1987. "Byzantine Ktetorika Typika: A Comparative Study". *Revue des études byzantines* 45, 82–83.
- Hinterberger, Martin. 1999. *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz*. Vienna.
- Kazhdan, Alexander. 1999. *History of Byzantine Literature (650-85)*. Athens.
- Korobeinikov, Dimitri. 2014. *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century*. Oxford.

