

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

10. *Eleousa: Rule of Manuel, Bishop of Stroumitza,
for the Monastery of the Mother of God Eleousa*

Date: 1085–1106¹

Translator: Anastasius Bandy

Edition employed: Louis Petit, “Le Monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine,” *IRAIK* 6 (1900), 1–153, with text at 69–93 and commentary at 94–114. Photoreproduction of the text in Petar Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa: Manastir Sv. Bogorodica Milostiva vo seloto Veljusa kraj Strumica* (Skopje, 1981), pp. 258–72.

Manuscript: Parisinus, supplément grec 1222 (19th c.)²

Other translations: Macedonian, by Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 258–72.

Institutional History

A. Foundation of the Monastery by Manuel, Bishop of Stroumitza

As we learn [1] from the *Rule* itself, the author Manuel was once a monk at the famous monastery of St. Auxentios near Chalcedon. After he became bishop of Stroumitza (ancient Tiberiupolis) on the empire’s Balkan frontier, he resolved to found a monastery dedicated to the Mother of God *Eleousa* (of Mercy)³ on property that he purchased [3] with his own money (an important detail) in his diocese at Palaiokastron. The monastery’s church still stands in the village of Veljusa (a corruption of *Eleousa*) near Strumica in the southeastern corner of what is now the newly independent Republic of Macedonia. There is a donor’s inscription over the principal door to the church that records Manuel’s construction of the building “from the foundations” and is datable to 1080.⁴

B. Patronage by Alexios I Komnenos

Although he was at best a reluctant follower of the monastic reform movement (for which see below, Chapter Four) that was just then beginning to introduce profound changes in the attitudes of contemporary patrons towards their religious foundations, Manuel took the precaution of obtaining from Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) a chrysobull that granted his foundation exemption from all public charges and independence from both civil and religious authorities.⁵ This document, dated to July 1085, is still extant as part of *Eleousa*’s cartulary. It also grants *Eleousa* the coveted status of a self-governing (*autodespotos*), independent (*autexousia*), and free (*eleuthera*) foundation. The composition of the *Rule*, which bears no date, may have followed shortly thereafter, but surely before Alexios’ second chrysobull of August 1106.⁶ A visit by the emperor to *Eleousa* while on a campaign against the Serbians made him aware of the extreme indigence of its monks and prompted the issuance of this second chrysobull that grants the monastery twelve peasants (*paroikoi*), freed of all fiscal obligations, to help them cultivate their land.

ELEVENTH CENTURY

The monk Clement, one of Manuel's successors as bishop of Stroumitza, subscribed to the rescript⁷ that orders the registration and delivery of this chrysobull. This same bishop attests to the accuracy of the copy of Manuel's *Rule* which has assured that document's preservation.

C. Patronage by John II Komnenos and Manuel I Komnenos

Alexios' son and successor John II Komnenos (1118–1143) also issued a decree (*prostagma*) for *Eleousa*,⁸ but according to a scribal note in the cartulary it was lost during the era of Latin rule (i.e., after 1204). Several documents issued by John's son Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180) in favor of *Eleousa* are preserved however, including a rescript (*epilysis*) of January 1152 inserted in a *praktikon* of Michael Tzankitzakes, an imperial official responsible for investigating complaints by *Eleousa*'s superior Dionysios that the monastery's peasants had been unjustly registered on the tax rolls.⁹ Manuel's rescript also forbids Clement, the bishop of Stroumitza, from entering the monastery, citing not only his predecessors' chrysobulls but also *Eleousa*'s *typikon*. Whether this individual was the same bishop who had previously authenticated Manuel's *Rule* or not, it appears that he was unreconciled to *Eleousa*'s institutional independence. Four years later, in an effort to assure that *Eleousa* did not again lose the services of its assigned peasants, Manuel issued an ordinance in May 1156 declaring their status to be hereditary.¹⁰ In 1159, the emperor confirmed the monastery in all of its privileges.¹¹ Finally, by a decree (*prostaxis*) of May 1160, Manuel awarded *Eleousa* an annual income of thirty *nomismata* from the local tax revenues.¹²

Eleousa then stood in an enviable position in the second half of the twelfth century. With imperial assistance, the monastery had fended off an attempt by the local bishop to compromise its autonomy, recovered its peasant cultivators with a re-establishment of their tax-exempt status, and secured a modest imperial subsidy as well.

D. Eleousa in the Thirteenth Century

The foundation appears to have fared less well during the disruptions that accompanied the fall of the Byzantine Empire to the Latin crusaders after 1204, though documentation for this crucial period is relatively scarce. The monastery's inventory, (61) *Eleousa Inv.*, drawn up much later in the fifteenth century, refers [4] to several lost documents, including a judicial decision of John Komnenos, archbishop of Bulgaria (Ochrid), recognizing the foundation's independence, and a chrysobull of the Nicaean Emperor John III Doukas Vatatzes (1222–1254). As another Balkan foundation, the Rila monastery, was to do in the fifteenth century, *Eleousa* sought out a protective relationship with an Athonite monastery, in this case the Iveron monastery.¹³

The date at which *Eleousa* formally became a dependency (*metochion*) of Iveron is not known, but it must have occurred before 1250, when the Nicaean Patriarch Manuel II (1244–1255) sat with his synod to decide a dispute between Iveron, represented by its superior Nicholas, and the diocese of Stroumitza, represented by the bishop Michael, over their respective rights in *Eleousa*.¹⁴ In support of his position, Nicholas brought forth chrysobulls of Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–1081), Alexios Komnenos, and the Bulgarian king John Asen II (1218–1241); of these, only the chrysobull of Alexios (possibly that of July 1085 mentioned above) is otherwise attested. The synod's decision, said to be in conformity with these documents, grants ownership (*somatike despoiteia*) to Iveron but reserves correction of spiritual faults, commemoration (*mnemosynon*),

10. ELEOUSA

and an ecclesiastical tax on monasteries (the *kanonikon*) to the bishopric of Stroumitza. Thus the monastery of Iveron was apparently unsuccessful in maintaining *Eleousa*'s independence of the local bishop, for the rights accorded Stroumitza considerably exceed those conceded [16] by the founder Manuel in the *Rule* translated below.

E. Subsequent History of Eleousa Down to Modern Times

At present, little is known about the history of the foundation from the fourteenth century down to modern times. After sixty years of Serbian rule (1334–94), the area around Stroumitza became part of the Ottoman Empire in 1394. The monastery's inventory, (61) *Eleousa Inv.*, was produced in 1449 and authenticated by Clement, the contemporary bishop of Stroumitza. *Eleousa*'s formal association as a dependency of the Iveron monastery continued until 1913, when, after the Balkan Wars of 1912–13, the area around Stroumitza came under Serbian administration. Restoration of the church was carried out in 1968–69, and the structure still stands on a hill over the village of Veljusa in Macedonia.¹⁵

F. Architectural Evidence from the Site

Architectural investigation of the church shows that the structure dates mostly from the original foundation in 1080.¹⁶ The frescoes of the choir, the naos, the narthex, and the small south chapel (laid out just like the main church on a small scale) are thought to date from the late eleventh century. A masonry tomb, probably that of the founder Manuel, was found in the south arcosolium of the narthex; there are other tombs dating from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries in the church's southern portico. There were renovations and additions in the second half of the twelfth century, when the frescoes of the south portico and other parts of the exonarthex were executed. Some reconstructed parts of the exonarthex were decorated with other frescoes in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The naos of the church was repainted in the nineteenth century and a donor's portrait of the founder Manuel, possibly based on a now lost original composition found over his tomb in the south arcosolium of the narthex, was painted on the west facade of the exonarthex.¹⁷

Analysis

This document employs several traditional elements seen in earlier documents, such as the author's reflection on death [1] shared with (5) *Euthymios* [3], (6) *Rila* [2], and (7) *Latros*, the profession of faith shared with (3) *Theodore Studites* and (7) *Latros* [1], [2], [3], the foundation history [3] shared with (6) *Rila* [1] and (9) *Galesios* [246], and the concluding injunction [22] to preserve his commands unaltered shared with (3) *Theodore Studites* [24], (5) *Euthymios* [2], (6) *Rila* [5], (8) *John Xenos* [3], and (9) *Galesios* [246]. By expanding its scope beyond these traditional elements to include disciplinary regulations and certain constitutional provisions, this *Rule* continues the trend observable in some of these earlier documents¹⁸ of the steady evolution of the genre into a form recognizable as the medieval Byzantine *typikon*.

Reflecting the growing cult of the Mother of God—paralleled at this time in the medieval West—Manuel named his foundation in her honor. In Byzantium this was a phenomenon of the eleventh century—witness the dedications of the foundations for which (8) *John Xenos*, (21) *Roidion*, (22) *Evergetis*, and (23) *Pakourianos* were written, as well as one of the monasteries

included in (9) *Galesios* [246]—and continued with varying degrees of enthusiasm down to the end of the empire. Her feast day was the occasion [13] for a festal meal and what was becoming (in contrast to the late antique monastic traditions) increasingly token, ritualistic charity.

In its administrative conventions, this is a conservative document, generally reflecting the usages of traditional private religious foundations. In ideological terms, however, (10) *Eleousa* is more in tune with the progressive sentiments of its contemporaries, championing the cenobitic life, endorsing the notion of monastic equality, and eliminating the monks' ownership of private property.

A. *Lives of the Monks*

As in (4) *Stoudios*, the regulation of liturgical services and diet [13] (but with exceptions for old and sick monks) are major concerns of our author. This foundation was like many reform monasteries in emphasizing the priority of various liturgical duties, especially performance of the office, over all other pursuits. Perhaps this predisposition to emphasize the spiritual life may have been related to an unwillingness to tolerate the pursuit of private crafts to which many of the monks at Lazarus the Galesiote's Resurrection monastery were devoted in (9) *Galesios* [191], [192].

Manuel's decision to restrict [5] the personal property of his monks to "their beddings and clothes and holy icons for worship" shows the founder aligning himself with the contemporary monastic reform tradition on an important point of controversy (cf. (9) *Galesios* [192] and (22) *Evergetis* [22]). This reflects the author's partiality to the cenobitic life, an outlook he shared with the reformers. Manuel has even absorbed and endorsed the added refinement of allowing [4] no differences in the food and drink served to his monks (so also (22) *Evergetis* [26]).

Unlike the monastic traditions of late antiquity, which welcomed youths into monastic communities both as postulants and in some cases (as in the Basilian tradition) as students, as early as (3) *Theodore Studites* [18], founders of monasteries in medieval Byzantium had been hostile to them. Manuel professes to share this hostility [17], yet, like the author of a contemporary document, (23) *Pakourianos* [31], he provides for the maintenance of youths in a monastic dependency preparatory to their admission to the monastery on reaching adulthood. He also pairs [3] older and younger monks in cells, apparently without fears for sexual misconduct.

B. *Constitutional Matters*

1. Private Ownership with an Independent Constitution

As we have seen, Manuel took the precaution in 1085 of obtaining [18] an imperial chrysobull from Alexios Komnenos to secure his foundation's title to being an independent monastery, yet what this *Rule* describes is in all essentials a traditional private religious foundation. The author is careful to note [3] that he bought the land on which the monastery stands, then built it, as founders liked to boast, "from its very foundations." In the discussion [11] of the lifetime rights (*pronomia*) of the monk Elias, his designated successor as superior, Manuel pointedly turns over the monastery held in "private ownership" (*idioktetos*) with all of its possessions. These rights include Elias' irremovability (either by an outsider or by one of Manuel's relatives), free use of the foundation's possessions "by his own will and absolute rule," tonsuring of whomever he chooses, and expulsion, after warnings, of factious and disobedient monks.

As usual for a foundation of this type, Manuel recognizes the possibility [11] that his secular relatives will make property claims against the institution, and attempts to foreclose it. Also, while explicitly denying [16] the inheritance of his patronal rights by Elias' successors, Manuel nevertheless permits them to expel an incorrigible monk, even one of his own blood relatives, thereby implicitly ranking good order over familial privilege.

Along with many of his contemporaries, both those who were reform-minded like the author of (23) *Pakourianos* [3], and those who were not, like the author of (19) *Attaleiates* [8], Manuel needed to preserve his foundation from the threat posed by the *charistike*. This surely was the reason why he was so fearful of the consequences of interference by his episcopal successors, motivating his declaration [18], (cf. [21]) of the foundation's independence. Manuel had only a very limited grasp of the broad implications of institutional independence, however, and in practical terms the monastery's independent constitution was to have no internal administrative significance until the end of Elias' upcoming tenure as superior. That Manuel should have chosen an independent constitution anyway does show the burgeoning prestige of the contemporary concept of the "independent and autonomous" monastery (for which see the discussion below in Chapter Four).

2. Election of the Superior

The unsuitability of the family as a dependable intergenerational vehicle for the administration of private religious foundations had been increasingly clear to benefactors since the tenth century.¹⁹ Therefore, procedures for the internal election of a new superior became an important topic of regulation. Manuel discusses both the desired qualifications for Elias' successor [15] and also procedures [16] for his selection and installation. He envisions a choice by the current superior "and the preeminent monks" (who were to play an increasingly important administrative role in reform monasteries), with "the knowledge and approval of all the rest of the brothers." His statement that he has chosen Elias as superior, "a member of your select group [of monks] and not an alien one" [11], shows a further sensitivity to reform ideas (cf. (14) *Ath. Typikon* [20] ff.) heightened by fear of the *charistike*.

3. Removal of an Unworthy Superior

Like some of his reformist contemporaries, such as the author of (22) *Evergetis* [14], Manuel was willing to contemplate the removal of an unworthy superior. The grounds for deposition included [16] appropriation of the monastery's property and "annoying" the monks by setting aside the founder's regulations. The mechanism prescribed for deposition of the superior is unfortunately lost in a lacuna in the text, but may have relied on the same "preeminent monks" whom he has designated for the selection of the superior.

4. Style of Rule

The authoritarian style of rule favored in practice if not in theory by Theodore the Studite came naturally to our author, but Manuel does caution [12] his successor Elias not to be too severe in punishment: "whip them not with a strap and rod but with a spiritual penalty" (cf. punishment by confinement mentioned in (4) *Stoudios* [25] and (11) *Ath. Rule* [19]). Moreover, his successor was not to be too ready to use his right of expulsion. Nevertheless this document suggests what the implications of the "absolute rule" to which Elias was entitled [11] might be in another private monastery.

C. Financial Matters

1. Size Limitation

With the decline in the importance of manual labor, which is nowhere mentioned in this document, the ability of foundations like Manuel's to support monks became directly linked to the productivity of their endowments. Thus we see a new feature, size limitations [3] on the number of monks (initially here only 10), which will be increasingly common for these sorts of foundations. As the subsequent history of this foundation makes clear, it proved difficult to support even this small number of monks without significant assistance from the emperors in the course of the twelfth century (see above, Institutional History).

2. No Inventory

Readily dispensing with canon law²⁰ when he thought its requirements to be irksome, Manuel orders [18] that no inventory of the monastery's possessions is to be drawn up, an example of his almost petulantly stubborn insistence on patronal prerogatives. There was, however, to be an examination of these possessions in the presence of Manuel's relatives, perhaps so that they could be assured that these valuables in which they too had a vested interest had not been secretly alienated. Manuel's injunction is doubtless one reason why no inventory was drawn up for this monastery until the fifteenth century (see (61) *Eleousa Inv.*).

D. External Relations

A bishop himself, Manuel is ambivalent [18] about endorsing the canonical prerogatives of his successors in the see of Stroumitza over his foundation. He allows [16] the monks to take a newly elected superior to the local bishop to receive a blessing (*sphragis*) in exchange for a cash gift, but the bishop was not to assume entitlement to any patronal rights from this concession. Manuel, however, provides no role for the bishop in the actual election of the monastery's superior.

Notes on the Introduction

1. For the dating of this document, see Petit, "Monastère," p. 15; the dates proposed are those of the two chrysobulls of Alexios I Komnenos, the first of which our author refers to in [18] while one of his episcopal successors is a witness to the rescript accompanying the latter. In view of the document's traditional approach to the foundation's governance, a date in the eleventh century is to be preferred.
2. Petit's edition is based only on a transcription made before 1865 by Emmanuel Miller of a manuscript in the Iveron monastery that itself appears to be a medieval copy of the official authenticated copy (the *isotypon*) of the original *Rule*; see Volk, *Gesundheitswesen*, p. 105, n. 232. Petit, "Monastère," p. 2, supposed that the Iveron manuscript, of which he had seen only photographs sent to him by Theodor Uspensky, was of the fifteenth century. Papageorgiu, "Dokumenten," p. 70, considered the Miller transcription to be of poor quality. If the Iveron manuscript is still available, a critical edition would be most welcome.
3. For the iconography of the Mother of God *Eleousa*, see Petit, "Monastère," 48–50.
4. See Petit, "Monastère," p. 6; Miljković-Peppek, *Veljusa*, pp. 32–33, with text at p. 253.
5. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1124, ed. Petit, "Monastère," doc. 1, pp. 25–27, and reproduced in Miljković-Peppek, *Veljusa*, pp. 253–55; see discussion by Laurent, "Recherches," p. 9, Miljković-Peppek, pp. 33–34, and Petit, p. 8.
6. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1231, ed. Petit, "Monastère," doc. 2, pp. 28–30, and reproduced in Miljković-

10. ELEOUSA

- Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 256–58; see discussion by Miljković-Pepek, pp. 34–36, and Petit, p. 9.
7. Ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 3, p. 30, with discussion, p. 9.
 8. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1328; cf. discussion by Petit, “Monastère,” p. 9.
 9. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1385, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 4, p. 31 = *Praktikon*, doc. 8, pp. 36–37, reproduced by Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 275–76; see discussion by Miljković-Pepek, pp. 48–52, and Petit, pp. 9–11.
 10. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1409, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 6, pp. 32–33, reproduced by Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, p. 281; see discussion of this and the following two documents by Miljković-Pepek, pp. 56–64, and Petit, pp. 12–13.
 11. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1337, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 7, p. 33, reproduced by Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, p. 282. Although technically this document can be dated to either 1144 or 1159, only the latter date fits the context of events at *Eleousa*.
 12. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1437, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 5, pp. 31–32, reproduced by Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 282–83.
 13. See discussions in Laurent, “Recherches,” pp. 12–13; Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 64–75; and Petit, “Monastère,” p. 14.
 14. Laurent, *Regestes*, no. 1312; ed. Laurent, “Recherches,” pp. 23–27, with discussion, pp. 5–7, 23.
 15. For the modern history of *Eleousa*, see Angelopoulos, *Boreios Makedonia*; Pandevski and Stoev-Trnkata, *Strumica*; Volk, *Gesundheitswesen*, p. 108.
 16. The architectural survey is based on Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, pp. 109–22, with French summary, p. 310; Babić, *Chapelles*, p. 94; for architectural plans, see Tatić, “Dva ostatka,” pp. 88–95.
 17. See Miljković-Pepek, *Veljusa*, Fig. 74; cf. Ill. 36.
 18. Particularly (3) *Theodore Studites*, (6) *John of Rila*, (7) *Latros*, and (9) *Galesios* [246].
 19. See the extended discussion in Nikephoros Phokas, *Novella de monasteriis* (*JGR* 3.292–96 = Zepos, *Jus* 1.249–52); for awareness of the problem among Manuel’s contemporaries, see (19) *Attaleiates* [10], [13], [43]; (23) *Pakourianos* [18].
 20. For the canonical requirement of an inventory, see *C. Const. I et II*, c. 1 (R&P 2.648–49).

Bibliography

- Angelopoulos, Athanasios, *Boreios Makedonia. Ho Hellenismos tes Stromnitses: Topographia, historia, ekklesia, paideia, ethnike kai koinotike zoe* (Thessalonike, 1980).
- Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 646.
- Babić, Gordana, *Les chapelles annexes des églises byzantines: Fonction liturgique et programme iconographique* (Paris, 1969).
- Laurent, Vitalien, “Recherches sur l’histoire et le cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Pitié à Stroumitsa,” *EO* 33 (1934), 5–27.
- Miljković-Pepek, Petar, *Veljusa: Manastir Sv. Bogorodica Milostiva vo seloto Veljusa kraj Strumica* (Skopje, 1981).
- Pandevski, Manol, and Stoev-Trnkata, Gorgi, *Strumica i strumichko niz istorijata* (Strumica, 1969).
- Papageorgiu, P. N., “Zu den Dokumenten des Gottesmutter-Klosters in Makedonien,” *BZ* 11 (1902), 70–73.
- Talbot, Alice-Mary, “Veljusa Monastery,” *ODB*, p. 2157.
- Tatić, Zharko, “Dva ostatka vizantiske arhitekture u strumichkom kraju,” *Glasnik Skopskog Nauchnog Drushtva* 3 (1928), 83–96.
- Volk, Robert, *Gesundheitswesen und Wohltätigkeit im Spiegel der byzantinischen Klostertypika* (Munich, 1983), pp. 105–8.

Translation

[This is] the copy of the Rule of our most holy father, Manuel, monk and founder of the monastery of the supremely holy Mother of God, the Merciful, which has been established in the theme of Stroumitza and in the village called Ano Palaiokastron.

1. Truly “the life of human beings is a shadow” (I Chron. 29:15; Job 8:9), as the saying goes. This has not resulted without cause. For since after the transgression and that curse which was transmitted to us, we have come under the dominance of time, as condemned we have both fallen into corruption and have surely had to proceed towards non-existence. For this reason, in fact, we must consider the dissolution of the body and make a continuous study of death, which, inasmuch as it belongs to “the highest and more noble pursuit of knowledge” (cf. Col. 3:2), is in reality honest and certain. We must carefully consider that unbribable examination, yea, indeed, “the unbiased judgment of God” (cf. I Pet. 1:17), too, which is severe and shuddering to those who have been condemned, and besides also the continuous and inevitable punishments after such a judgment. According to the statement of [Gregory] the Theologian,¹ we must not continually be engrossed by things that are seen and to be beguiled by their spells. [p. 70] Therefore, because I consider these things to be such as I have distinctly stated, I, Manuel, the least monk and bishop of Tiberiopolis, that is, Stroumitza, having been one of the congregation of monks in the venerable monastery of Saint Auxentios² and having long ago pursued for some time the ascetic course in this monastery and having absorbed the good milk of the solitary way of life as best I could, being terrified at the sickle of excision, namely death, and expecting it, moreover, every hour, and pondering that undeceivable judgment seat before which I am going to stand, “seized by the neck” (cf. Heb. 4:13), in order that I may be asked for reasons for the deeds that I have done, having my mind sound and my body by God’s grace healthy and free of any illness whatsoever, have decided that I must set in order the matters that concern me, which, indeed, I set in order as follows.

2. “I believe in one God, all-sovereign . . .” and so forth (for, in fact, I must begin from the very One from whom all of us have had our beginning and towards whom we are led by means of the most beautiful mode of life; for it is actually faith which truly achieves everything). “I profess one baptism for forgiveness of sins. I expect the resurrection of the dead and the life of the future age. Amen.” (cf. *Symbolum Nicaenoconstantinopolitanum*) I so think with unwavering and unequivocal resolve. I so profess and declare wholeheartedly. I so profess and proclaim with a clear voice, being both united and “joined together” (cf. Eph. 2:21; 4:16) to the God-chosen society of the Church of the faithful in accordance with the traditions of the God-inspired fathers. I agree also with their divinely wise teachings and dogmas that have been enunciated and ratified on behalf of this our Christian orthodox faith in the seven holy and ecumenical councils; and avoid the accursed and profane tenets and propositions alike of the heretics who accuse the Christian faith which have been anathematized by the same divine fathers in these [councils]. I loathe them for being different in character from this our undefiled faith. As if they were pestilential and Arabian wolves, [p. 71] not only do I turn away from the inventors of such propositions and tenets as well, and stigmatize them as heretics, but I also subject to a curse the newly appearing teachings and tenets that are introduced by them, and, since they are spurious, I detach and separate them from

10. ELEOUSA

our holy and apostolic church and its God-established tradition. Holding fast to this most noble “trust” (I Tim. 6:20, II Tim. 1:14) of the faith in such manner as I have shown, I pray that I may keep possessing it as “a firm anchor” (Heb. 6:19) in the present age, and that in the extended and future one (in which idle reasoning and movement of mind as well as thought that occur to us with our cooperation, that is, and approval will be weighed by God, who is unbiased, at his undeceivable and shuddering judgment-seat). I may be enriched with it as a defender and “helper who cannot be shamed” (cf. II Tim. 2:15) and an advocate and most valiant protector against my bitter accusers and auditors alike, as the saying goes. Furthermore, [I pray that my faith may be] also a passport and an indestructible bridge to the future life, which does not perish but is truly permanent if, indeed, I am not deceived in my hope. However, I have this [hope] in the Lord firm and unbroken. My account has in summary sufficiently discussed this concerning, that is, both my resolve and declaration regarding the undefiled orthodox Christian faith.

3. Regarding, however, my newly acquired monastery, which I built from its very foundations, bearing the name of the Mother of God, who pities me (for, in fact, this [monastery] has had the good fortune to bear this name), my writing will discuss more at length and also at the same time more leisurely and will clarify more distinctly both my wish and desire for this [monastery]. For, after I had, in fact, purchased with my own money the place for this monastery, which was formerly a fallen mass of debris and useless and happened to be in the theme of Stroumitza and was situated at Palaiokastron, and had brought it round with boundless expenditures to the condition that is seen at the present time, I dedicated it as both a useful and useless dedication to the Mother of God inasmuch as I had erected on it a very beautiful church for her and [p. 72] a worthy dwelling place for one such as she, even though the Divine Spirit “does not dwell in temples made with hands” (Acts 7:48. 17:24; cf. Heb. 9:11, 24) but rather in the tabernacle in us, I mean the soul’s substance (for how can that which has no visible shape [dwell] in things that have visible shape and that which is without shape and form [dwell] in material [objects] with concrete form?). But since it is truly estimated by faith and disposition, it is perceived as casting a shadow upon the divine churches and through them it sanctifies us by its invisible overshadowings and transmissions, inasmuch as we subject ourselves to it through our divine and glory-ascribing gatherings and hymns. Thereafter I also tonsured monks who were attested for their wisdom and virtue and had their calling assured by their deeds, and I “settled them together” (cf. Ps. 132 [133]:1) in the same monastery, according to the Psalmist, partly to send up to the Mother of God the hymn of glory at the assigned times and partly, in addition to these supplicatory prayers, to utter also propitiatory words on my behalf.

4. I prescribe that there be no difference in respect of foods in the case of those men who live by a cenobitic manner of life, and that they not thereby destroy the cenobitic manner of life, but that all of them gratefully share equally in the same foods and drinks alike. For a really cenobitic manner of life is this: that it not admit of any difference and diversity in the case of some, but that even he who holds the office of superior share and be reckoned as one of those who sit for the partaking of things that are brought to the table, or rather be one who is both “an example” (I Pet. 2:21) and model of the true and first shepherd, Christ our God, and “a servant” (Luke 22:26), in accordance

with the statement of the Lord himself, and that he be eager to be considered as being “all things to all men” (I Cor. 9:22) the brothers in order that he may gain and save them and be rather by his deeds “a shepherd and not a hireling” (Cf. Mark 1:20; John 10:11–12).

5. I prescribe that the monks who are going to spend their lives in this monastery of the Mother of God, who pities me, be ten in number (if, however, through the wholly pure intercessions of the Mother of God the affairs of the monastery progress well, then the number of the monks shall grow), having in their cells only [p. 73] their bedding and clothes and holy icons for worship and at the same time affirmation of our undefiled and divine Christian faith and nothing else at all. For how will those who are eager to appropriate to themselves that which is shared in common and who intensely strive towards diversity and difference be called members of a cenobitic community and practitioners of the solitary life if they reckon that “mine” and “yours” ought to be preferred to that which is shared in common? [For these are] the words which cool and break down into members and parts the things that are well-joined together and at the same time tear them asunder and also cause and produce difference and separation in many things.³ [I prescribe] also that they “submit to the superior” (Heb. 13:17) of the monastery respectfully in all matters and not prefer their will to his command, but that they be obedient to him as to a father, in accordance with their truly more divine regeneration [in the monastic life], taking the place of a son. I also prescribe that two monks dwell in each cell, namely an elderly one and a young one, in order that the young one may be remolded by the traits of the elderly one and display “the wisdom of old age” (cf. Wis. 4:9) in youth.

6. When all the monks enter the divine church itself of the Mother of God at the time of the doxology and are going to perform the appointed office, I both wish and desire that this be performed by them with undistracted and intense eagerness, as I distinctly state in my *typikon*, and that they stand together at the time of matins in the narthex of this divine church.

For, in fact, according to the divine prophet, “what else is so pleasant as for brothers to dwell together?” (Ps. 132 [133]:5). For thus, precisely because I settled in the monastery of the Mother of God men who are of such disposition as to lead a solitary life, I myself, too, will likely be reckoned blessed, in accordance with the statement of the same prophet (cf. Ps. 83 [84]:5). Let them perform not only the midnight services and alone speak to God alone with undistracted resolve, but let them also complete in this manner the entire nightly office without fail.

After the completion of these services let them again begin the *trisagion* [p. 74] (the really best and timeless beginning, the one “towards which every activity of serious import tends,”⁴ as the saying goes), and let them offer a propitiatory prayer on behalf of the permanence of our most mighty emperors. Next I want [the members of] my flock to collect their souls’ senses away from external disturbances and distractions and, with steadfast concentration, to utter in this manner with guileless (to state it thus) and honest voice the verses, “Come, let us worship” and then to sing the divine nineteenth psalm, “The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble,” and going back again to the very good beginning, [i.e.,] the *trisagion*, let them make this both the beginning and apt ending of the intervening [psalms].

[Afterwards] let them sing with one voice the [*troparion* of the Exaltation] of the Cross,

10. ELEOUSA

“Save, O Lord, thy people” and so forth, and also intone the Gloria. Thereupon, let them sing “Thou who wert raised upon the cross” and after intoning “Now [and forever],” let them sing again “Speedily prevent us” and cry out “*Kyrie eleison*” twenty-four times, in confirmation and conclusion of the preceding office. Then let them begin the six psalms⁵—I mean the best address—and through them and the remaining office and service [let them] speak to God truly with an unwavering mind, “face to face,” (Exod. 33:11) and propitiate him.

7. After the hymnody of matins has been completed, let the doxology of the hours be performed, just as if it were a golden chain, I mean through the beautiful and most salvific order of sequence: [for] the first hour, as it were, precedes the others, since, in fact, the announcement of the resurrection was transmitted to all on this [hour]. Next, then, let the hymn of ascription of glory to God pass over to the third hour. For on this [hour] “we were recalled from the ancient deceiver’s long-time deceit and our fall;”⁶ and, because we had accepted the grace of the [p. 75] new and divine covenant, we perceived the light from the light, as the saying goes (cf. Ps. 35 [36] 9), inasmuch, as the Comforter had come upon the disciples of the Word, (cf. Acts 2:1–4) and through them upon us “who sat in darkness and in the shadow of ignorance” (Luke 1:70). [The Comforter] illuminated us more brightly than the sun and enlightened us with the rays of the knowledge of God and led us to the co-eternal and “unapproachable light” (I Tim. 6:16) by the divinely wise teachings [of the apostles].

After the prayer of the third hour, let in turn the divine hymnody of the sixth hour begin. For on this [hour] the Savior of our souls, because he had been fixed to the cross bodily because of his compassion [for us], healed through the [tree of the] cross the tasting of the [forbidden] tree; and because “he had become a curse, he redeemed us from the curse” (Gal. 3:13); and because we had become captivated by “pleasure-loving” sin (cf. II Tim. 3:4), “the Good Shepherd laid us on his shoulders” (Luke 15:5), as the saying goes, and brought us back to heaven from our humiliation in this world, that is.

After the hymnody of the sixth hour has been completed, let in turn the doxology of the ninth hour begin. For on this [hour] the Mortifier of passions, because he had been put to death as a mortal man by his own volition, revived us who had been subjected to death, having mortified our carnal surges and thoughts alike, and “the Author of life” (Acts 3:15) consented of himself to live in us who had deadened ourselves to the world, that is.

8. Fathers and brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, when you perform these truly divine services, as I have pointed out, along with the *mesoria*, in accordance with the traditional rule among you, do not stand at the time of these gatherings as though you were lifeless and indolent. I paternally beseech you, to whom I have now made this exhortation and instruction to the best of my ability, and whom I have gathered together to the same place with eager zeal and have loved with heartfelt disposition, and I am confident that I have you in the Lord as a source of pride and boast and a truly delightful exultation. But since you have comprehended [the purpose] for which you have been called, hasten to confirm this with deeds and, according to the saying, “to be found worthy of your Master Christ, who called you [p. 76] to this most noble way of life and change” (cf. Matt. 22:3, 8–9). Since you have your calling agreeing with your ways, gather your soul’s

senses, as I have indicated above, together and by themselves, as the saying goes, and alone speak to God alone through your prayers. For in this manner “your conversation will be pleasing to him” (Ps. 103 [104]:32), according to the divine David, because your disposition has been freed, that is, from the cares that confine it like a prison.

For obviously, if, when praying, you have your soul’s senses beclouded and you are distracted in soul—a thing that I pray may not happen—and you make [your soul] have two natures instead of one through the passionate attachment to the things of the world and you become distracted in mind by evil reflections. Not only “the lifting up of your hands” (Ps. 140 [141]:2), [as] you certainly know, will not be directed straightforwardly at the time of your prayer, when your thoughts waver, that is, while those who are carefully observing them are standing there and estimating them by intention rather, and not by voice and tongue, but also your petition to God and address will become fraught with danger inasmuch as the enemy, who envies your good deeds, has carefully watched both the relaxation and slackening of your mind and has construed this as a windfall for your destruction. He easily shakes the changeful movements of your thoughts by insinuating and implanting contrary thoughts, through which he undertakes to choke and to extirpate completely, alas, even the divine seed, which is the word of God (cf. Matt. 13:25; Luke 8:11). When the truly fierce one removes from you your spiritual “burden” (cf. Matt. 11:30), the spirit in you which resembles a smooth sea, that is, because your state is peaceful and spiritual, he stirs up [in you] a fierce surf and sinks [you], alas for me, in the depth of despair. For these reasons, brothers, you must be “sober and watchful” (I Pet. 5:8) at the time of your work lest “the heavenly [p. 77] Bridegroom, having arrived and having found you sleeping, consider you unworthy workers” (cf. Matt. 25:1–13) and consign you as “utterly evil” (Matt. 21:41) to the fire of hell.

9. Or do you not know what sort of vows we professed to him when we were actually making our promise on the things that we were proclaiming, frequently repeating our consent with both a subdued posture and a calm voice? Since angels had invisibly recorded both these promises and consents at the time of their enunciation, they will inevitably seek from us at the time of our decease the fulfillment of such [promises and consents] and will severely exact punishments from those who have been neglectful with regard to this [fulfillment]. At that time the means of help for us, frequently turning around this way and that way and having our conscience a patent accuser, will not depend upon relatives and acquaintances but upon our deeds alone, “which” undoubtedly even after our decease “we have proceeding before us” (cf. Apoc. 14:13).

Let us keep in mind, spiritual children in the Lord, the symbols of the holy habit with which, that is, we have been clothed and the white garments [we put on] at the time of our tonsure, as these decisively are symbols that by their nature are indicative of angels and of purity, being administered bodily and at the same time symbolically.⁷ For, in fact, the cuttings of our hair, which the scissors removed at various times, precisely as is the custom at the sacrificial altars, and furthermore also the consecrations of our heads, have caused us more than other men to be called Nazirites (cf. Num. 6:18; Jud. 13:5), that truly revered name.

What does this word indicate? [That] we are certainly consecrated to God. Let us respect our calling. Let us preserve our dignified state. Let us understand the gain of this divine mystery. Also let us anticipate him who called us, and “let us come before his presence” (that is, the visitation of

10. ELEOUSA

his manifestly probative power against sinners) “with thanksgiving” (Ps. 94 [95]:2) and tears [p. 78] for our transgressions. Since we have become lofty by our habit, let us not make ourselves debased by our deeds.

For how, indeed, have you not become lofty if you are willing to walk uprightly and by means of a sacred life to return to “the common head, Christ” (Eph. 4:15), the very one to whom you have totally sacrificed yourselves, having long ago severed from mixing with the crowd and having crucified your flesh (cf. Gal. 6:14). By your ragged dress, too, you have indicated the appearance of servitude in order that, having struggled well, you may “receive in return adoption” (Gal. 4:5) as most genuine sons and be established as heirs of his eternal kingdom, which, as you know “those who force themselves” (Matt. 11:12) and hold absolutely fast to the toils of the monastic life receive as a worthy repayment.

Since you have “crucified your limbs” (Gal. 5:24; Col. 3:5) by your cruciform scapular and hold on to this as an unconquerable weapon, repel the attacks of the adversary. Again, since you have “girded your loins” (Eph. 6:14) by your divine strap and by it you have been made dead to the world, nobly fight against “the passions of the flesh” (I Pet. 2:11; Gal. 5:16), according to the saying.

Since you have put upon yourselves your sacred cowl as a “helmet” (Eph. 6:17) and a defensive weapon (for “our struggle is, in fact, not against blood and flesh but against both the principalities and powers of the terrible world-ruler” [Eph. 6:12] according to Paul), protect your backs, against which is [directed] the evil one’s attack, in order that, being fortified all round from every side and clearly becoming incontestable and invincible soldiers of the universal Sovereign, Christ, by his power, you may run in the stadium the noble course of the monastic life, and, having in reality contested well and “having pleased him who enlisted you” (II Tim. 2:4), according to the divinely inspired Paul, soaring with eagerness through the sacred scapular that has been placed around you, you may fly as if with wings and may piously find rest, as I pray, [by him] from whom we have dementedly fallen away, and, having kept your pledge, you may receive the mystical grace of the all-Holy [p. 79] Spirit.

For this is the goal of your race in God or to God, which these singularly spiritual weapons of yours procure. For “God is Spirit, and those who worship him must worship him in spirit and truth” (John 4:24), having deadened themselves, that is, by the Spirit and having lived by themselves, as I have often said. For this reason hasten forward to “sing the praises of true wisdom in the streets” (cf. Prov. 1:20) (to cite opportunely to you Solomon’s statement) in order that you may enlarge yourselves by the truly God-pleasing pursuits and become rich in your confidence in God.

10. Yes, spiritual children in the Lord and beloved by me, yes, a sacred community and a host that is precious and chosen by God (for I beseech you once again as an affectionate father, seeking and desiring your salvation), in such manner, as I have pointed out, strip yourselves for the monastic life’s “struggle that lies before you” (Heb. 12:1), in such manner engage in this struggle to the end. Do not make me carry off to Hades my concern for you as a distressing shroud. For you are to me a daily care and a solicitude that is deep-seated and grieves my soul, and a limb and part and heart and “light of my eyes” (Ps. 37 [38]:10), according to the saying, and everything that anyone can say about things that bound [us] together in love and sincerity. But “let him who is strong in words

strengthen with admonitions and kindly exhortations whoever is not so” (cf. Rom. 15:1), according to the Lord’s commandment; and when his limb is not well, let him make it healthy appropriately.

For you are, I am convinced, a limb and body in God and “one composite whole that is fitted together and at the same time brought together in oneness” (Eph. 4:16). For this reason, in fact, let not any of the things that are to be deprecated and that are contrary to the things that are morally good interpose itself among you, children, inserting harm in your souls and making room in them for the hater of good and wicked demon. But let also strife and grudge-bearing, which is generated from the latter, be absent from you. For these are the principal sources of “the flaming darts of the evil one” (Eph. 6:16) through which he confuses our minds and counterplans to withdraw us from God. But if such things do, indeed, occur among you—a thing that I pray may not happen—through conciliation with [p. 80] one another let them be banished from your souls and let the sun “not go down on your anger” (cf. Eph. 4:26).

Likewise, also detest with your soul and ardently the rest of the things that are in reality diametrically evil and rivals of the former [evils], I mean lechery, drunkenness, gluttony, loquaciousness, lying, back-biting, heartlessness, inhumanity as well as hatred of mankind, envy, which begets murder, love of money, which is truly “the second idolatry” (Col. 3:5) and vices that are like these. For, since I wish you to be superior to such passions, I want you to go through life and to conduct yourselves with this good conduct in such manner that, by sprouting forth “the fruit of the Divine Spirit” (Gal. 5:22) (I mean “unhypocritical love” [Rom. 12:9] and compassion for one another, both absence of anger and at the same time absence of grudge-bearing, and moderate thinking in all things), “your soul’s light shall break forth as the morning, your health shall speedily spring forth” (Is. 58:8), according to the saying, because the True Light, Christ our God (John 1:9), has invisibly descended upon your minds and has overshadowed and “lived or truly dwelled in them” (II Cor. 6:16) and has made you, by the divine sharing of it, perfect lights, or, to state it better, “products of the Perfect Light,”⁸ according to [Gregory] the Theologian.

For our Master and Lord is, in fact, such that “when he has perceived that we are aroused to the performance of good works” (cf. Luke 12:37) and that we are anxious to cause the seed that is stored up in the furrows of our mind, which is the teaching that is conducive to salvation, to sprout forth and “to yield its fruit in its season” (cf. Ps. 1:3) in large quantity, he hastens to pour forth in full strength the mercy of his love for humanity, because the Bountiful One anticipates our requests to him with his bounties and is truly most ready for this.

Since we have such a Master, so loving and “forbearing” (II Tim. 2:24), both compassionate and at the same time sympathetic, and one who awaits our conversion (for he does not willingly desire the death of us sinners, so that we may repent and live [cf. Ezech. 33:11], thirsting, as he is all-merciful, for our salvation and as our God reckoning the latter as a personal gain), [p. 81] let us not depart far from him because we have become indifferent. Let us not [do that], fathers and brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, in order that we may not be miserably delivered to destruction. For “those who” through indifference “remove themselves far from him shall perish” (Ps. 72 [73]:27).

Let us not become a refractory and rebellious people. Let us not turn back again to our carnal cravings in order that we may not, because we have let our mind become callous or hardened in

10. ELEOUSA

them, become “a pillar of salt” (Gen. 19:26), as the saying goes. Let us not become eager to choose earthly things instead of heavenly ones. Do not prefer over the eternal joy in the other world the temporary life of pleasure, which makes those who embrace it bear afterwards retributions more bitter than gall. May you not, because you pursued “praise from men” (Rom. 2:29), be disregarding of “the glory which is going to be revealed” (Rom. 8:18) at the time of the frightful advent of our Lord Jesus Christ to those who have been well pleasing to him. Do not, because you have become indifferent, shut off for yourselves the heavenly bridal chamber, in order that you may not hear the detestable voice which says, “I do not know you” (Matt. 25:12). But with compassion towards one another and as though you had kindled from the latter the oil-lamps of your souls, hasten rather to enter into the same undefiled bridal chamber along with Christ the Bridegroom and to be called prudent, or rather to appear at his side, as I pray.

But these things are, indeed, sufficient, fathers and brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, for your admonition and edification and truly ultimate rule. Accordingly, engrave them “in the tablets of your hearts” (II Cor. 3:3) and “preserve them as a trust indeed” (I Tim. 6:20; II Tim. 1:14) with eager mind, I implore you, and keep struggling to execute them, considering me, the lowly one, though departed from life, as being present with you by the spiritual, that is, and indissoluble bond of my love towards you, in order that you may benefit yourselves very greatly and thereby procure a reward for me, the sinful founder of your monastery.

11. Since I prescribed and appointed with my *sigillion* the most honorable monk lord Elias to hold the office of superior over both you and this monastery that I hold in private ownership, including all things in it, [p. 82] I also turned over to him during my lifetime the privileges that belonged to me over this monastery and the things in it and besides you, too, my brothers in the Lord, the monks. These privileges are, to wit, precisely the following: The fact that [lord Elias] is to be the superior over this monastery that I hold in private ownership, up to the end of his life, and he is not to be removed from it by anyone whosoever, whether he happens to be a person related [to me] or a stranger. The fact that by his own will and at the same time absolute rule he is to make full use of the things in it. The fact that he is to tensure in it whomever he chooses, and again, to expel from this monastery, after a first, second, and third admonition as well as instruction, those monks among you who perchance appear openly factious and disobedient towards his injunctions to you regarding the goals of the monastery.

Also now, too, I formulate and prescribe that these privileges be preserved both inviolable and inviolate in the hands of this most honorable man up to the end of his transitory existence in this life, as I have distinctly stated, inasmuch as he has been associated with me over many years and is known to me as God-loving.

I ask you, O fathers and brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, or rather I admonish you as beloved to me, to obey him as a father in all things and to subject yourselves to him with the appropriate honor, rejoicing in the leadership of this truly most honorable man for a twofold reason: both because he is a member of your select group and not of an alien one, and because you have obtained a shepherd who is dexterous and able to make you perfect in the Lord, and to lead you back to godly pastures.

For this most devout monk happens to be one of those who are celebrated for virtue inasmuch

as he has been consecrated to God from the “first hair of his head” as the saying goes, and “has chosen rather to be an abject in his house” (Ps. 83 [84]:10), according to the Davidic statement, than to be involved in worldly matters and by the distractions of the passions to contaminate the soul’s substance (which carries about in itself the image of the divine substance, preserving, that is, in itself the virtues unimpaired) and to run after [p. 83] the flesh, that is, [after] its cravings. Inasmuch as this “excellent fellow,” as the saying goes, has pursued the ascetic course for many years and “has put to death his limbs” (Col. 3:5), according to the divine apostle, and makes him who wishes to exercise discrimination well understand from the condition that is manifested in him the authority and independence of mind and, generally speaking, has gathered together, as does an industrious bee, the beautiful flowers of virtue and has deposited these in his mind, just as if in a beehive, and in the course of a protracted period of time has produced the good honey of virtue and by his inclination and elevation to higher things has become a towering “tree planted by the brooks of waters” (Ps. 1:3), to speak in accordance with the divine David, or, to state it better, a second paradise, he because of the luxuriance of his virtues will furnish you, O brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, the greatest benefit if you are eager to elevate yourselves so as both to resemble and imitate him.

For which of you, if he is conceited, when he has perceived his [the superior’s] moderation and humility, will not immediately suppress his arrogance and ameliorate himself [by correcting] such a fault? Who again, if he possesses an inordinate impulse and a loquacious as well as contentious tongue, will not become gentle-minded and “set a guard on his mouth” (Ps. 38 [39]:1; 140 [141]:3) when he observes his gentleness and tranquillity? Who, again, if he has his soul’s disposition inflamed with anger and grudge-bearing, will not restrain himself when he has undergone a change, will not then rouse himself towards reconciliation with the brother with whom perhaps he means to contend? Who will not cast off from himself that which grieves him and be forthwith elevated to a state of cheerfulness when he has seen with his own eyes this man’s graciousness as well as sweetness of countenance? Who, when he has discerned that the aforesaid most devout man “has become in everything all things to all men” (I Cor. 9:22) (not to recount in sequence each of his good attributes individually), will not return to that which is better, having deemed this amiable man blessed not only for his way of life and character but, indeed, also for nature itself, as is right, inasmuch as [nature] had attached to this man every form of virtue?

It is for this reason, in fact, that [p. 84] I offer with a very clear voice my gratitude to the Mother of God, because by her invisible supervisions she disclosed the man to me as a windfall that profits the soul and revealed him as your shepherd. Therefore, because he is such as I have pointed him out, accept him with glad welcome and render to him the honor that befits him and offer him your obedience in all things, as I have distinctly stated. He, too, when he has you obedient to him, “will shepherd you” in a manner that is both pleasing to God and skillful and, having nurtured you well, “will make you dwell in a place of green grass” (Ps. 22 [23]:1–2), I mean in the heavenly and beloved abodes.

12. As for you, my most honorable superior (for, since I am ostensibly departing from life and I am being led on to the places of judgment in the other world, I shall address myself to you and make this instruction), inasmuch as you have been appointed to shepherd the aforesaid monks by

10. ELEOUSA

my humility, as I have said, or rather by the nod and decree of the Mother of God (for these men are, in fact, not only a flock but also at the same time a portion [of the Mother of God] and a truly “especial people” (Tit. 2:14) of hers, to whom, indeed, you are going to give an account as regards these men at the undeceivable and frightful judgment-seat), do be willing to prefer nothing at all to their souls’ salvation and their bodily care, but, as an affectionate father, embrace and accept them favorably as spiritual children.

Affectionately and kindly feel passionate love for them. Protect them from the snares of the evil one, even more at the present time, in which this truly crafty-minded one and hater of good “cunningly contrived stratagems” (Ps. 82 [83]:3) against our undefiled Christian faith, and those who cooperate with this clearly evil demon in his deeds and “who hate us have lifted their head” (Ps. 82 [83]:2) because they had not differentiated between the sanctity of the aforementioned orthodox faith and their loathsome and profane tenets, even if we, too, are culpable for these evils, pouring out against ourselves the cup of the Lord’s anger and “having drained the cup of calamity” (Is. 51:17, 22).

Alas! Who will lament these things properly? What sort of lamentations will he find that compensate for such an [p. 85] inhuman assault? It is for this reason, in fact, that I have borrowed Jeremiah’s statement at the present time and I say in lamenting in my heart, “Let me weep bitterly over the destruction of the daughter of my people” (Is. 51: 17, 22). For our affairs are “on the axe and the mason’s chisel” (Ps. 73 [74]: 6), according to the saying.

For these reasons, therefore, I shall surely cry out to him who is able to save, “Draw nigh to our help” (Ps. 69 [70]:1) who seek thee out, Lord, thou who art quick to comfort and to help, “and give not thine heritage to complete extermination and destruction in order that those who are wholly profane will not boast against us and say: ‘Where is their God?’ Let them know that thou art ‘the one who defends us’ (Prov. 30:5) ‘overlooking our sins’ (Wis. 11:23) because of thine abundant goodness.”

But my account must run back again to its sequence, even if it has diverged a little from the direct path. Anoint them, I beg you, “the congregation” (cf. II Cor. 11:28) of my monastery (to speak in accordance with the divine apostle) with exhortations for the good race of asceticism. As a disciple of the peaceful Christ, pacify them whenever they quarrel, if ever it will be necessary. Comfort them whenever they grieve. Care for those who are ill in accordance with your ability. Be kindly minded, feel compassionate love for all of them equally, and not for some more, while for others less. Do not refuse to make healthy and sound those who are ill and lame in soul. For not everyone’s responsibility is it to make sound that which is lame and to restore to well-being that which has need of it.

Do not reproach them because of simplicity. Do not despise them. Do not readily expel from the monastery those who perhaps have made a false step over something, but whip them not with a strap and rod but with a spiritual penalty. In the case of those who have repented, expel with a very gracious countenance the timidity of their souls that stems from their false step after the rendering of the prayers that are customary for them.

13. Refresh them at the cenobitic table, sitting down together with them and partaking without discrimination of both the same foods and drinks equally with them. For how shall a difference be

ELEVENTH CENTURY

made in the case of those who are brotherly minded unless, that is, a need of the body is pressing, someone of the monks having perhaps become ill or even having reached a ripe old age? Therefore, if some of them should happen to be so, I prescribe that they be deemed worthy of commensurate special fare. [p. 86] I both wish and order that two courses prepared with legumes and vegetables of whatsoever kind with seasoning be served up to such monks, that is, on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Mondays; but on the rest of the days, that is, Tuesdays, Thursdays, Saturdays, and Sundays, three courses likewise with legumes and fish.

On the twenty-first day of the month of November, that is, the festal day of the Entrance of the Mother of God, my Mistress who is merciful to me, into the divine temple (which day I formulate that my aforementioned newly acquired monastery celebrate annually in accordance with tradition, and on which it is my wish that the copy of my present Rule, which has been confirmed, as is customarily done, be read within earshot of you, the superior at that time, after matins or even during the partaking [of food] at the cenobitic table) I prescribe that a special fare be offered to the aforesaid monks in accordance, that is, with the capability of this monastery and your, its superior's, wish.

Let, however, the same special fare be offered also on the twenty-third day of the same month for my remembrance and forgiveness of the sins that I have committed during my lifetime. I prescribe that a distribution be made also on the same two feast days at the gate of the monastery to my brothers in Christ. I prescribe that, in addition to the aforementioned special fare, a distribution of this sort be held also at my departure from the body, its commemoration, and the night offices of my third-day and ninth-day memorials, and that both you, the most honorable superior, and the monks under the monastery's jurisdiction, make mention of my humility in your entreaties.

14. I formulate and prescribe these things, in fact, for both you, the superior, and the monks, as I have already distinctly stated, whom, indeed, I entrust to the Mother of God, who pities me, and with tears I address her for your sake both suppliantly and at the same time boldly, "Guard, I beg thee, O Mistress, both the shepherd and the flock unoffended by the snares of the evil one. Protect them as thy God-chosen [p. 87] flock. Lead them on to the divine abodes through a God-pleasing conduct, having deemed me, too, the least, worthy to be led up along with them to the eternal abodes themselves, as I pray to thee and entreat thee, in order that, when I stand before the frightful judgment seat of our God, who became incarnate from thee, I may utter aloud with outspoken voice this assuredly delightful to me and lovely statement, 'Here am I and the children which thou hast given me, Master' (Is. 8:18); and may I hear from him the prayed-for voice which leads me 'into the joy' (Matt. 25:21) which is unending, and enjoins me gently and genuinely to enter into it together with them."

15. I wish and prescribe that he after you, the aforesaid most honorable superior lord Elias, who is going to receive in succession the office of superior of this monastery that I hold in private ownership, and besides his successors, too, are to be of this sort. Not only are they to be renowned for understanding and propriety and irreproachable life, and able to instruct besides, and make the monks in it perfect (as I have indicated above), but, also to manage skillfully all the things under

10. ELEOUSA

its jurisdiction, having sufficient experience, that is, in its affairs. That none of these persons, because he is parsimonious, is to claim as his own the things of the monastery and to embezzle them to the deprivation of the brothers. That he is not to be heartless nor haughty, neither a drunkard nor quick-tempered and at the same time grudge-bearing and truly a treasury of bad things.

Rather he is to be an abode of good things, and to possess the following superior qualities which produce goodness: discretion and at the same time humility, love and hospitality towards all, in order that through the latter [virtue] he, too, may receive God in his soul, as if in a tabernacle, as did Abraham. He is also to have the fountainhead that is mixed with such virtues, I mean charity, while possessing a “temper which is free of avarice” (Heb. 13:5) and to lead his own flock well. [p. 88]

16. I prescribe that the appointment of superiors of this sort be done as follows. After the one who is worthy to hold the office of superior has been selected without bias and with fear of God by him who at the time holds the office of superior of the aforesaid monastery and the preeminent monks under its jurisdiction, with the knowledge and approval also of all the rest of the brothers, they are to take him up to the most God-loved bishop of Stroumitza, whoever happens to be in office at that time, to receive from him the *sphragis*. As a gift and [token] of my generosity the aforesaid bishop is to receive for this *sphragis* three *nomismata* of the impress that prevails, that is, at the time and is in effect in the land of him who conducts the affairs of the imperial authority, even if perhaps just now for each *sphragis* one *nomisma* of the same impress is offered by canon law and regulation to him who happens to be the prelate in the area.

The most God-loved bishop himself of Stroumitza, however, is surely not to take such *sphragis* as a privilege or authority over the monastery which I hold in private ownership. For not, in fact, as an overseer or wielder of authority ought he to confer on him the *sphragis* who is to hold the office of superior and to receive the three *nomismata*, as I have distinctly stated, but as a local prelate, in accordance with the regulation of the sacred canons. If, however, the aforesaid bishop, because he is perhaps greedy, is not content to have received the three *nomismata* but undertakes rather to do something against the monastery and the things under its jurisdiction, it is my wish that the *sphragis* not be conferred by him but by the one who at that time holds the office of superior. My present Rule will suffice in place of the *sphragis* by such a superior.

After he who is going to hold the office of superior received the *sphragis* and has departed to the monastery together with the monks, in the course of the customary [liturgical] office for his [installation], let him take the pastoral staff from the holy altar after, that is, the *trisagion* has been performed and he has made a genuflection, and then thus let him assume the leadership of the monastery.

The privileges that through my *sigillion* have been lavished upon you, the above-mentioned most honorable lord Elias, and have been drawn up in my present Rule are to cease and be completely inoperative with regard to him who becomes the superior after you [p. 89] and those after him. In fact, the following privilege alone is to be preserved with regard to those who are to be superiors after you, as I have indicated, namely, that if he shall find anyone being either unruly or rebellious or engaging in harm to the monastery from the ranks of the monks in it and remaining incorrigible after a first, second, and third admonition as well as instruction, he is to expel him

ELEVENTH CENTURY

from the aforesaid monastery as a manifestly spoiled and useless member, even if he, indeed, happens to be from the ranks, that is, of my blood relatives.

Just as, again, if one of the very men chosen to hold the office of superior of this monastery appears to be corrupt—a thing that I pray may not happen—and claims as his own the things that belong to this [monastery] and also annoys the monks and sets aside the things that have been prescribed by me, and, to state it concisely, is clearly shown by his deeds to be a hireling and not a shepherd (John 10:12), I prescribe that after the [admonition and instruction] to him . . .⁹

17. If some strangers come to the monastery, I direct that in that eventuality they be shown hospitality and find refreshment at the instruction of the superior. If, however, some come to some of the monks in this monastery for the sake of conversation, I prescribe that such men not be permitted to come in the monastery secretly, contrary to the instruction of the superior, but I direct that first the gatekeeper make a report to him concerning them, and, after he has been instructed, permit them to enter, and that, if the time of day requires, they, too, be refreshed at the cenobitic table.

I also prescribe that the entrance of the monastery be completely closed to women. But neither is it, indeed, my wish that any youth who is younger than eighteen years of age be accepted in this my monastery. Let its dependency,¹⁰ therefore, admit one who is under eighteen years of age; and when he becomes eighteen years of age, let such a person be accepted in the monastery and tonsured. [p. 90]

18. I wish and prescribe that this, the monastery that I hold in private ownership and which bears the name of the Mother of God, who pities me, be self-governing and administered by itself, and that it not be subject perchance to any personage, ecclesiastical or magisterial, but to the Mother of God alone, whom, in fact, I have instituted as heir and through her the aforementioned most honorable superior, lord Elias, and those who after him are to hold the office of superior of both this monastery and those things in it that have been assigned to it by me, namely immovable, movable, and animate [property], and besides, sacred vessels and utensils.

Nor do I wish and prescribe that after my departure to the Lord an inventory be made over all these things, as the laws determine, but only an examination in the presence of my relatives by the superior of the monastery at that time and the monks in it. I instruct that such an examination be conducted after the death of the aforesaid superior at that time, namely, the most devout monk lord Elias, inasmuch as one such as he carries during his lifetime my privilege over both this the monastery that I have in private ownership and all the things in it, as I have stated.

As a matter of fact, this monastery shall not be subjected in any way whatsoever by anyone to any keeping of accounts. It shall not undergo removal of the things in it that have been attached to it partially or entirely, as I have explained. It shall not be transferred to any person by way of grant (for how shall this monastery be even brought under subjection to a person's authority since it has been consecrated absolutely to her who incomparably transcends the heavenly authorities and powers alike and is descriptively called her place?), but neither shall it be assigned to imperial rights perhaps on the pretext that it has been built on imperial land. Yea, rather this monastery will remain over and above all extraordinary impositions that are exacted and demanded now as well as in the future.

10. ELEOUSA

For, in fact, according to the chrysobull that has been issued to me and is attached to this [*typikon*] by our most excellent and holy emperor, Lord Alexios [I] Komnenos (1081–1118),¹¹ for the sake of a supplicatory prayer on behalf of the permanence of his divine sovereignty, no one of the tax collectors in the region, I mean the state officials who have been entrusted with any services whatsoever in the theme of Tiberiopolis, that is, Stroumitza, [p. 91] or, after my lowliness, [any] of the most God-loved bishops of the most holy bishopric in the aforesaid theme of Stroumitza, and [any] of the most holy prelates themselves of the archbishopric of Bulgaria, will be permitted, on pretext of any reasonable right or privilege or even specious manipulation contrived by them in any way whatsoever, to innovate and to injure or to abuse at all this monastery of the Mother of God, who pities me, and the immovable things that have been assigned by me in the aforesaid [monastery], as I have distinctly stated.

19. Thus, if anyone of the above-mentioned holy persons, O Christ (for I shall raise my voice in heartfelt anguish to thee, who art consubstantial with thine inoriginate Father and the all-Holy Spirit) (cf. *Symbolum Nicaenoconstantinopolitanum*) shall attempt in any way whatsoever, as I have explicitly stated, either to abuse or to innovate this my monastery that I hold in private ownership, which was founded by my lowliness and humility in the name of the Mother of God, who pities me, namely thine all-Holy Mother, and the things in it that have been assigned to it, or to cast at all a gluttonous eye upon my labors, “do thou not direct the works of his hands” (Ps. 89 [90]:17).

“Let such a person,” while he is alive on earth, “have no helper” (Ps. 108 [109]:12). Let the contagious leprosy of Gehazi (IV Kings 5:27) and the trembling of the fratricide Cain (Gen. 4:12–14) from thy just judgment come upon him and those who are descended from him. “Let strangers spoil his acquisitions” (Ps. 108 [109]: 11). Let him be an heir to the curse of the three hundred and eighteen holy and God-bearing fathers. “Let his memorial perish out of the earth” (Job 18:17) and “let his habitation be made desolate” (Ps. 68 [69]:25; Acts 1:20) in accordance with the saying. May, again, such a person, when he has departed from life, not see thy countenance, Master. May he not hear thy prayer for life. May he not attain a position at thy right but may he be granted a lot with thy lawless and evil minded disciple, the one who had betrayed thee, my Master and Lord, and [with] the unmerciful and heartless rich man (Luke 16:23) who is dreadfully being fried in the flame of hell [p. 92].

20. In just the same manner, again, may he who has clearly preserved inviolable and inviolate the things that have been prescribed by me with respect to both this monastery that I hold in private ownership and the things in it, be deemed worthy of blessing from thee, Lord, the God of our fathers, while he is a wayfarer in life, and may he be satiated “from the fatness of the earth” (Gen. 27:28, 39). May such a person be as “a fruitful vine” (Ps. 127 [128]:3) in his pursuits in his lifetime. “May thou make him rejoice in thy strength” (Ps. 20 [21]:1). “May no enemy prevail over him” (Ps. 12 [13]:4). May he not fall into [diabolic] encounters in his life, but “let thine eyes continually gaze over him” (cf. Ps. 33 [34]:15). May he be deemed worthy of a position at thy right after his departure from this world. May paradise, the sacred precincts worthy of love, the unfailing dignified state, the most beautiful way of life, that is delightful and truly to be sought by

ELEVENTH CENTURY

those who are beneficent, be allotted to him just as a worthy reward for having made the right judgment of observing the things that have been enjoined by my lowliness. But these things have been formulated for the above-mentioned persons.

21. You, however, the most honorable superior of this monastery that I hold in private ownership, and those who after you are going to hold the office of superior in this [monastery] and besides, the monks too, in this monastery, I enjoin in the Holy Spirit and at the same time order that none of you ever transfer this monastery to anyone by way of gift or *epidosis* or alienate any of those things that have been assigned to it or even give out anything from its immovable possessions to any person by way of leasing out or in any other way to betray utterly any of my labors.

For, even if anyone from your ranks should attempt to violate a single one of those very things that have clearly been enumerated and indicated in my present Rule and have been forbidden by command by my humility, as I have explicitly stated, and proceed to overturn the things that have been prescribed by me, not only will he be liable to the above-mentioned curses but also whatever he might have done to harm the monastery, as I have indicated, will be reckoned invalid and as not even having been done at all, [p. 93] such a person being expelled from the monastery for “having removed the landmarks which his fathers placed” (Prov. 22:28, 23:10; Deut. 19:14), as it has been written.

22. Therefore, now that I have both formulated and prescribed in writing all these things in the text of my present Rule and have confirmed them, as is customarily done, through my personally written signature, I implore you, the most honorable superior lord Elias, and those who after you are going to hold the office of superior of the very monastery that I hold in private ownership, and besides also the monks in it, namely, those who are and those who will be, to preserve them without innovation and without violation, and with much eagerness to execute them and at the same time to see to it that they are executed, knowing that, if you shall set aside any of those things that have been put into this my Rule, you are going to render accounts to me at the undeceivable and frightful judgment seat, or rather to the Mother of God, who pities me, by whose vigilant and most saving intercessions may you be saved, I pray, O fathers and brothers and spiritual children in the Lord, unoffended by the snares of the evil one. Be superior to every kind of bodily ill-disposition, continually mindful also of my humility, particularly in your prayers, for the glory of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, the life-giving and consubstantial Trinity, which maintains and governs this earthly world and us who dwell upon it, now and always, and unto the ages of ages. Amen.

The Signature

I, Manuel, the least monk and bishop of Tiberioupolis, that is, Stroumitza, and servant, even if unworthy, of the supremely holy Mother of God, who pities me, have signed with my own hand.

+++

Having compared the present copy of the regulation and having found it to be exact, I have signed it. +

The lowly bishop of Stroumitza, Clement,¹² monk. +

Notes on the Translation

1. This quotation is not found among the works of Gregory Nazianzen.
2. For this monastery, see Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, p. 47.
3. Cf. John Chrysostom, *De sancto Philogonio*, PG 48, col. 749.
4. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio 25, In laudem Heronis philosophi*, PG 35, col. 1200A.
5. Ps. 3, 37 [38], 62 [63], 87 [88], 102 [103], 142 [143]; cf. (4) *Stoudios* [2].
6. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio 44, In novam Dominicam*, PG 36, col. 609A.
7. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio 25, In laudem Heronis philosophi*, PG 35, col. 1200B.
8. Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio 39, In sancta lumina*, PG 36, col. 336C.
9. Lacuna in the text at this point.
10. Perhaps this is the *metochion* at the village of Roulina near Mostenitz mentioned in the *Praktikon* of Michael Tzankitzakes, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 8, p. 38.
11. Dölger, *Regesten.*, no. 1124, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 1, pp. 25–27, and reproduced in Miljković-Peppek, *Veljusa*, pp. 253–55.
12. If this individual is identical with the bishop of the same name found in the *Praktikon* of Tzankitzakes, ed. Petit, “Monastère,” doc. 8, p. 38, then the certification must have been made circa 1152.

Document Notes

- [1] Meditation on death. Compare to similar discussions in (5) *Euthymios* [3], (6) *Rila* [2], and (7) *Latros*, Introduction.
- [2] Profession of faith. Compare to similar statements in (3) *Theodore Studites*; (7) *Latros* [1], [2], [3]; (49) *Geromeri* [2] ff.; and (54) *Neilos Damilas* [1].
- [3] Foundation history. Compare to parallel histories in (6) *Rila* [1], (9) *Galesios* [246], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [2] ff, (17) *Nikon Metanoite*, (18) *Nea Gephyra* [1], (19) *Attaleiates* [1], [2], (22) *Evergetis* [2], (23) *Pakourianos* [1], and (24) *Christodoulos* [A2] ff, etc. The wasteland *topos* has parallels in (6) *Rila* [1] and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [1].
- [4] Equality in food and drink for all; so also [13] below. This is a key concept of the cenobitic life as developed by the monastic reform movement; see (22) *Evergetis* [26], (27) *Kecharitomene* [56], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [53], (30) *Phoberos* [45], (32) *Mamas* [34], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [33], and (34) *Machairas* [106].
- [5] Size limitation; restriction of personal effects; placement of two monks in a cell. For similar size restrictions, see (9) *Galesios* [246], (16) *Mount Tmolos* [1], [2], (19) *Attaleiates* [27], (23) *Pakourianos* [6], (27) *Kecharitomene* [5], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3], (30) *Phoberos* [42], (32) *Mamas* [5], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [33], and later documents. The restriction of personal effects, while stricter than in (9) *Galesios* [191], [192], is more lenient than in the militantly reformist (22) *Evergetis* [22], (20) *Black Mountain* [84], and related documents. Even the items permitted here could be—and probably were—communally supplied. The pairing of monks in cells is also found in (22) *Evergetis* [24].
- [6] Midnight and morning offices. Compare to treatments in (4) *Stoudios* [11]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [11], [12]; (20) *Black Mountain* [15] ff.; (22) *Evergetis* [7]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [38], [39]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [15]; (30) *Phoberos* [12], [13]; (32) *Mamas* [47]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [46]; and (34) *Machairas* [45], [46], [48].

ELEVENTH CENTURY

- [7] Daytime offices. Compare to treatments in (11) *Ath. Rule* [8]; (20) *Black Mountain* [9] ff.; (22) *Evergetis* [6]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [35], [36]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [15]; (30) *Phoberos* [12]; (32) *Mamas* [47]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [46]; and (34) *Machairas* [42], [43], [44].
- [8] Proper deportment at services. See also (36) *Blemmydes* [13], (55) *Athanasios I* [4], and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [58], [59].
- [9] Discussion of monastic vows.
- [10] Moral exhortation.
- [11] Rights of the new superior; admonition to obedience. For other examples of exceptional privileges accorded only to the first incumbent of an administrative office, see (19) *Attaleiates* [26], [33], and (32) *Mamas* [15]. The admonition is a traditional element, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [25], (22) *Evergetis* [16], (27) *Kecharitomene* [12], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [43], (30) *Phoberos* [36], and (34) *Machairas* [142], etc.
- [12] Admonition to the superior. This is another traditional element, employed by reform founders to urge a moderation of the superior's absolute disciplinary authority; see also (22) *Evergetis* [17], (27) *Kecharitomene* [12], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [44], (30) *Phoberos* [36], (32) *Mamas* [42], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [41], (34) *Machairas* [144], and (58) *Menoikeion* [19].
- [13] Dietary concessions for old and sick monks; celebration of the patronal feast. Note justification of this important exception from the general principle of dietary equality (cf. [4] above). (4) *Stoudios* [30], (11) *Ath. Rule* [25], (22) *Evergetis* [26], (27) *Kecharitomene* [56], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [53], (30) *Phoberos* [45], (32) *Mamas* [34], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [33], and (34) *Machairas* [107] also make selective provision for dietary concessions to the elderly and the sick. For the treatment of patronal feasts at other monasteries, see (4) *Stoudios* [A30], (21) *Roidion* [B9], (22) *Evergetis* [10], [11], (27) *Kecharitomene* [59], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [10], [29], (30) *Phoberos* [32], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [48], and (34) *Machairas* [27], [29]. The provision here for the reading of Manuel's *Rule* is a standard feature of reform *typika* such as (22) *Evergetis* [43] and related documents.
- [14] Appeal to the Mother of God for protection. See similar appeals for heavenly assistance in (19) *Attaleiates* [7], [15]; (28) *Pantokrator* [71]; and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [119].
- [15] Qualifications for the superiorship. Documents from reform monasteries such as (22) *Evergetis* [13], (27) *Kecharitomene* [11], (30) *Phoberos* [35], (34) *Machairas* [80] also illustrate this concern with the moral qualities of the superior.
- [16] Selection and installation of the superior; limited rights of Elias' successors; removal of a bad superior. Manuel envisions the superior selecting his own successor with the advice of the *prokritoi* and the consent of the other monks; cf. the more complex arrangements found in (22) *Evergetis* [13]. His willingness to have his monks present the new superior to the local bishop for the *sphragis*, for which the latter would receive a consideration of three *nomismata*, was shared by the authors of (29) *Kosmosoteira* [33], (32) *Mamas* [1], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [1], but not those of (22) *Evergetis* nor (29) *Kecharitomene* [11]. The notion of restricting the rights of successors to the founder's hand-picked administrator is found also in (19) *Attaleiates* [26], [33] and (32) *Mamas* [15]. Documents drawn up for reform monasteries also provide for the removal of a bad superior, most commonly for financial misconduct; see (22) *Evergetis* [14], (23) *Pakourianos* [19], (24) *Christodoulos* [A20], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [41], and (30) *Phoberos* [35].
- [17] Hospitality; ban on admission of women and youths; housing of young novices in the dependency. For a contemporary discussion of the requirements of hospitality, see (21) *Roidion* [B2] ff. Manuel's ban on the admission of women parallels the hostility of reform monasteries to access by the opposite sex, for which see (22) *Evergetis* [39], (27) *Kecharitomene* [17], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [84], (30) *Phoberos* [55], (32) *Mamas* [27], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [27], (34) *Machairas* [115], and later documents. (23) *Pakourianos* [31] features a school for future monks under the tutelage of an elderly priest at that foundation's dependency.
- [18] Self-governing status; no inventory to be drawn up. For the development of the concept of the indepen-

10. ELEOUSA

dent and self-governing monastery, see (13) *Ath. Typikon* [13] with the discussion in Chapter Two. Centuries later, an inventory was in fact drawn up; it is included as the last document in our collection as (61) *Eleousa Inv.*

- [19] Curses on violators. The use of curses seems directly related to the advent of the *charistike* and the increasing peril it posed in the eleventh century to the well-being of private religious foundations. For other eleventh-century examples, see (8) *John Xenos* [2], (9) *Galesios* [246], (18) *Nea Gephyra* [4], (19) *Attaleiates* [23], (22) *Evergetis* [12], and (24) *Christodoulos* [B14].
- [20] Rewards for preservers. See also (19) *Attaleiates* [34]. As reform sentiments became more common towards the end of the eleventh century, founders sought also to enlist the support of the pious laity and public officials for the preservation of their *typika*.
- [21] Warning to dishonest officials. See also (22) *Evergetis* [32], [42]. Assuring honest administration was one of the most important concerns of monastic reformers in the course of the transition from traditional family patronage to genuine institutional independence.
- [22] Injunction to preserve the founder's commands. Compare to other examples found in (3) *Theodore Studites* [24], (5) *Euthymios* [2], (6) *Rila* [5], (8) *John Xenos* [3], and (9) *Galesios* [246]; eventually personal injunction is transformed into a command for the preservation of the founder's *typikon*, as in (22) *Evergetis* [40], backed up by the periodic public reading [43] of that document.

