

This is an extract from:

Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents:

A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments

edited by John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero

with the assistance of Giles Constable

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

in five volumes as number 35 in the series Dumbarton Oaks Studies

© 2000 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

9. *Galesios: Testament of Lazarus of Mount Galesios*

Date: October 31, 1053¹

Translator: Patricia Karlin-Hayter

Edition employed: Reconstructed from the *Vita S. Lazari auctore Gregorio monacho*, ed. Hippolyte Delehaye, *Acta sanctorum novembris*, vol. 3 (Brussels, 1910), pp. 508–606.

Manuscript: Codex Lavrioticus I.127, fols. 81–293 (14th c.)

Other translations: None

Institutional History

A. Early Career of the Founder Lazarus

Lazarus' life and the history of his monastic foundations are known almost exclusively from the *Life* composed by his disciple Gregory, which Delehaye justly praised as one of the most substantial and interesting works of the Byzantine hagiographic genre.² The *Life* also preserves the surviving fragments of Lazarus' *Testament* as translated below. The *Life* records his birth as Leo in the village of Theotokos near Magnesia on the Meander, not far from Ephesos; calculating backwards from his reported death at the age of 86 in 1053, he would appear to have been born in 967/68.³ There is, however, an unpublished manuscript in the Historical Museum, Moscow, which indicates that he died at the age of 72; if true, this would mean that he was born about 981.⁴ After being educated locally for a career as a notary, Leo became a monk at a monastery in the vicinity of Attaleia in Pamphylia, taking the monastic name of Lazarus. He lived here as a solitary for seven years. Then he realized a long-frustrated ambition to visit the Holy Land, where he served in both the monastery of St. Euthymios and the St. Sabas monastery near Jerusalem.⁵ The superior of the latter institution bestowed on him the great habit and ordained him as a priest. Increasing Arab pressure on the local Christian community seems to have been a factor in his decision to return to his homeland after an absence of twenty years.

Lazarus found himself back home near Ephesos, either in 1005 (so Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 242, n. 6) or in 1013 (so Delehaye, *Stylites*, p. cxv). He decided to settle down as a stylite close by an existing oratory of St. Marina. After gathering disciples, Lazarus obtained funding from a pious lay woman to pay for the construction of a monastery as well as a new church to replace the little oratory; the local metropolitan of Ephesos contributed landed property for the support of the foundation.⁶ Lazarus remained here for seven years, then he sought refuge from the press of his many admirers as well as the increasingly meddlesome metropolitan of Ephesos by heading off for Mount Galesios (modern Alamandağ) north of Ephesos beyond the Kaystros River.

9. GALESIOS

B. Establishment of Lazarus' Monasteries on Mount Galesios

Summoned back to St. Marina by his metropolitan, Lazarus escaped again with a few companions, including his younger brother Ignatios, and established a new monastic settlement on Mount Galesios dedicated to the Savior (*Soter*).⁷ Galesios would be Lazarus' home for the rest of his life, though he felt constrained to move higher up the mountain as time went on to escape the curiosity of visitors. Lazarus lived near the Savior monastery on a new column for twelve years, then he himself moved further up the mountain while the monastery continued to function under his direction. Lazarus next had a new column and a church dedicated to the Mother of God (*Theotokos*) constructed at a higher elevation on the mountain.⁸ He is reported to have lived there for twelve years as well. Lazarus' final residence on the mountain was on a column adjacent to a new monastery dedicated to the Resurrection (*Anastasis*), which became the most important of the three monasteries under his direct administration.⁹

In addition to these three directly administered monasteries, there were others near the mountain that were associated more loosely with Lazarus' foundation. At some point during his residence on Galesios, Lazarus' steward Gabriel sought to take advantage of the good relations between the Galesian monastic community and Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) to endow a new imperial monastery that would be immune from the claims of the metropolitan of Ephesos. The foundation, the imperial monastery of the Mother of God at Bessai, was supported by a gift of landed property offered by the emperor in the memory of Maria Skleraina, who died circa 1046.¹⁰ Although this proved to be a prosperous foundation with some 300 monks, several times more than all the rest of Lazarus' directly administered monasteries combined, he never really welcomed the new foundation as a member of the Galesian community. Bessai was self-governing (*autodioiketos*), and was the only monastery associated with Lazarus that had its own superior and a separate landed endowment, the estate (*proasteion*) of Eoptine. The monastery church was likely that dedicated to the Mother of God, the Consolation (*Pausolype*), as a memorial for Maria Skleraina by her brother Romanos Skleros, who had paid a visit to Lazarus on an earlier occasion.¹¹ Lazarus' mother also established a nunnery in the vicinity of Galesios which bore her monastic name, Eupraxia; it does not seem to have been an administrative dependency of Lazarus' foundation.¹²

Lazarus' three directly administered monasteries, the Savior, the Mother of God, and the Resurrection, were supported by estates donated by various benefactors, which were in turn administered by various stewards appointed for this purpose.¹³ The metropolitan of Ephesos had evidently reclaimed the administration of St. Marina after Lazarus' departure from that monastery. Lazarus' *Testament*, drawn up eight days before his death, prescribes for the support of forty monks at the monastery of the Resurrection and twelve each at the monasteries of the Savior and the Mother of God; Bessai, having its own endowment, was to share in the common revenues of the other three monasteries only if there was a surplus.¹⁴

C. Preservation of Institutional Independence

After Lazarus' death in 1053, the concerns of his monks for preserving their institutional independence made even the place of interment for his remains a matter of controversy.¹⁵ Some thought the original burial place in the right side of the narthex of the church of the Resurrection would

ELEVENTH CENTURY

serve as a pretext for the metropolitan of Ephesos to seize control over the adjacent monastery, while a proposed alternative, burial at the imperial monastery at Bessai, risked a loss of autonomy to another master. Eventually there was a translation of the founder's relics, commemorated in a *synaxarion* on July 17, but the site of the new depository is not known.

D. The Galesios Monastery in the Thirteenth Century

After the translation of the founder, little is known of the Galesios monasteries thereafter until the thirteenth century, when, treated at that time as a single administrative entity, the Galesios foundation seems to have partaken in the general revival of monasteries during the Nicæan Empire (1204–61).¹⁶ Later, one of its superiors was elected patriarch of Constantinople as Joseph I (1266–75 and 1282–83). On at least one occasion this patriarch benefited his old monastery by abolishing the independent constitution of the monastery of Christ-Who-Is, regulated by the author of (36) *Blemmydes* (for which see below, Chapter Seven), and annexing that monastery to Galesios as a dependency (*metochion*).¹⁷ After Joseph's deposition in 1275 for refusing to support the church reunification policies of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–82), Galesiote monks were prominent among the emperor's opponents.¹⁸ Upon Joseph I's return to office in 1282 after Michael VIII's death, the Galesiote monk Galaktion took the lead in purifying the Constantinopolitan cathedral church of Hagia Sophia. Joseph I's successor Gregory II Kyprios (1283–89) was interested enough in Galesios to compose a hagiographic *Life* of Lazarus, which, however, is not an independent historical witness, but rather a reworking of Gregory the Galesiote's eleventh-century *Life*.¹⁹ A letter of this patriarch mentions the monastery and shows its monks in a dispute with the local metropolitan of Ephesos, John Cheilas, just like their respective predecessors in the eleventh century.²⁰ The future patriarch Athanasios I (1289–93 and 1303–9), author of (55) *Athanasios I* (for which see below, Chapter Nine), spent some ten years at the Galesios monastery, where he was ordained a priest and made good use of what he considered to be an excellent library.²¹ Some manuscripts from this library are still preserved.²²

E. Administrative Union with the Anastasis Monastery

As the Turks consolidated their control around Ephesos towards the end of the thirteenth century, the Byzantine authorities sought to save what they could of the important monastic foundations in that area. In a preserved chrysobull dating from the early years of his reign, Emperor Andronikos II (1282–1328) Palaiologos chose to unify Galesios with the church of the Resurrection (*Anastasis*) then being restored by George Akropolites.²³ Later George's son Constantine would write (46) *Akropolites* for that foundation (see below, Chapter Eight). It was likely also at this time that the head of St. Lazarus of Galesios was brought to Constantinople, as commemorated on October 25.²⁴ The imperial chrysobull does not explicitly refer to the destruction of the old monastery of Galesios but it is likely, based on the evidence from notes in some contemporary manuscripts, that this did occur and that the surviving monks were then relocated to the capital.²⁵

9. GALESIOS

Analysis

This composite “document” is surely the most unconventional one in our collection. Like (5) *Euthymios* and (7) *Latros*, what we know of Lazarus’ *Testament* (*diatyposis*) is encapsulated [246] as part of a much longer hagiographic *Life*. The author Gregory was a cellarer (*kellarites*) in Lazarus’ foundation who wrote during the superiorship of Ignatios, Lazarus’ brother and successor, while a good many of the founder’s associates were still living.

In addition to supplying [246] a summary of the contents of the lost *Testament*, Gregory’s *Life* also provides unique details on the process of the creation of a testamentary *typikon*, illustrating the role of both oral tradition and the spiritual director’s jurisprudential teaching in determining the rules for the life of this foundation. The exceptional interest of the *Life* in this case seemed to us to justify a translation not only of Gregory’s brief summary of the *Testament* but also of the excerpts which shed light on the circumstances of its composition and on various customs of the foundation that once may have been included in it. Janin (*Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 245, n. 5) believed that other provisions of the lost *Testament* were to be found disseminated throughout the narrative of the *Life* in the form of Lazarus’ responses to various inquiries by his monks.

Unlike most *typika*, which present idealized, normative views of their communities, this highly conjectural and only partially reconstructed document affords an unusually frank, unvarnished perspective on the disciplinary problems of a traditional private religious foundation on the eve of the monastic reform of the late eleventh century.

A. Contents of the Lost Testament

According to Gregory’s summary [246] of the “essential points” of the lost rule, the *Testament* included standard features such as a founder’s biography, an inventory of landed properties, administrative prescriptions, limits on the number of brothers, instructions for the election of the superior and appointment of a financial steward, regulations for diet and clothing, and provisions for church services as well as “boilerplate” provisions such as a curse on transgressors (cf. (8) *John Xenos* [2]). The provision [246] that the monastery’s dependents not be “reduced to hardship” is an ambiguous confirmation that Lazarus’ monks had abandoned Studite aspirations to economic self-sufficiency and now relied on the labor of others to support their lives of prayer.

It also is worth mentioning here that towards the end of the last century, Manuel Gedeon believed that he had located the liturgical *typikon* of the Galesios foundation in a thirteenth-century manuscript originally copied at the Resurrection monastery on Mount Galesios that is now in the library of the Lavra monastery on Mount Athos.²⁶ Though Papadopoulos-Kerameus rejected this attribution, considering Gedeon’s document to be only a copy of a common Palestinian liturgical *typikon* that just happened to be copied at Galesios, a review of the evidence may show that Gedeon was correct.

B. Lives of the Monks

Gregory’s *Life* enables us to fill in this bare outline of his summary with some details on the lives of the monks at Lazarus’ foundation. It amply demonstrates lax disciplinary standards common to monks at this time, particularly with respect to their possession of private property. Although he exhorted postulants to give away their personal possessions upon entrance [192], some kept a

portion of their private fortunes, while others surrendered their assets but “compelled the father to rule that certain comforts be supplied them by the monastery . . . [and] in this way introduced more than a few scandals into the monastery and drew others to their ways.” Lazarus was forced to bargain with prospective monks in exchange for their financial contributions to the monastery. Monks were also permitted [191] to retain private wealth gained after admission and to own [138] their own icons (with votive lamps) for personal veneration in their cells.

There is other evidence of the unpopularity of cenobiticism such as the monks who refused to take common meals [147] and other monks who insisted on leaving the community to pursue the solitary life [189], cf. [141]. Moreover, in what would become a common feature of later Byzantine monasteries, even in the era of the monastic reform, the community was divided [182] into literate members of the choir and the illiterate brothers who could not sing (and who presumably worked at manual labors).

Some of his monks were troubled by the obvious inequality of resources and the prevailing hierarchy of rank among the members of their community, yet Lazarus himself considered [130] the contemporary hierarchy of monastic habits—martyrs, apostles, and angels—a regrettable but ineradicable innovation. Although his instincts were reformist, his policies were almost invariably accommodationist. Faced with cohabiting monks who had fathered children [129], Lazarus preferred occasional lapses from celibacy to concubinage. He recommended spiritual exercises for conquering homoerotic longings [196] for young people in the vicinity of the monastery. Unable to reform his own foundation, Lazarus espoused a bolder philosophy [187] for patrons who asked for rules for their own monasteries, specifically, “not to differ in food, clothing, or any other necessities for the body in order to preserve, through equality in these matters, the rule of submission unshaken and unhurt.”

C. Constitutional Matters

According to his biographer Gregory, Lazarus had been able to enforce [191] the traditional ban on the ownership of private property at his two earlier monasteries, those dedicated to the Savior and the Mother of God, but not at the Monastery of the Resurrection, since “some of those who have been tonsured in the monastery have brought money with them from the world, and would absolutely not give it up, because they could not be satisfied with what the monastery provides,” perhaps a reference to the personal endowments known as *prosenexeis* brought to monasteries by monks of aristocratic origin.²⁷ This suggests that the monasteries of the Savior and the Mother of God were organized cenobitically, perhaps on the model of older Studite monasteries, while the Resurrection must have been a mixed community in which some monks lived separately on their private resources or incomes, coming together with the cenobitic members of the community only for certain special purposes.

Clearly, Theodore the Studite’s charismatic, authoritarian model of monastic governance was neither practical nor dispositionally suited for Lazarus, who ruled his monasteries from atop various columns for many decades.²⁸ Taking advantage of Lazarus’ accommodationist disposition, many of his monks showed their traditional partiality for solitary forms of monasticism in preference to the cenobitic form promoted earlier by Stoudios, while still other monks of a different temperament began to show their disgust with the disciplinary lapses and financial compro-

mises that were endemic in non-cenobitic monasticism. The contemporary Athonite *typikon*, (15) *Constantine IX*, demonstrates the latter phenomenon even more clearly in its record of hostility to the numerous secular interpenetrations of monasticism by manifestations of aristocratic privilege.

Lazarus was anxious to protect his foundation from harm at the hands of representatives of the metropolitan of Ephesos [141], cf. [247]. The threat of dissolution or, perhaps more realistically, of the foundation's forcible participation in the *charistike*, gave urgency to the composition of his testamentary *typikon*, which Lazarus signed (if indeed he did at all) only on his deathbed [250]. The imperial monastery of Bessai that was associated with Lazarus' personally administered monasteries was already "independent," and thus thought to be immune from any attempt to usurp control over it by the local hierarchy.²⁹ Just before Lazarus' death, a deputation was sent [223] to Constantinople to obtain confirmation of the foundation's independence from Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos and Patriarch Michael Keroullarios (1043–58). The long-term effectiveness of these precautions against the *charistike* cannot be determined in default of evidence about the foundation's history during the crucial period of the last half of the eleventh century when the threat posed to private and independent religious institutions from that notorious management program was at its peak.

Notes on the Introduction

1. For dating, see [246], with Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 245, and Malamut, "Bessai," p. 244.
2. Halkin, *BHG* 979; for the *Vita S. Lazari*, see Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 502–8, and *Stylites*, pp. cvi–cxvi; Kazhdan, "Lazaros," p. 1198.
3. For the traditional dating, see *Vita*, chap. 254, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, p. 588; Delehaye, *Stylites*, p. cxv; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 242, cf. 246, n. 6; Stiernon, "Lazare," col. 110.
4. Ms. Moscow, Hist. Mus. 369/353, fol. 220, for which see Kazhdan, "Ideals," p. 476, n. 16, and "Lazaros," p. 1198.
5. For Lazarus' career in the Holy Land, see *Vita*, chaps. 14–30, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 513–19; Delehaye, *Stylites*, p. cix; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 242, with n. 6; Stiernon, "Lazare," col. 110. The precise chronology is uncertain.
6. For Lazarus' tenure at St. Marina, see *Vita*, chaps. 31–53, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 519–26; Delehaye, *Stylites*, pp. cx, cxv; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 242–43; Malamut, "Bessai," p. 246; Stiernon, "Lazare," col. 110. Once again, the chronology is uncertain.
7. For the *Soter* monastery, see *Vita*, chaps. 53–57, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 526–27; Delehaye, *Stylites*, pp. cx–cxi; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 243.
8. For the *Theotokos* monastery, see *Vita*, chap. 43, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*; Delehaye, *Stylites*, p. cxi; Janin, *Géographie* vol. 2, pp. 243–44.
9. For the *Anastasis* monastery, see *Vita*, chaps. 110–11, 162, 246, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 541–42, 557, 585; Delehaye, *Stylites*, pp. cxi–cxii; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 242.
10. For the Bessai monastery, see *Vita*, chaps. 202, 216, 218, 238–39, 245–47, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 570–71, 574–75, 582, 584–86; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 244–45; and especially Malamut, "Bessai," pp. 246–48.
11. So Malamut, "Bessai," p. 247; for this church, see *Vita*, chaps. 245 and 247, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 584–86, and Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 244–45; for Romanos Skleros' visit, see *Vita*, chap. 87, p. 536.
12. For the nunnery of Eupraxia, see *Vita*, chaps. 164 and 201, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, pp. 558, 570, with Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 245.
13. See Lazarus' brother Ignatios, steward of the *proasteion* of Philippikos, *Vita*, chap. 221, ed. Delehaye,

ELEVENTH CENTURY

- Acta*, p. 575, Cyril, steward of the *proasteion* of Pentakrene, *Vita*, chap. 244, p. 584; *Vita*, chap. 221 also mentions another dependency, Kampsai; see discussion in Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 246, n. 1.
14. *Vita*, chap. 246, ed. Delehay, *Acta*, p. 585.
 15. *Vita* chaps. 252–54, ed. Delehay, *Acta*, pp. 587–88; Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 246–47.
 16. For the later history of Galesios, see especially Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 247–50.
 17. For Joseph's election, see Pachymeres, 4.2, ed. A. Failler, *Georges Pachymérés, Relations Historiques*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1984), pp. 333–35; cf. Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantina historia*, 4.8, ed. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, *CSHB*, vol. 1, p. 107; for the annexation of Nikephoros Blemmydes' monastery, see Pachymeres, *De Michaele Palaeologo*, 5.2, *CSHB*, vol. 1, p. 342.
 18. See Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 248, with sources in nn. 3, 4, 5.
 19. Halkin, *BHG* 980; for this *Vita*, see Delehay, *Stylites*, p. cviii; Stiernon, "Lazare," col. 110.
 20. Laurent, *Regestes*, vol. 1, pt. 4, no. 1500 (ca. 1286–87).
 21. Theoktistos the Studite, *Vita s. Athanasii*, chap. 6, ed. Hippolyte Delehay, "La vie d' Athanase patriarche de Constantinople," *MAH* 17 (1897), 39–75, at p. 51.
 22. For details, see Volk, "Klosterbibliotheken," pp. 150–58, with assessment by Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 249.
 23. Franz Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, vol. 1 (Munich-Berlin, 1924–32), no. 2085, ed. MM 5.264–67; see discussion by Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 249.
 24. For this *translatio*, see Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 247.
 25. See Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 249, 250.
 26. Ms. Lavra lambda 99; see discussion in Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 246.
 27. For *prosenexeis*, see (22) *Evergetis* [37] and related documents in the Evergetian tradition, with Emil Herman, "Die Regelung der Armut in den byzantinischen Klöstern," *OCP* 7 (1941), 406–60, esp. 439–42.
 28. For a different view, see Kazhdan, "Ideals," p. 476: "Lazaros . . . administered with an iron hand the monasteries built around his column."
 29. See *Vita*, chap. 245, ed. Delehay, *Acta*, p. 584.

Bibliography

- Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 210.
- Delehay, H., *Acta sanctorum novembris*, vol. 3, pp. 502–8.
- , *Les saints stylites* (Brussels-Paris, 1923), chap. 6: Saint Lazare le Galésiot, pp. cvi–cxvi.
- Gedeon, Manuel, "Gnoseis ek tou typikou ton monon tou Galesiou orous," *EA* 18 (1898), 27–31, 61–67; rev. by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *EA* 20 (1900), 259–62, and by Waldemar Nissen, *BZ* 9 (1900), 541–44.
- Halkin, François, *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, 3rd ed. (Brussels, 1957), 979, cf. 980.
- Janin, Raymond, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, vol. 2: *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975), pp. 241–50.
- Karlin-Hayter, Patricia, "Lexicographical Notes, 1. Diakrisis, 2. Paraphylakteon," *Byzantion* 55 (1985), 589–91.
- Kazhdan, Alexander, "Hermitic, Cenobitic, and Secular Ideals in Byzantine Hagiography of the Ninth Centuries," *GOTR* 30 (1985), 473–87, esp. 476.
- , "Lazaros of Mount Galesios," *ODB*, p. 1198.
- Lampsides, O., "Anekdoton keimenon peri tou hagiou Lazarou tou Galesiotou," *Theologia* 53 (1982), 158–77.
- Loparev, Chrysostom, *Kratkiya otset o poezdke na Athon letom 1896 goda* (St. Petersburg, 1897), pp. 15–21.
- Malamut, Élisabeth, "A propos de Bessai d'Éphèse," *REB* 43 (1985), 243–51.

9. GALESIOS

- Ševčenko, Ihor, "Constantinople Viewed from the Eastern Provinces in the Middle Byzantine Period," *HUS* 3–4, pt. 2 (1979–80), 712–47, esp. 723–26.
- Stiernon, Daniel, "Lazare le Galésio," *Catholicisme*, vol. 7 (Paris, 1975), cols. 110–11.
- Volk, Otto, "Die byzantinischen Klosterbibliotheken von Konstantinopel, Thessalonike und Kleinasien" (Ph.D. diss., Munich, 1955), pp. 150–58.

Translation

[p. 546]

128. . . . The brothers would often discuss with each other points arising, whether from the Holy Scriptures or from the things that happened to themselves, sorrows, insults and all the other things that men consider and call ills, or again, concerning the differences between the sin and the sinner, and when they questioned the father about these things, he would give them the shrewdest and most admirable interpretations and solutions, such as the one about to be related, and others no less remarkable.

129. A brother asked the father about monks who fall into the sin of fornication. "[There are] those who fall again and again [indiscriminately], regularly trying to repent [and reform], but because of the grip of habit, falling back into their old ways. Then there are those who fall once for all, sticking to one same person in their error. Which was the best?" he asked. The father replied: "Neither is right, neither is blameless, and if they fail to repent and right their ways, they are certainly [both] guilty and liable to punishment. However, as I see it, he who falls indiscriminately is more likely to turn and repent than a man who has settled [his affection] on one person, and wants the situation to continue. A man who has attached himself in this way to one [p. 547] person, particularly if, furthermore, he has children by her, will hardly repent, unless an exceptional mercy of God—he who makes a way where no way is—through some special dispensation, set his affairs right. But the indiscriminate sinner, pricked by his own conscience, jeered at each time and insulted by men, may yet repent and change his ways." Such the question, such the answer given by the father.

130. Some of the brothers once questioned him about the monastic habit.¹ "Seeing there was only one," they asked, "how had the custom arisen making three out of it?" To this question also he replied: "The habit" he said "is indeed one, even if some people have attributed two classes to it.² As for our contemporary trick of dividing it into three classes, this was first established because of the slackness and impotence of the present generation, yet not altogether vainly and irrationally. This too is a type that mirrors something greater and higher. For this division seems, in a way, to represent the array of the three following orders, martyrs, that is, apostles and angels. He who applies himself to observing the rule of the first order is enrolled with the choir of the martyrs, he who [observes the rule] of the second with those of the apostles, the third with those of the angels. This is clear from the names themselves, since we regularly talk of the angelic, of the apostolic habit, and of the garment of submission, which goes to show. So much for the habit."

[p. 548]

135. This too deserves mention. The brothers disagreed once over the service, some saying the *theotokion* should be sung along with the *troparia* of [every] feast day, while the others would not agree to this. They went to the father, asking what they should do. He [replied]: “Yes, indeed, it is appropriate to sing the *theotokion* on every occasion. Just as in all seasoning salt plays the most important part, so in all Christian singing of praise, praise of God’s mother is most appropriate and most necessary. If you like, I will give [the brothers] a suitable talk to accompany what I am saying.”

[p. 549]

138. But let the narrative proceed. Laurentios—who is now a stylite—was standing with me, once, in front of the father’s column, and put some questions to him, about lamps in church and in the cells. The father answered: “The church represents the type of heaven, and the lights in it represent the stars. But as for those in the cells, at any rate so it seems to me, he who has in his heart the light that is apprehended by the mind does not need the light apprehended by the senses. If one [of you] wishes to sing something he does not know by heart, or if he has something to read, he may light his lamp, finish his office or whatever he has to read, and then put it out. For if a monk has a lamp burning in his cell while he sleeps he shall be reckoned as dead to God. If anyone owns an icon, let him take it to the church; for himself, let him erect a wooden cross facing him, and so say his prayers. When he goes to church, let him embrace the holy images.” All this the father said, not legislating, so to speak, or laying down a rule that no one should have an icon in his cell, but urging [us to embrace] poverty, and securing thereby those he won over against distraction.

139. The brothers of the monastery once denounced John Smyrnaios to the father, [saying] he leaned on a staff when standing in church. When the father questioned him, he answered: “As you know, father, I am weak and not able to stand like the rest of the brothers. It is so as not to leave the church, go to my cell and lie down in slackness and sleep that I have taken to this.” Then the father to him: “Since this is your condition, from now on prop yourself on two staffs if you like; only do not leave the church on that account.”³

140. On one occasion, on some major saint’s day, the brothers, standing, according to custom, before the column, said to the father: “Give us a treat,⁴ father, [in honor of] the saint whose memory we are celebrating, and send and buy us some fish.” Then the father said to them: “It was not through luxury and ease that he became a saint, but through fasting and much striving. We too, if we wish to celebrate the holy days of the saints as God approves and in a manner pleasing to the saints themselves, must imitate their life to the best of our ability.” One of the brothers, by name Pachomios, rejoined: “As Christ said to the apostles, the wedding guests cannot fast so long as the bridegroom is with them, but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then they will fast” (Matt. 9:15). The brother’s aim in saying this did not escape the father. Turning his face away and not looking at the brother who had spoken, but averting his eyes, he said: “The case of Christ and his disciples is as you say. But as for me, I trust in Christ my God that after my death you will receive [all that you need] and lack nothing.”

9. GALESIOS

141. This the father said, not on this occasion only, but frequently. But on this point the brothers heard him without enthusiasm. They did not expect the monastery to survive after his death, for emissaries from the metropolis⁵ were daily badgering us to withdraw from the mountain. As a result, most of the brothers, some privately and individually, others openly and in front of all, begged him to consent to their leaving after his death. To some he gave his consent, but others, on the contrary, he bound by his impending departure itself to stay. When some said to him whoever took his place as superior of the monastery would not be capable of the same spiritual discernment towards those under him, nor of taking upon himself adequately the weaknesses of all, and of seeing to their spiritual and material needs in a suitable manner, he answered and said to them: "I know that it is impossible that the monastery should not have, after my death, a superior who, with help from above, will take your material needs satisfactorily in hand, and to him you will be obedient in everything, as is proper, having the same faith in him as you now confess for myself. As for spiritual questions⁶ the superior, it is true, will not always be here, but, by the grace of God, you have elders. The experience of many years has given them a sure knowledge of the spiritual way. Take them as guides. Lay bare to them the workings of your soul. Whatever you do, do it after inquiring of them and with their approval, and I know that you will not stray from the straight way. If, as you hint, they should drive any one of you from the monastery, let the expelled man remain outside, before the gates, for seven days. If during those seven days they neither bring him food or drink from the monastery nor are willing to admit him, then let him remove himself and to where he wishes, for this man's [right] will be allowed both by God and by me."

[p. 551]

144. Someone came up by night once, stole from the monastery stable one of the monastery horses with the very pack on its back and made off. On being informed next morning the father sent out some of the brothers to investigate. They set forth, inquired everywhere, and returned without having discovered anything. On which account, they banded together with the other brothers. All went together to the father and pestered him to have a wall built around the monastery and control going out and coming in with lock and key.⁷ "For" said they "the same thing has happened to us on numerous other occasions." But the father would hear none of it, saying to them: "St. Sabas tried to do the same thing in his lavra, and had already got some way with the building, but he was stopped by God's mother, who appeared to him saying: 'If you wish to have me as guardian of your lavra, leave it as it was before. If [you prefer] the wall, have your way and build it.'⁸ He dropped the building on the spot, entrusting to God's mother and no one else the guard of his lavra; and to this day it stands. Therefore, neither shall we, if our hope and trust are firm in Christ Jesus and in her who bore him, his all-holy mother, depend on walls and enclosures for safety." While he said this to those who were pestering him about the wall before dismissing them, at the same time, seeing St. George's day was at hand and some of the brothers were preparing to go, as was their custom, to the monastery's dependency at Mathaia and to the church there of the said great martyr, the father said to them: "Say to St. George: Unless the horse is found tomorrow, in the monastery, from now on I shall no more celebrate your feast." With these words, and having blessed the brothers, he dismissed them. The next day, the monastery's lost horse, with its pack, was found grazing on the foothills of the mountains and moving towards the monastery. The monk

who had found it caught it and led it in. Seeing this the father said, “Well, St. George has lost no time in giving us back our horse.”

[p. 551]

147. On a solemn holiday, once, some of the brothers did not, as is the custom, join the others at the common table, but ate in their own cells. Learning about this after the brothers had left the table, the father summoned them and, from the top of the column, addressed them cheering their souls with his sweet, mellifluous words—for this was always the father’s way, unless it was impossible—and besides his other exhortations, this too was wafted down for all to hear: “If anyone fail, on feast days, to join the other brothers at table, he is under a curse.”

[p. 552]

150. Some of the brothers pressed the father to give a ruling concerning the strangers who daily turned up at the monastery, to the effect that they stay for three days only and then leave—for his wish was that, however long anyone might wish to stay in the monastery, stay he should and be pushed out by none—they pestered him likewise about [visiting] monks, vagrants in particular, [asking] that they should not eat at the [monks’] table, but in the hospice.⁹ They had asked this a number of times, and insisted, without being able to persuade him, when, all at once, seizing, as they thought, on a good pretext, they approached him and said: “There is trouble over the strangers. The guestmaster does not look after them, either in their service or elsewhere. He takes the legumes from the cellarer for cleaning, and gives them to them. They take them, pick out all that is sound and eat them, leaving whatever is rotten for us. Since you will neither listen to us nor follow the rule of other monasteries, at least listen to Christ himself when he says it is not fair to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs (Matt. 15:26) and [p. 553] make it a rule that they should stay three days and then leave.” When they had said this, the father, pretending to be angry with the guestmaster, sent for him. When he had him fetched: “Is this” says he “how you look after the stranger brothers? You furnish them properly neither with water nor with proper service. Are you unaware that the good care or contempt you mete out to strangers reverts to Christ? Be assured that if, from now on, I learn that a stranger has been grieved by you, you are going to grieve, in no uncertain manner. However, as my fathers insist, let them spend three days [here] and then leave. But it is my wish the monks should share their table. Even if they are poor and vagrants, yet because of the habit they are our brothers, and it is not fitting they should eat with laymen in the hospice.”¹⁰ When the father had spoken the guestmaster bowed deeply and asked forgiveness, and having received it, went away to his work.

[p. 562]

180. I have related all these incidents concerning our fathers and brothers, as I said at the beginning of my narrative, so that “the tree be known by its fruit” (Matt. 12:33) and the master by his disciples. For indeed, looking to his mode of life as to a pattern and picture, or rather, guided and governed by him, they progressed in every virtue.¹¹ A holy emulation was to be seen among them, as, through their ascetic labors, they sped with eager foot along the “narrow and hard way” (Matt. 7:14), striving along it to reach the broad space of eternal felicity. For they were obedient, as has been said, to his godly counsels and instructions, and followed them without swerving, and therefore bore easily the hardships of the ascetic ring. To all those who came to him and chose to make

9. GALESIOS

their abode with him, he taught one thing above all else, making it the preliminary foundation and a favorable starting point for progress and amelioration: that they do not hide their thoughts from him, neither having nor doing anything without his approval, following their own wishes; that they do nothing beyond what is enjoined on them, neither undertaking efforts above their strength, nor binding themselves, in accordance with their own whims, to fasts or vigils or anything else outside the rule of the monastery.¹² “Carry out with all zeal the rule of the monastery, in the church, at table and in everything else; accept thankfully what is given; leave, each of us, the church or the table in silence, our mind full of praise, and go straight to our cell, not clustering together [p. 563] to spend time in idle talk, not sitting drinking and eating together, not leaving our cells out of *akedia*, and going to the cells of others—unless it should be necessary—but rather remaining steadfastly in our own cell. Lest” he would say “leaving our own cells and going off to those of others, we should see or hear or say things we would rather not. For this is what leads to words, in this way we come to judge our brothers and abuse them, till the blinded soul loses her way and strays from the right goal. We give up looking at ourselves to gossip about the faults of others, unable to stop ourselves or recognize our own weakness, we begin bandying insults and quarreling and daily provoking scandals with the brothers.” Such were his daily lessons, spoken privately to particular individuals or addressed to all, and he would add this last word: “Anyone who observes all this with all the might that is in him, and receives gratefully what the monastery supplies at table and for his other needs, and is satisfied with that, I am confident in my Christ that he will have a place beside Antony and the other inspired fathers.”

[p. 563]

182. To those who questioned him about places in church, he replied by saying: “Those who know the Scriptures and stand in the choir to sing are like the reapers in the field, while the ignorant, who cannot read and do not know how to sing, and for that reason stand behind the singers, listening to the chant, are like those who follow behind the reapers and pick up the ears that fall or are overlooked. The reapers,” says he, “frequently collect tares in their fistfuls of wheat, while those who follow pick up nothing but wheat. For it is through those who stand and sing in the choir that the service of the church is celebrated, yet, because sometimes they attend to what they are singing, but at others raise their voice at the wrong moment because they are not paying attention to what they are singing—for this I compared to tares—they do not perform [the service] quite without introducing impurities and stains. While the illiterate, if they stand soberly and attend to what those in the choir are singing—for the accidents referred to do not trouble them, unless they fall asleep because of indifference—even if they do not recognize everything [they hear], yet all they do manage to grasp they hold safe in their mind.” In this way he humbled the pride of the former while strengthening the resolution of the latter to stand patiently and soberly in church.¹³

He further ordered that to those who did not arrive for the service at the beginning of the matins, the cellarer should not supply the portion of wine allotted to them, or even, sometimes, food. Conversely, those he saw eager and persevering in church, standing and singing, he would often praise in the presence of the brothers and favor them, besides which he would on occasion do the opposite for the slackers and the sluggish. He did not do this purposelessly, as you might think, but in order to increase the zeal of the former—for he knew that praise often increases the

zeal of those who are striving for virtue, and also the contrary—and to rouse the others from their laziness and slackness.

[p. 564]

184. To those who questioned him about slackness over hours, he said: “If any monk, except from compelling necessity or some other [overriding] circumstance, takes food before singing his hours, God will reckon it as if he has skinned seven dead donkeys and eaten with unwashed hands.”¹⁴ When some of them asked whether penalties would be exacted for this by God, “Yes,” said he, “unless they confess, for whoever makes a full confession, and receives absolution from him who has received his confession, may be confident that he receives it from God too, so long as he does not fall again into the same faults.” All this the father said to all in general.

185. But for those whose days were absorbed by their offices he framed his exhortations differently, admonishing and instructing them, before all else, to carry out the office entrusted to them honestly and with a will.¹⁵ Next to that he exhorted them “not to disregard hours and other liturgies, but whenever they had a respite to go to the church, in particular for matins, for the holy Eucharist, as well as for the office of lamplighting also of course. But if they have not a break, they should ever have the *trisagion* on their tongue and in their mouth, and if the beginning of any psalm comes into their mind, let them hum it softly with their lips. If they cannot manage even this, at least let them not dispense with mental prayer; and if, during the night a favorable moment should occur, let them rise straight and pay the daytime’s debt, attentive not only to psalm-singing, but to confession with hot tears. For this,” he was in the habit of saying, “is of more use to those in office than chanting.” This was what he frequently practiced himself, for whenever he was distracted by numerous cares throughout the day, so that he could not offer up thoroughly the service he had fixed himself by rule, he used the night to make good the day’s obligations, in particular that of tears, so that during the vigils, while the brothers sang the *polyeleos*, he wept and lamented without interruption.

[p. 565]

187. To outsiders who came to him for his blessing and asking to be given rules and canons for the founding of a monastery where they might collect a brotherhood and lead the spiritual life, this was his exhortation, in everything to display the rule in their own persons to their flock, and not to differ [from them] in food, clothing, or any other necessities for the body in order to preserve, through equality in these matters, the rule of submission unshaken and unhurt. “For through inequality,” says he, “the rule of submission habitually suffers.”¹⁶ He would also warn them not to prefer the more able [brothers] because they were energetic in their offices, and despise the weaker as useless, nor, on the contrary, as sometimes happens, stoop [to the level of] the weaker brothers, and not demand of them all the rigor the monastery requires. So, with these exhortations and suggestions and many more, he dismissed them with his customary blessing; and they, acting on these instructions given them by our holy father, as they put them into practice discovered their value, and by the grace of God stand fast to this day, leading a virtuous life.

[p. 565]

189. When brothers wished to follow the solitary life in preference to that of submission, he would

9. GALESIOS

refuse permission to some while with others he took the opposite course, for, through discernment and much experience, or rather, to speak nearer the truth, in everything he did initiated by the Holy Spirit, he knew exactly in what sphere each one would succeed. That is why numbers who rejected his words and persisted in following their own will realized too late that even their good works performed out of obstinacy had turned, for them, to the opposite.

190. Then there were also the brothers assigned to services away from the monastery. If one of them happened to fall into some fault, and word came to his ears, he did not allow the brother to spend any more time there, but immediately recalled him and sent another. This he did for fear habituation should [make the culprit's fault] [p. 566] totally incurable,¹⁷ as usually happens with long custom.

191. He used to advise and urge all those who practiced a handicraft to pay the profits of their work into the common fund of the brotherhood, and if anyone, from poor health or any other reason, wished to spend part of it on his private needs, if it was one of those who served in church, he first offered to supply the [brother's] needs himself. If he saw that the brother was not content with this, he allowed that he should satisfy his own need from his own work, but in consultation with himself. If he saw him opposed to this too, he left him to follow his own will and do as he liked.

If, however, it was one of those who could not read, he would in no circumstances give permission, unless it was the holder of some office and he had done the work in his moments of leisure. For he said that the church [brothers] have a job to do, service in the church, and something should be allowed them, especially as they received nothing more than was supplied at table. "Whereas you," says he, "who cannot read, there is not the same reason for allowing you anything, since you play no active part in the church, and for the services entrusted to you, you get a little compensation." For his instructions to the cellarer were to supply a little more food and drink to those who had services than to the others. These, however, were the father's rules before moving up to the Holy Resurrection, since at the Savior's and at the Mother of God's [monasteries] it was not like this, but everything belonged to all in common, and no one had any private property in his cell. This would be the rule to this day, but that some of those who have been tonsured in the monastery brought money with them from the world, and would absolutely not give it up, because they could not be satisfied with what the monastery provides.

192. For indeed our holy father exhorted alike all those who came to him, advising them, above all, according to the word of the Lord, to distribute all [they had] and divest themselves of it, and so enter the life of the Cross (cf. Luke 9:23).¹⁸ Some obeyed, and approached the monastic life in this spirit, either distributing [their goods] to the poor or making an offering of them to the father and the monastery. For indeed, if anyone who was giving up the world brought an offering, he accepted it, but certainly did not himself press any to do so, nor ask any gift for the monastery; but anything anyone offered spontaneously, of his own initiative, that he did not reject.¹⁹ Some, however, acting with more "wisdom," supposedly, decided to keep for themselves a part of their money. But they spent it to no good end, and neither their keeping nor their spending of it were well-advised. Others, again, decided to surrender all, but, because they compelled the father to rule that certain comforts be supplied them by the monastery, they too, without realizing it, missed the true

goal. For in this way they introduced no few scandals into the monastery, and drew the others to their ways, for vice excites more envy than virtue, and men find it easier to share the former than the latter.

[p. 567]

196. If [a brother], seeing [the father's] mode of life, was in a hurry to emulate it and imitate it to the best of his ability, or troubled by the affections of the flesh, wished to cope by a rather harsher regimen than that of the monastery, and went to the father to beg permission, he would put him on his guard, and say: "Take a good look, brother, at what you are undertaking; perhaps you will be unable to carry it through. For many have started off and, unable to complete that which they had begun, gone backwards [instead of forwards], losing [the benefit of] their self-willed and premature achievement twice over, because they were not content with what the monastery offered them.²⁰ But those who proceed by the rule of the monastery, treading untroubled the 'royal road' the fathers prescribed,²¹ advancing with discretion and not singularity, do not stumble, for they have not stirred up against themselves the ingenious and multiform malice of the demons, because they proceed in simplicity. For a monk," says he, "must care more for the soul's simplicity and innocence than for physical asceticism. He must shun the company and conversation of the many, in particular the young, being young himself. The enemy has delivered many to perdition this way. That which began as a so-called spiritual friendship, by his contriving has ended in fleshly perdition, so that in them are fulfilled the words of the Apostle: 'Having begun with the spirit, are you now ending with the flesh?' (Gal. 3:3) For this reason, [a brother] not only ought not to frequent these [young persons], he must even, if he can, make his eyes understand they should not gaze fearlessly on such faces, for fear the sower of evil take occasion to implant some wicked thought in his heart. Let him rather keep his eyes lowered and his thoughts to himself, and if ever any such thought spring or stir in his heart, straightaway let him fix his mind on God, and, by straining towards him, refuse from the outset to entertain the pleasant idea of mutual feeling, and at the same time let his tongue sing thus and invoke [God]: 'Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, help me;' 'They have now cast me out and compassed me round about' (Ps. 16 [17]: 11), '[Thou art] my joy; deliver me from them that have compassed me!' (Ps. 31 [32]: 7), 'Draw nigh, O God, to my help' (Ps. 69 [70]: 1), 'Judge them, O Lord, them that injure me' (Ps. 34 [35]: 1). If, when he has prayed in this way, the sinful thought is laid, thanks be to God; but if the obsession and the compulsion are still there, here is an ingenious counter-scheme for scheming against [the Devil's] manifold ingenuity for evil, and escaping the damage that would be incurred by giving in to this thought. Just as it is preferable, they say, when faced with two evils to choose the lesser, so here, diverting one's thoughts to a different [sin] may serve—love of gold or love of praise, or some other such preoccupation. By favoring it and giving it rein, play your mind a little trick and shake off the violent onslaught and assault of the other.

"Yet [the real solution is], rising at dawn, to strive to offer to God the first-fruits and first movements of the mind [in order to] sow the wheat before the enemy can mix his tares with the seed, spending the whole day in physical labor, with a humble mind, to be able to say with the inspired David: 'Look upon my affliction and my trouble, and forgive me all my sins' (Ps. 24 [25]: 18). In the evening, making exact confession of the faults into which he has fallen throughout the day, and, when he lies down on his bed, not letting his mind be lured away through wicked ideas

9. GALESIOS

into unseemly and improper imaginings, but through attentive study of the divine pronouncements checking and collecting himself, and binding himself with the recollection of death, and so sleep.

“Let him have a guard on his thoughts secretly at work, and continuously converse with it, to avoid his wandering thoughts being carried away by emotions. Let him not look for the faults of others, judge, envy, backbite, or listen with pleasure to others backbiting. Let him not return evil for evil, if anyone should wrong him unintentionally, but bear everything magnanimously, willingly forgiving and forgetting any wrong done to him, that he, in return, may be able boldly to say to God: ‘Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us’ (Matt. 6:12).

“He must take care, too, and guard against wounding the conscience of a brother by his assumed spiritual attitudes and practices. He must not be led astray for the sake of filling his stomach, but every day eat as having, once and for all, adopted the rule of the monastery: not [to eat] to satiety; on the contrary, to stop [eating] before the stomach is satisfied. For this was the judgment of the fathers.²² They ruled that, rather than fasting two or three days and then eating one’s fill, it was better to eat every day, but only a little. As for clothes, always the more modest.

“Quite simply, he who truly wishes to be saved should always pursue those things that conduce to humility, simplicity, and innocence, and shun everything that exalts and has a vain name. He who does this and acts in this way, putting all his hope in God and trusting in him as helper and as supplier of all good things, and not in his own efforts and asceticism, easily gets the better of his passions.”

[p. 576]

223. A little while before the father’s death, I went up to him, and he said to me: “I wish, if it is possible, you would not let the brothers come up to me, but stop them. I cannot, in the grip of this sickness, answer each one of them.” When I said: “But the brothers are afraid, father, that you will die suddenly and leave the monastery high and dry, without having either made a will or given any other instructions for the two monasteries,”²³ the father answered: “They have no cause for fear on that score; there will be a rule, and the emperor and the patriarch are going to see it.”²⁴ He said the same to the monk Laurentios, the stylite: “After my demise, you will see the rule, [sealed] with an imperial bull.” And behold, just as our holy father foretold to myself and to the monk Laurentios, so we have it now, sealed with an imperial bull, and the emperor and patriarch saw it and took it in their hands. If there was some trickery and the second took the place of the first born, nonetheless, on that occasion he who was blessed was blessed as first born (cf. Gen. 25:29–34), and in this matter too our holy father’s words were not given the lie.

The brothers went up to the city [of Constantinople], saw the emperor, [and] settled everything satisfactorily.²⁵ For they found the emperor ready to accede to everything, even if earlier he had been irritated against them, because of what the father had written him and sent by the monk Kosmas,²⁶ blaming his unjust and unreasonable acts. . . .²⁷

[p. 585]

246. When the brothers sent by the father, both to the city and elsewhere, returned to the monastery, as the father had instructed them, as already mentioned, he fell straightaway into the sickness that removed him from this life. Eight days before his death he sent for Nicholas, the aforemen-

ELEVENTH CENTURY

tioned scribe, and told him to write out a rule for him. So the brother questioned him and was told all the points he was to note in the rule, went off, wrote it out and brought it back to him. When he had read it out to him, the father was content and said it was good.

But at this point I too must note briefly the essential points of what the father had him write. So it included how the father had left his own country and gone to the Holy Land, and, returning again thanks to God's providence, reached this mountain, ascended it and built the three monasteries on it, gathered monks in them and, up to that date, continued to govern them to the best of his powers. Not only that, but concerning the estates that God sent, [gifts] from such as love Christ, that they should be given to Bessai—for there he directed that there should be a superior—but administered at Galesios. Forty brothers to be at the Holy Resurrection, twelve at the Savior, and twelve at the Mother of God. From among these the superior is to be elected, in consultation with the brothers and with their approval, a man capable of administering the monastery's affairs well. He is to appoint a steward, and entrust to him the whole care for the brothers on the mountain. He is not to be hindered by the Bessai people, nor meet with obstruction in anything he does. However, once a year, at the end of the month of August, the superior is to carry out a check, and if he finds any surplus from the produce of the estates, it shall be collected and carried to Bessai, but if he finds no surplus he shall not harry [the steward] nor demand anything of him so that this should not be the cause of his reducing those settled here to hardship.

It included too [instructions] for the brothers' daily diet, and not only that, but also for the special fare for feast days. Likewise concerning their clothes, footwear, and other needs, and [the duty] of the steward of the day to supply these unflinching to the brothers. "As I have done," says he, "so far."

Later, questioned by the brothers, he said: "The service of the church is to stay as it is, undisturbed. But for my miserable body, drag it away by one foot, and throw it into the ravine to be food for the beasts of the earth and the birds of the sky."

At the end, as usual when making rules, the brother who wrote it out put in the curse of the three hundred and eighteen inspired fathers, and also the bit about whoever should dare to destabilize or transgress even one syllable of this testament meeting our holy and inspired father Lazarus himself, on the fearful Day of Judgment, ready to arraign him at the tribunal of Christ.²⁸

I have written this concerning the rule of our holy father, not pointlessly, so to speak, but in order that we may be able to discover the truth as if we were inquiring of our holy father himself.

But as the illness that had him in its grip prevented him from coming to the window or by any other means taking hold of the rule and signing it, it remained without signature until the day he died. For neither the man who had written it out and kept it in his possession, nor any other of the brothers could or dared force him to sign it, because all still hoped he would live. For which of us expected to see his death? Even after he died it seemed unbelievable to many, although they saw him lying before their eyes.

247. As some of the brothers were talking about the [p. 586] estates, that they should be administered at Bessai, the father answered: "No, everything that lies inside the ridge dividing the two monasteries is to be administered here.²⁹ As I said before, the superior is empowered to take and remove from here only what he shall find in excess in his yearly check on the steward, and nothing more. As for the Pausolype monastery, it is self-governing and owns the estate of the Eoptine, as

9. GALESIOS

you all well know. God who approved the founding of that monastery, being good, foresaw and provided the means for it to be self-sufficient and self-governing.”

When the brother Kyrillos said: “You have been very generous with our food and comforts in writing the rule. I do not know, I am at a loss to imagine, where we are going to find it all so easily.” The brother said this because of the shortage, even of necessities, and scarcity [of everything] prevailing at that time in the monastery, and because no one expected that after his death it would survive. So, when he said this, the father answered: “I trust in my Christ that if you do as I have instructed you, everything will be yours in abundance.” Questioned about a superior, he answered: “Whoever God wills, do you appoint.”³⁰ So much for these matters.

[p. 587]

250. That was the state the brothers were in, when the father slowly half-opened his eyes and looked at them. On seeing this, the brothers began one after another to call out in a loud voice: “Absolve us, father.” On hearing this cry from them, the father, raising his right hand a little, and with a matching movement of his lips, gave each one absolution. When they also brought the rule for him to sign, as he was incapable of taking it in his hands and signing, brother Kyrillos—for he too was inside the column—putting the pen in the father’s hand and guiding the slight movement the father imparted to it, signed.³¹

He remained thus till the second hour, as if half asleep, then, after partaking of the sacred mysteries—for one of the priests among the brothers had celebrated the sacred mystagogy in the right hand side of the narthex—as in an untroubled and peaceful sleep, he surrendered his saintly soul to the Lord by the hand of holy angels, falling asleep and sleeping the same sleep that all the saints know, of eternal rest in Christ.

Notes on the Translation

Editors’ note: The assistance of our translator, Patricia Karlin-Hayter [PKH], is gratefully acknowledged for the notes to this document.

1. *schema*: both the monastic habit and the monastic life. The habit is the symbol of the life, and interference between the two meanings often makes adequate translation impossible. Cf. Theodore the Studite, *Ep.* 1.10, *PG* 99, col. 941C. [PKH]
2. For the two classes of monastic habit, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [12], which condemns the distinction, but cf. (4) *Stoudios* [A2] which accepts the distinction without comment, as does (27) *Kecharitomene* [30].
3. The opposite, rigorist position returns to favor much later with (36) *Blemmydes* [13]; cf. (55) *Athanasios I* [4].
4. *diakrisis*, meaning something special to eat, and specifically, a good meal, see P. Karlin-Hayter, “Lexicographical Notes,” pp. 589–90; cf. (10) *Eleousa* [13]. Typically, outside benefactors were expected to provide such “treats”; see (22) *Evergetis* [10] and related Evergetian documents.
5. Agents of the metropolitan of Ephesos.
6. *logismoi*: thoughts, mental processes, etc., in particular “good thoughts” and “bad thoughts.” Here Lazarus is somewhat elliptically referring to the confession of the latter, normally made to the superior. [PKH]
7. For some examples of walls erected around monasteries, see (24) *Christodoulos* [A12], (27) *Kecharitomene* [73], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [101], and (33) *Heliou Bomon*, Prologue; the foundation for which (7) *Latros* was written was also enclosed by a circuit wall.

ELEVENTH CENTURY

8. This vision is in fact not found in Cyril of Skythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, ed. Ed. Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig, 1939).
9. The three-day limit on hospitality is found also in (21) *Roidion* [B2] and (34) *Machairas* [118]; perhaps Lazarus was influenced by the more generous seven days' hospitality at the Monastery of St. Sabas, testified to later in (42) *Sabas* [8].
10. Note the special obligation to feed supplicant monks more generously than ordinary beggars that is assumed in (32) *Mamas* [13] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [13].
11. Cf. the Basilian *Sermo asceticus II*, PG 31, col. 884B; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [30], cf. (30) *Phoberos* [3] and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [9].
12. For two differing views on this problem from other eleventh-century documents, see (23) *Pakourianos* [15], which like Lazarus is critical of self-imposed ascetic practices, and (20) *Black Mountain* [72], which encourages them.
13. Cf. the treatment of this issue under the monastic reform in (22) *Evergetis* [33].
14. For later exhortations not to neglect the performance of the office, see (32) *Mamas* [21], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [21], (34) *Machairas* [49], and (55) *Athanasios I* [4].
15. See also (31) *Areia* [T7].
16. Cf. the Basilian *Sermo asceticus I*, PG 31, col. 885A; (56) *Kellibara II* [3]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [83].
17. The text presents a lacuna; it should be filled in the following sense: *hina me chronisas ho eis to pathos empeptokos, to ptoma poioie pante aniaton . . .* [PKH]
18. That is, the monastic life, also called "the angelic life," etc., cf. [130]. [PKH]
19. Lazarus' distinction between compulsory and voluntary entrance gifts anticipates that made later by the reform movement, above all in (22) *Evergetis* [37].
20. The object of the self-imposed ascetic observances here is not, as in [180], a rejection of the official diet, but rather of the monastery's prescribed spiritual exercises. [PKH]
21. Ps.-Basil of Caesarea, *Constitutiones asceticae*, 4.2, PG 31, col. 1349B.
22. Cf. the treatment of diet and clothing in Basil, *Regulae fusius tractatae* 19 ([LR 19]), 22 ([LR 22]), PG 31, cols. 968–69, 977–81; *Regulae brevius tractatae* 210 ([SR 210]), PG 31, cols. 1221–24.
23. The two foundations, the imperial monastery of Bessai and the three Galesiote monasteries, are meant here and below in [247].
24. The reference is to Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) and Patriarch Michael Keroullarios (1043–58).
25. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 922, with discussion by Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 246, n. 3.
26. See *Vita*, chap. 230, ed. Delehaye, *Acta*, p. 579; the emperor's reply is Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 855; see discussion in Delehaye, *Stylites*, p. cxv.
27. Part of [245] has been omitted here in our translation.
28. For curses of this sort in other eleventh-century documents, see (8) *John Xenos* [2], (10) *Eleousa* [19], (18) *Nea Gephyra* [4], (19) *Attaleiates* [18], (22) *Evergetis* [12], and (24) *Christodoulos* [B14].
29. See the discussion in Malamut, "Bessai," pp. 245–47.
30. Lazarus' indifference to the choice of his successor is unusual, but in fact his younger brother Ignatios was chosen for the office after the founder's death.
31. Kazhdan, "Ideals," p. 476, with n. 16, and "Lazarus," p. 1198, reports that the unpublished Ms. Moscow, Hist. Mus. 369/353, fol. 220, explicitly states that Lazarus had died before signing the *Testament*.