

UNDERSTANDING BYZANTINE MONASTIC PATRONAGE DURING THE REIGN OF PALAIOLOGAN DYNASTY

PALAILOGOSLAR DÖNEMİNDE MANASTIR BANILIĞI

Esra Güzel Erdoğan*

Özet

Bu çalışma, 1261-1453 tarihleri arasında Konstantinopolis'deki manastır baniliğinin genel özelliklerini incelemektir. Bu süre boyunca, Bizans güçlü ve geniş bir imparatorluktan iç problemlerle, dıştan gelen istilalarla boğuşan küçük bir şehir devletine dönüşür. Ancak Bizans Devleti bir yandan politik, askeri ve ekonomik yönden zayıflarken aynı dönem kültürel ve sanatsal yaşamın canlandığı bir dönem olur. Palaiologos döneminin ekonomik ve politik şartları altındaki Konstantinopolis manastır baniliğinin ayırıcı özellikleri ve bu dönemin manastır baniliğini nasıl etkilediği dikkatli bir değerlendirme gerektiren ilginç bir sorudur. Bizans İmparatorluğu'ndaki manastır baniliğine dair pek çok çalışma olduğu halde, sözkonusu dönemi ve başkenti inceleyen geniş bir çalışma eksiktir.

Foreword

In the history of Byzantine monasticism, one may easily observe the determinant role of the founder –*ktetor*. Monasteries were always under the control of three different classes, namely, founders, state and ecclesiastical hierarchy. Monastic patronage in the Byzantine period began in the fourth century. Although patronage emerged at the same time with monasteries, one cannot see the patron privileges in the early periods. The ruling class

*Öğretim Görevlisi, Dr., Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu, Beykoz, İstanbul, Türkiye. Email: esra.guzel@gmail.com

accepted themselves as responsible for establishing monasteries.¹ The emperor and his immediate family founded monasteries, and also there were limited examples, which were founded by the ruling elite and state officials and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In some cases the rivalry among them had crucial effects over monasticism. On the other hand, some of the founders from the aristocracy accepted the ecclesiastical hierarchy as protector of their monasteries, and they shared patronal privileges with them.² So, the point is to determine who were those patrons.

From the beginning of the Palaiologan period, the heritage of the corruption during the Latin invasion came to display its consequences. The decentralization movement paved the way for a new and influential group of aristocrats. During the long life of the Empire, Constantinople had been pioneer of the economy and of the socio-politic issues, but now it was declining.³

Reconstruction of the *City*

Besides the Emperor and his immediate family, the Palaiologan period created its own patron group. The new group of patrons were members of the aristocratic families of the capital who were great land owners, some of them being court officials, scholars, and some of them belonging to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. First of all, a group of landowners were from rich families, and they were the holders of *pronioa*. On the other hand, founders such as Metochites were rich, active in the court and creative in literature or history. Moreover, the Church was the patron of the new foundations at the same time, especially in the provinces. So the best term to describe them came from their own time: *dynatoi*, which literally meant

1 For historical background as to history of monasticism and Monasteries in Byzantine Empire see. J. M. Hussey, "Byzantine Monasticism", **Cambridge Medieval History**, Volume IV, pp.161-184.

2 J. P. Thomas, "The Rise of the Independent and Self-governing Monasteries as Reflected in the Monastic *typika*", **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, Volume 30, No:1, 1985, p. 22.

3 I. Sevcenko, "Theodore Metochites, the Chora and the Intellectual Trends of His Time", **Kariye Djami**, ed. P. A. Underwood, vol.4, Princeton, 1975,p. 35.

powerful.⁴ Because of their varying origins it is not easy to classify them, the aristocracy of the Palaiologan period can be defined as the powerful groups except the emperor and their immediate families, they could be landholders, court officials and members of the rich families.

The Byzantine aristocracy was an active participant in the Palaiologan revival, especially as patrons of monasteries and as supporters of art and literature. They had a certain importance as an influential social class, especially from the Komnenian period onwards. One may notice that their participation and interest in patronage and other fields of charitable works increased particularly after the weakness of the central authority of the State during the Palaiologan period. Their extended power might be accepted as a turning point for the definition of the social class in Byzantium. They shared the privileges and interests of the Emperor and his immediate family, although sometimes they were not the members of the ruling family. On the other hand, they became the relatives of the emperor and of each other by marriage alliances in order to raise their economical power, social and political prestige. The members of these extended families frequently had three or four family names, which indicates their relation with other aristocratic families. In the monastic charters that we used widely in this study, the founders were proud of their connection with the Emperors and they tried to explain their relation as a sign of social prestige.

Some of the members of the aristocracy were great landholders in the provinces and in Constantinople and they became great families around the 1250s. The Kantakuzenos, Raoul and Tornikoi families can be given as examples.⁵ For instance, the first Kantakuzenos took part in the campaign of Alexios I Komnenos in 1100.⁶

Palaiologan monastic patronage can be seen as the continuation of the previous period. The influential aristocratic class, emperors and their immediate families who conducted with identical stimulus were the active participants.

4 A., Laiou, "The Byzantine Aristocracy in the Palaeologan Period: The Story of Arrested Development", in **Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium**, Variorum Reprints, 1992, V., p.131.

5 A., Laiou, *supra*, p. 134.

6 D.M, Nicol, **The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos, A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study**, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1968, p. 3.

The era of reconstruction of Constantinople started after the recapture of the City from the Latins in 1261. The main objects of these re-building activities were monasteries that had suffered under the Latin rule. Michael VIII (1259-1282) was the first monastic patron of the Palaiologan period. Michael VIII not only participated in the renovation affairs on a modest scale but also granted lands and treasures to some other monasteries. As it has been noted in the first chapter, the period of Michael VIII dealt with internal and external problems. So, during the period of the first Palaiologan emperor, the Byzantine State witnessed limited renovation and new establishment affairs. Two or three new monasteries were built and two restorations were undertaken.

During the reign of the second emperor of the Palaiologan dynasty, namely Andronikos II (1282-1328) the reconstruction effort reached its peak point, with the number of re-founded and nearly established monasteries amounting to approximately thirty-five. In Andronikos II's reign the number of newly built monasteries went up to ten and that of restorations to at least twenty-two.⁷

Donations of the emperors paved the way for an active renovation period that was patronized by their immediate family members. In addition, because of the marriage alliances among the imperial family and other aristocratic families, the two parties' possessions became bigger than before.

Among the monasteries, the first group includes those restored by the emperors themselves and their immediate family. The Monastery of Auxentios, Hagios Georgios in Mangana, and Theotokos Peribleptos were re-built by Michael VIII. Hagios Demetrios of Palaiologi Kellibara was renovated by Michael VIII, and later his son Andronikos II made a donation to this imperial monastery and issued a new *typikon*.⁸

7 A-M., Talbot, "Building Activity in Constantinople Under Andronikos II: The Role of Women Patrons in the Construction and Restoration of Monasteries", in **Byzantine Constantinople: Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life**, edited by Nevra Necipoğlu, Leiden, 2001, pp. 329-343.

8 **Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: a complete translation of the surviving typika and testaments**, ed. J. Thomas and A. C. Hero, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000, pp. 1237ff. (From now on it will be abbreviated as BMFD)

Andronikos II renovated the Nea Ekklesia Monastery that was within the borders of the Great Palace.⁹ He assigned a *chrysobull* for Christos Pantepoptes (Eski İmaret Camii), which had been built by Anna Dalessana in the eleventh century. He also made several donations to other monasteries that were renovated during his period by his court officials and members of his family. Whereas his wife Eirene/ Yolanda of Montferrat was not interested in monastic foundations, his brother Konstantinos Palaiologos Porphyrogennetos restored the Stoudios Monastery (İmrahor İlyas Bey Camii).¹⁰ Andronikos III and his wife Anna Palaiologina did not renovate any monasteries, but they made donations to the Pammakaristos Monastery (Fethiye Kilise Camii), which was renovated by Michael Komnenos Doukas Glabas Tarchaneites.¹¹

The *Ktetors* and their Motivations

In the social life of Byzantium, participation in charitable activities was widely accepted, and founding monasteries were important activities for Byzantine women due to their charitable aspect.¹² So, the role of imperial women as *ktetorissa* lasted during the Palaiologan era. Besides his wife, Michael VIII had various female relatives who were active in the re-foundation of the monasteries. Most of them were also the relatives of the different aristocratic families by their father and mother's side, or through their husbands.

Michael VIII's wife and the mother of the second Emperor of the Palaiologan family, Theodora Doukaina Komnene Palaiologina was active in foundation activities.¹³ The power and the privileges of the Empress Theodora came not only from her marriage to the Emperor but also from

9 V. Kidonopoulos, **Bauten in Konstantinopel, 1204- 1328**, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1994, pp.56 ff.

10 W., Müller Wiener, **Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls**, Tübingen, 1977, p. 150.

11 V. Kidonopoulos, *supra*, pp.80ff.

12 A.M Talbot, "Women", in **The Byzantines ed. By Guglielmo Cavallo**, University of Chicago Press, 1997, p. 134.

13 For further reading as to the Women of Komnenian Period, see. B. Hill, **Imperial Women in Byzantium 1025- 1204, Power, Patronage and Ideology**, Pearson Education Limited, 1999.

her high status as the member of an aristocratic family by birth. She was the daughter of Eudokia Angelina and John Doukas, who was the son of the *sebastokrator* Isaac Doukas.¹⁴ The premature death of Theodora's father made her heir to a huge property, since she was the only child. Theodora had her dowry and the right to conduct this possession.¹⁵ According to the monastic charter of the Lips Monastery (Fenari İsa Camii), which she restored, some of her lands were ancestral while some others were purchased; in addition her son Andronikos II gave her some. Theodora's donations listed in the charter include, for instance, estates in Pergamum, Smyrna, and Lopadion, a village near Constantinople, a village in Macedonia, and houses and workshops in Constantinople. Her mother also made some donations to the Lips Monastery.¹⁶

Theodora wanted to create a shelter for herself and the future generations of her family. In order to preserve her monastery and her endowment, she declared it as self-governing and independent; however, Andronikos II assigned an *ephoros* to the Lips monastery. Theodora left a great amount of property to her two institutions, Hagioi Anargyroi and Lips, with her mother, who also retired and was buried in the Lips Monastery.

Michael VIII's illegitimate daughter, Maria Palaiologina, who has been known as *Despoina* of the Mongols, established the Theotokos Panagiotissa Mouchliotissa (Kanlı Kilise) sometime after 1282.¹⁷ In the year 1265, her father had sent Maria as a bride to Mongolian Khan Hulagu. Hulagu died before her arrival and she married Hulagu's son Abaga. After the death of her husband in 1282, Michael VIII wanted to marry her to another Khan, but she refused and she returned to Constantinople and eventually retired to the Monastery of Mouchliotissa. Besides her foundation, Maria Palaiologina made a donation to Chora Monastery (Kariye Müzesi). In return for her donation, according to most scholars she was depicted in the Deesis mosaic of Chora Monastery.¹⁸

14 A.M., Talbot, "Empress Theodora Palaiologina, Wife of Michael VIII", **DOP** 46 (1992), p. 295.

15 **Ibid.**

16 BMFD, pp. 1279-1280.

17 V., Kidonopoulos, **supra**, pp.88-90.

18 A.M. Talbot, "Building Activity in Constantinople" in **Byzantine Constantinople: monuments, topography and everyday life**, ed. Nevra Necipoğlu, Leiden, 2001, p.335.

The foregoing foundress of the Palaiologan period was Theodora Kantakouzene Doukaina Angelina Palaiologina Komnene Raoulaina. Theodora can be considered as an example of intermarriage among the aristocratic families. She was the niece of Michael VIII and one of the three daughters of Eirene-Eulogia and John Kantakouzenos.¹⁹ First she was married to Ioannes Raoul and approximately ten years after her husband's death, she restored St. Andrew en te Krisei²⁰ (Koca Mustafa Paşa Camii), retired there and took the name Kyriake.²¹

Theodora was active in political discussions, and she had a shifty relationship with her uncle, the emperor. She was in the opposite party in the *Arsenite* schism, just like her mother. Because of this opposition she lost her property. Finally after the death of her mother Eirene-Eulogia, she regained her possessions. By using her private property that she inherited from her mother, Theodora restored St. Andrew en Te Krisei, and the nearby small Monastery of Aristine. She devoted her remaining life to intellectual activities.²² She is also known for her learning and love towards literature.²³ She presumably founded the library attached to the monastery of St. Andrew en te Krisei.

Theodora Synadene was another niece of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos. After the death of her husband, she retired to the monastery which was built by her and named Bebaia Elpis. Even though she had a wealthy husband, her donation includes her ancestral endowment. According to the *typika*, she donated half of her estate in Pyrgos and a vineyard in Pegai.²⁴

Just like the other contemporary founders, Theodora Synadene wanted to keep her family together by offering burial places and commemoration in the same monastery. She was a member of the ruling family and she was widowed in her early years. According to the Byzantine tradition, a widowed woman should either choose the monastic habit or marry again. If she refused the second choice, she should enter a monastery just like the

19 D.M Nicol, *The Byzantine Lady, Ten Portraits*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996, p. 40.

20 A.M. Talbot, *supra*, p. 340.

21 S. Fassoulakis, *The Byzantine Family of Raoul-Ral(l)es*, Athens, 1973, p. 25.

22 D.M Nicol, *supra*, pp. 33-47.

23 V., Kidonopoulos, *supra*, p. 9, p. 14.

24 BMFD, p. 1557.

patronesses that we have discussed above. They lived a privileged monastic life after they were widowed and they lived securely, until the end of their lives. Moreover, due to a motherly concern, they tried to strengthen their family relations.

Michael VIII's sister Maria-Martha Palaiologina renovated the Monastery of Kyra Martha. We have limited information about its founders and the convent itself. Maria-Martha was married to Nikephoros Tarchaneiotos, who served as *epi tes trapezes* during the reign of Michael VIII.²⁵ Kyra Martha Monastery was located near the Holy Apostles (Fatih Camii) and served also as a shrine. According to *Anonymus Description* and the account of Alexander the Clerk, the monastery had various holy relics.²⁶

Moreover, Michael VIII's cousin, the *Megale Domestikissa* Eugenia Komnene Palaiologina, built a convent that was named after her. She was married to the *Megas Domestikos* Syrgiannes, and was the mother of the *Megas Dux* Syrgiannes Komnenos Palaiologos Philanthropos²⁷

Anna Komnene Raoulaina Strategopulina was another aristocratic woman who dealt with a monastic foundation. She established the nunnery of Krataios (Christ Soter). She retired to her convent and took the monastic name Antonia after the death of her husband, a certain protostrator Strategopoulos.²⁸

Another group of *ktetors* were the members of the aristocratic families. They intended to share their property with the monastery in return for founder privileges that were given by the monastery, such as shelter in old age or in case of trouble, and a burial place with their entire families. It has been argued that some of them were the relatives of the imperial family and some of them were eunuch court officials during the Palaiologan period.²⁹

25 D.M Nicol, **The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos, A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study**, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies., 1968, p. 139.

26 "Anonymus Description of Constantinople", p. 152; and Alexander the Clerk "On Constantinople", 164, in G.P Majeska, **Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries**, Washington D.C, 1984.

27 V., Kidonopoulos, **supra**, pp.53-54.

28 S. Fassoulakis, **The Byzantine Family of Raoul-Ral(l)es**, Athens, 1973, p. 32.

29 S.D., Kyritses, Kyritses S. D., **The Byzantine Aristocracy in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries**, unpublished Ph.D thesis in the Department of History,

As it has been noted above, intermarriages among the aristocratic families and the imperial family were frequent. Aristocratic founders and their daughters and widows were also active in monastic foundations.

The unreliable political circumstances of the period gave rise to rapid changes in the political arena. It was quite easy to lose a high status in the court and most court officials suffered from exile and persecution. So, the monasteries were often built when an official was at the peak of his political and financial power, as insurance for the founder and his family.

Theodore Metochites had a special place in the Palaiologan period as a monastery founder. He started his political career as an ordinary man but his ambition led him to arrange marriage alliances on behalf of his family. He gave his daughter to the nephew of Andronikos II, and he became a close relative of the imperial family. But this marriage alliance was a disappointment for Metochites, since his son-in-law John Palaiologos sided with Andronikos III, in the civil war among Andronikos II and his grandson. In the year of 1328 Andronikos III entered the city and Metochites was sent to exile. During his long lasting official career Metochites gained a great amount of wealth, and he used this wealth for the restoration of the Chora Monastery.³⁰ After two years the new rulers gave him permission to retire to his monastery and he lived in the Chora until the last day of his life.

Nikephoros Choumnos was the other important political figure of Andronikos II's court. He came from an aristocratic family that had first appeared in the eleventh century. The members of this family served in court during the Komnenian and Palaiologan families. Nikephoros' political career started in 1275, and when his political power was destroyed by Theodore Metochites, Nikephoros was a loyal minister. He was also the father-in-law of the *despotes* John Palaiologos, son of Andronikos II, by the marriage of his daughter Eirene Choumnaina. He founded the monastery of Theotokos Gorgopekos in Constantinople, based on his fortune in land in Macedonia. He lost his position and retired to the Monastery of Christ Philanthropos Soter that was rebuilt by his daughter Eirene.³¹

Harvard University, 1977, p. 239.

30 I. Sevcenko, "Theodore Metochites, the Chora and the Intellectual Trends of His Time", **Kariye Djami**, ed. P.A. Underwood, vol.4, Princeton, 1975 p. 27.

31 A. M., Talbot, "Eirene Choumnaina", **Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium**, Vol. 1, p.

Michael Doukas Glabas Tarchaneiotes was a court official and he was assigned to campaign against the Bulgarians. He restored the Pammakaristos monastery (Fethiye Camii) with his wife Maria Doukaina Komnene Branaina Palaiologina. After the death of Michael, Maria took the name Martha and she retired to Pammakaristos. Maria added a funeral chapel for her family, and her husband was buried there. There is no surviving monastic charter of the monastery but the memory of its founders still survives in the mosaics of the chapel.³² The Glabas family also founded a new monastery, which is known as the Monastery of Glabaina. Michael Doukas Glabas Tarchaneiotes and his wife Maria-Martha are accepted as the founders of this family monastery.³³

There are several other monasteries that were rebuilt or founded during the Palaiologan period, but the identity of their patrons is obscure. Most probably they were court officials or their family members who were granted lands and treasures by the emperors. By using these financial sources, they founded monasteries in Constantinople. One of these is Christos Euergetes Soter which is identified as St. Theodosia Church or the present Gül Camii in Ayakapi.³⁴ The monastery was originally built by Ioannes Komnenos as an imperial monastery and it was renovated by Bartholomaios Atouemes. According to some historical sources, Bartholomaios Atouemes is identified with Bartholomaios Palaiologos, who was the son of Andronicus II and Yolanda of Montferrat.³⁵ It can be assumed that this imperial monastery was rebuilt by a member of the imperial family, so Atouemes may be Bartholomaios Palaiologos. Ioannes Kanabures was a court official. He renovated a monastery and added a male monastery, which has been named after him.³⁶ A certain woman renovated Myraleion Monastery (Bodrum Camii) ca.1300.³⁷ Phokas Marules, who was from an aristocratic family and the father of Ioannes Synadenos, founded a convent as a shelter for

433.

32 H. Belting, C.Mango, D. Mouriki, **The Mosaics of St. Mary Pammakaristos (Fethiye Camii) at Istanbul**, Washington, 1078; A Mary Talbot, "Glabas, Michael Tarchaneiotes", **Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium**, Vol. II, p. 852.

33 V., Kidonopoulos, **supra**, pp. 41-42.

34 B. Aran, "The Church of Saint Theodosia and the Monastery of Christ Euergetes", **JÖB 26** (1977), pp. 211-228.

35 V., Kidonopoulos, **supra**, pp. 25-27.

36 He was *prokathemenos tu bestiariu*, see. **Ibid**, p. 43.

37 A.M. Talbot, 2001, p. 341.

his wife and daughters. He assigned his patronal rights to his son Ioannes.³⁸ Angelos Dukas Komnenos Sarantenos and his wife renovated the Monastery of Ioannes Prodromos in Petra, near the monastery of Hagios Nikolaos of Opaines that was renovated in the thirteenth century as well.³⁹

Moreover, the Monastery of *Megale Doukaina* was founded by the mother-in-law of the *Megas Dux* Alexios Doukas Philanthropos and the mother of Syrgiannina. She renovated a monastery, which has been known by her title.⁴⁰

According to J.P Thomas, the patriarchate never played an important role in establishing monasteries.⁴¹ However, there are a few Constantinopolitan monasteries that were renovated or built by the members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. One may assume that the ecclesiastical patrons found free grounds to practice their thoughts on monasticism. As it has already been discussed, Patriarch Athanasios suggested (1289-1293/1303-1311) a reform program to the monasteries. He patronized two double monasteries.⁴² One of them was called the Monastery of Patriarch Athanasios⁴³, and the other was dedicated to Theotokos Hodegetria in Manganon region.⁴⁴ Patriarch Ioannes XIII (1316-1320) renovated the monastery of Theotokos Kyriotissa Glykys, present Kalenderhane Camii, in the fourteenth century.⁴⁵

38 A.M Talbot, "A Comparison of the Monastic Experience of Byzantine Men and Women", **Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, Volume 30, No.1, 1985, pp.7-8.

39 V., Kidonopoulos, *supra*, p.45, p.59; Nothing is known about the monasteries of Hagios Nikolaos but according to some scholars the Kefeli Mescidi of today was a original building of this convent: See, Majeska, p. 339.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 54.

41 J.P Thomas, **Private Religious Foundations**, DOS 24, 1987, p.249.

42 R.H.Trone, "A Constantinopolitan Double Monastery of the Fourteenth Century: The Phianthropic Savior", **Byzantine Studies**, 10 (1983) p. 84.

43 V.,Kidonopoulos, *supra*, p. 16.

44 *Ibid.*, p. 77.

45 C.L Striker and D. Kuban, "Work at Kalenderhane Camii in Istanbul: First Preliminary Report" **DOP** (21), 1967, p. 267- 271; V. Kidonopoulos, *supra*, pp.79-80.

Conclusion and Comparison

To sum up, approximately thirty-five or forty monasteries were renovated or established by different influential groups of Byzantine Society. Besides the emperors and their relatives, the second group was the aristocratic class. They were the members of the extended and wealthy families and active participants in the life of the court. In addition, another group was composed of wealthy court officials. It is not easy to know the borders of these groups, since they were mixed through intermarriages, not only with each other but also with the imperial family. The last group was more homogenous than others, namely the ecclesiastical hierarchy. On the other hand, it should be noticed that the financial conditions that made it possible to create a monastery came from similar sources. Members of the imperial family supported by the emperor and especially the women of the imperial family were also the members of the aristocratic families and they had ancestral property. Another group that gained imperial support was court officials and their widows. Emperors issued *chrysobulls* for their officers. The last group, namely the ecclesiastical hierarchy benefited from imperial support and outside donations.

From the very beginning monasteries have been founded under the patronage of certain influential social groups. The first group consists of emperors and their immediate families. The ruling class always accepted the creation of create a monastic institution to be their responsibility. However, the connection between the ruling class and monasteries sometimes resulted in the limitation of monastic property, since they became important to the landowner. The ruling class tried to reduce this landed property and used it for the sake of the welfare of the State. So, one may claim that the ruling families never lost their interest in monastic patronage.

The second group of patrons are aristocratic families. It is widely accepted that they started to form an influential social group after the eleventh century and they had an effect on monastic patronage. They were the dominant founder class in the Palaiologan era. The growing financial power of the aristocratic families led their members to imitate the imperial family. It should be noted that the intermarriages between the members of the imperial family and wealthy aristocratic families made an extended aristocratic class. So the members of this class were the relatives of the

other wealthy families and the imperial family at the same time. Moreover, most of them were active in the court, which gave rise to their increasing social and economic power.

Whereas the monasteries in the capital city were founded by the imperial family and aristocrats, the participation of ecclesiastical hierarchy, which was the third powerful class of Byzantine society, was limited in Constantinople. Thus, during the Palaiologan era there were only six monasteries that were founded by a member of this class.

As far as one can deduce from the identity of the founders, one easily observes that there were three different social classes that participated in the renovation or establishment of the monasteries in the last period of the Byzantine State, namely emperors and their immediate family, the aristocracy, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. However, the ratio of the different social classes varied according to the location of the monastery. There were approximately thirty-four monasteries that were newly established or renovated. Renovated monasteries were twenty-four and the remaining were new establishments. In the Komnenian period the new establishments were more than the renovated institutions. As far as we can focus in this study, there were eight new established monasteries, whereas only two monasteries were restored. On the other hand, there is a direct relation between the founder and the monastery, since the gender of the patron determinates the type of the monastery. In most cases, women *ktetors* preferred to establish a convent. Because of the monastery was accepted as a retirement place for the founder.

The changes in the economic, social and political balance of the Palaiologan period led wealthy classes to erect an untouchable foundation and this was the monastery. Monastic foundation served as a shelter in case of trouble and it was a reliable way to inherit property for future generations. In addition, a burial place in a monastery was another stimulus that led a person to establish a monastery. With the burial places, founders also enjoyed never ending commemoration services. These kind of patronal privileges were also inherited and shared with the other members of the family.

So, monastic patronage had another reason, i.e. a material reason. These material motivations did not offer any revenue to the descendants in

contrast with the Islamic *waqf* system. In most cases monastic institutions had financial rulers and they received payment in return for their service, but the descendants had a certain influence on the administration of the institutions and they had the traditional protector role over the monastery. In return for their services, they received privileges the founder promised them. Moreover, we have only one direct reference about the tax obligation of a monastery. The exemption from paying taxes should be considered but the *typika* did not touch upon this.

On the contrary, the provincial monasteries, were founded by the members of the clergy and a limited number of the aristocratic class. It should be pointed out that this preference of the ecclesiastical hierarchy should be directly related to financial power. In the provinces, most of the ecclesiastical patrons gained donation from aristocratic families from the capital city or the imperial family. It is obvious that they could not afford a foundation in the capital city.

The participation of these aristocratic families in the establishment of a monastic institution was sometimes limited with donations. The aristocratic class of the Palaiologan era established in the capital but the source of their wealth came from the provinces, and they wanted contact with their property by donation to the provincial monastery. In addition, the participation of the imperial family was limited with the donations as well. It is interesting that the foreign imperial families took part in monastic foundation as *ktetor* or *ephoros* in the Byzantine territory.

According to the surviving monastic charters of Palaiologan Constantinople the founders played an important role in the administration of the institution. They ordered certain rules about the daily life of the monks and nuns, such as diet, clothing, and liturgical duties. They insisted on equality among the monastic staff, but in some cases there was a privileged group. This group could be the founders' descendants and sick staff.

Another important aspect emerges from the comparison with the previous period. The philanthropic institutions of the Komnenian period turned into uncharitable foundations in the Palaiologan period. Constantinopolitan monastic charters rarely mention help to the poor or needy. The charitable institutions of the previous era were also active in

the Palaiologan time, but a new one was only added by an empress in the beginning of the Palaiologan period.

However, provincial monasteries went further and forbid any help to laymen, the only exception being needy monks, since cenobitic monasticism was widely accepted in the Palaiologan period. It has already been discussed that cenobitic monasticism tried to alienate monks and nuns from daily life, and charitable works were considered as the reason of corruption in the monasteries.

Provincial patronage had certain different characteristics that came from the identity of the patron. Frequently, a founder from the clergy did not have descendants to share his patronal privileges. Moreover, the rules that were dictated over the monks and nuns were strict but less in number. As far as one may notice in the monastic charters of the provincial monasteries, there is no implication on the burial place for the founder. On the other hand, it is obvious from other sources that the provincial monasteries served also as burial places. Similar to the Constantinopolitan contemporaries, a person who has no relation with the founder in return for a donation to the monastery may enjoy a burial place in the monastery.

Consequently, monastic patronage in Palaiologan Constantinople, and the relation between *ktetor* and monastery is the determinant factor in the monastic foundation. Monastic institutions developed according to the expectations of the founder. These expectations had several roots: some of them came from the traditional patronage definition whereas some others came to existence due to the unreliable political, economic and social circumstances of the period.

This study only focused on the relation between the founder and the monastery, but the relation of the state and the monastery is also important in understanding the monastic institutions of the Palaiologan period. This aspect of the Byzantine monasteries deserves further investigation. Moreover, the comparison of the monasteries as *philanthropic* institutions and the similarities and differences with the other provinces and the examples of the different religions still stands untouched.

Monasteries of the Palaiologan Period in Constantinople:

Founder/<i>Ktitor</i>	Name of Monastery	Dates of Patronage or <i>typikon</i>	New establishment or Renovation
Michael VIII	Auxentios	1261-1280/81	Renovation
Michael VIII	Hagios Georgios in Mangana	1261-1279	Renovation
Michael VIII	Theotokos Peribleptos	ca. 1261	New establishment
Michael VIII	Hagios Demetrios of Palaiologi Kellibara	1282	Renovation
Andronikos II	Hagios Demetrios of Palaiologi Kellibara	1315/1328	Renovation
Andronikos II	Nea Ekklesia	1283	Renovation
Konstantinos Palaiologos (brother of Andronikos II)	Studios	1293	Renovation
Theodora Palaiologina (Michael VIII's wife)	Anargyroi	1282-1303	Renovation
Theodora Palaiologina	Lips	1282-1303	Renovation
Maria Palaiologina (illegitimate daughter of Michael VIII)	Theotokos Panagiotissa Mouchliotissa	c.1282	Addition of new sections and renovation

Theodora Raoulaina (niece of Michael VIII, daughter of Eirene and John Kantakouzenos)	St. Andrew en te Krisei	1282-1289	Renovation
Theodora Raoulaina	Monastery of Aristines	1289-1291	Renovation
Theodora Synadene (niece of Michael VIII)	Bebaias Elpidos	1295-1300	New establishment
Maria Martha Palaiologina (Michael VIII's sister)	Kyra Martha	ca.1261-1266	New establishment
Eugenia Komnene Palaiologina (cousin of Michael VIII)	Megales Doukaines	1296-1321	Renovation
Maria Martha Glabaina	Glabanes	ca.1305-1321	New establishment
Maria Martha Glabaina and Michael Doukas Glabas Tarcheneites	Pammakaristos	ca. 1305-1321	Renovation and addition of parakklesion
Theodore Metochites	Chora	1316-1320/1321	Renovation
Nikephoros Choumnos	Theotokos Gorgopekoos	1294	Renovation
Unknown patroness	Myralaion	ca. 1300	Renovation

Eirene Choumnaina	Philanthropos	1307-1327	Renovation
Georgios Akropolites	Anastasis	1295-1324	Renovation
John Palaiologos	Ioannes Prodromos	ca.1294-1305	New establishment
Anna Komnene Raoulaina Strategopulina	Christ Soter	1314	New establishment
Ioannes Kanabures	Christos Eurgetes or St. Theodosia Church	?	Renovation
Phokas Marules	Theotokos	1321?	New establishment
Angelos Doukas Komnenos Sarantenos	Ioannes Prodromos in Petra	1291-1305?	Renovation
Patriarch Athanasios	Patriarch Athanasios	ca.1293	New establishment
Patriarch Athanasios	Theotokos Hodegetria in Manganon	ca.1309	Renovation
Patriarch Ioannes XIII	Theokos Kyriotissa Glkys	14 th century	Renovation
?	Nikolaos of Opaines	1305	Renovation