

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

11. *Ath. Rule: Rule of Athanasios the Athonite for the Lavra Monastery*

Date: Original composition, 963; possibly revised ca. 1020¹ *Translator:* George Dennis

Edition employed: Ph. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 130–40.

Manuscript: Codex Iveron 754 (16th c.)²

Other translations: None

Institutional History

A. Athanasios the Athonite and the Foundation of Lavra

1. Sources

As with Theodore the Studite's famous monastery of Stoudios at Constantinople, we are fortunate to have a considerable group of sources to illustrate the history of this foundation. Athanasios was the probable author, not only of the present document, but also of the later (13) *Ath. Typikon* and (14) *Ath. Testament*, which taken together enable us to follow the evolution of his ideas on the organization of Lavra over a troubled period of at least twenty years in the last half of the tenth century. Also, the cartularies of both Lavra and Protaton, the administrative center of Mount Athos, preserve documents dating back to the late ninth century, including several that date from Athanasios' lifetime. Both (12) *Tzimiskes* and (15) *Constantine IX* are preserved in the Protaton cartulary. The cartularies of some other Athonite monasteries, particularly that of the Georgian monastery of Iveron, are useful too, both for the early history of Lavra and for the balance of its history during Byzantine times down to the fifteenth century. Hardly less important are the contributions of the hagiographic tradition, especially the two *Lives* of Athanasios, for which J. Noret has provided a much-needed modern critical edition, and the Georgian *Life* of Athanasios' collaborator John the Iberian and his son Euthymios.³

The relationship between the two Athanasian *Lives*, their authorship, dating, and place of composition have all been subject to considerable controversy.⁴ The conclusions of Noret (*Vitae duae*, pp. cviii–cxxix) are accepted here: that *Life A* is the earlier of the two documents, having been composed by Athanasios, a monk of the *Panagios* monastery in Constantinople, in the capital in the first quarter of the eleventh century before the death of Basil II in 1025, while *Life B* was written at Lavra, utilizing *Life A* as well as other written sources, at some time after 1028, most likely considerably later, as late, in fact, as the first half of the twelfth century.

2. Athanasios' Monastic Vocation

The early life of Athanasios is known exclusively from the two *Lives*.⁵ He was born at Trebizond ca. 925–930, and given the baptismal name of Abraamios. Brought to Constantinople for studies

during the reign of Romanos I Lekapenos (920–944), he later became a professor. His attraction to the monastic life was due to Michael Maleinos, the superior of the Kyminas monastery on Mount Olympos in Bithynia.⁶ The latter, known to us from a hagiographic *Life* by his disciple Theophanes, had been a solitary ascetic before he built a lavra, a monastic institution designed to prepare monks for solitary life, for the benefit of his disciples. Maleinos drew up a *typikon* for this foundation that no longer survives. Abraamios became a monk at Kyminas under the name of Athanasios circa 952 and resided there for about five years, eventually progressing to the solitary life. During his residence, Michael introduced him to his nephew, the future emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (963–969), then *strategos* of the Anatolic theme and one of Kyminas' patrons.

3. Athanasios' Arrival on Mount Athos

Athanasios left Kyminas for Mount Athos, supposedly to escape the burdens of his growing notoriety. On his arrival, either at the end of 957 or the beginning of 958, he sought anonymity and even lived under an assumed name.⁷ He was welcomed both by an individual Athonite monk named Zygos, with whom he lived for a year, and later, by the Athonite community at Karyes, where he was installed in a *kellion* toward the end of 959. Sought out and eventually discovered by Leo Phokas, brother of Nikephoros, Athanasios nevertheless gained for himself a year of solitude during 960 at Melana, a desolate site near the southeastern tip of the Athonite peninsula ceded to him by the *protos*, the leader of the Athonite monks. It was here that the Lavra monastery would be erected a few years later.

4. Foundation of Lavra

(13) *Ath. Typikon* preserves the founder's own official account of the circumstances of the foundation of Lavra. This document, however, must be considered in conjunction with the hagiographic testimonies that not only present a different chronology but also record some important episodes that Athanasios chose to suppress.⁸ Summoned to Crete where Nikephoros Phokas was concluding his successful reconquest of the island for Byzantium, Athanasios arrived either just before or shortly after the fall of Chandax in March 961. Athanasios and his patron discussed the latter's idea of joining him in retirement on Mount Athos, but nothing definite was determined at that time. Later, Nikephoros Phokas sent Methodios, a monk and future superior of Kyminas, to Athanasios with sufficient funds to construct a lavra and the necessary associated buildings at Melana. *Life A* makes 961 the decisive year for the building of the Lavra, while (13) *Ath. Typikon* [6], [7] requires a chronology that would place the construction in 962–963.⁹ In any event, during the six months that Methodios was resident with Athanasios on Mount Athos, the latter began work, completing a group of cells designed for five solitaries and a refectory in which they could take meals together, then starting work on a church, a *katholikon* dedicated to the Annunciation of the Mother of God. Both the refectory and the *katholikon*, though much changed over the last thousand years, are still in existence today.¹⁰ The hagiographic sources record that Athanasios also fixed "in great detail" administrative, liturgical, and disciplinary procedures for his monks at this time.¹¹ The discussions clearly indicate that this was when the present document, (11) *Ath. Rule*, was drawn up, at least in its initial form.

11. ATH. RULE

5. Lavra's Patron Nikephoros Phokas Becomes Emperor

Work on the church was interrupted when the news of Nikephoros Phokas' accession to the throne reached Mount Athos; since he was acclaimed by his army at Caesarea in July 963 but not crowned in Constantinople until August, this must have been towards the end of summer or early fall 963. In (13) *Ath. Typikon* [7], Athanasios implies that he left promptly for Constantinople to reproach the emperor for his breach of engagement, but from the hagiographic tradition we learn that Athanasios' actions in response to the anticipated loss of his patron, partner, and financial backer were considerably more complicated.¹² He evidently considered abandoning his own association with Lavra, even going so far as to propose the monk Euthymios to Nikephoros Phokas as a suitable candidate for the superiorship, a nomination that the emperor accepted. Athanasios himself intended to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but political conditions there were unstable, so he halted his journey at Cyprus, where the superior of the Monastery of the Saints lodged him and his disciple Antony for a time. Prompted by a vision to return to Lavra where, Euthymios having declined to assume the superiorship, conditions had deteriorated in Athanasios' absence, the holy man arrived at the end of 963 or early 964, warmly welcomed by his monks as well as by the other Athonites.

6. Athanasios' "Conversion" to Cenobiticism

Athanasios actually appeared at Constantinople before Nikephoros Phokas only in 964, sometime before May, the date of a chrysobull awarding Lavra three relics including a fragment of the Holy Cross and the head of St. Basil of Caesarea.¹³ As noted by Papachryssanthou (*Prôtaton*, p. 81), the year 964 was a turning point in the history of both Lavra and Athonite monasticism, for by virtue of the fact that Lavra's founder (its *ktetor*) had become emperor, it was transformed into a de facto imperial monastery, which could not but have consequences for all of Mount Athos. Also, Athanasios' "conversion" to cenobitic monasticism becomes clear at this time. Before his accession to the throne, Nikephoros Phokas seems to have envisioned an individual *kellion* attached to a traditional Byzantine lavra (hence the foundation's name) as his place of retirement on Mount Athos.¹⁴ Yet subtly, as Leroy ("Conversion," p. 110) realized, Athanasios modified his patron's plans to make Lavra (despite its name) a cenobitic foundation. Despite the fact that there is nothing in Athanasios' background to suggest that he might be receptive to this form of organization rather than the lavriotiic and solitary forms of monasticism that he himself had practiced over the years, his choice of (4) *Stoudios* as the unacknowledged model for (11) *Ath. Rule* (for which see below, Analysis) certainly indicates that somehow he had come around to the idea of installing a cenobitic foundation on Athos.

7. Nikephoros Phokas' Chrysobulls for Lavra

In any event, the concessions Athanasios obtained from Nikephoros Phokas during the former's visit to Constantinople in 964 enabled him to support a large cenobitic foundation and assure its autonomy.¹⁵ Of the chrysobulls that the emperor awarded at this time, only the one mentioned above donating relics survives. This document confirms two earlier chrysobulls whose content must be reconstructed from scattered quotations and references elsewhere. The more important of

TENTH CENTURY

these two chrysobulls awarded an independent constitution to Lavra and (probably) also the revenues required to support 80 monks, specifically a cash annuity (*solemnion*) of 244 *nomismata*, an annual payment in kind, and the monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai near Thessalonike with all its properties (subordinated to Lavra under *epidosis*). The other chrysobull may have granted Lavra 32 tax-exempt peasants on a property near Hierissos, or some other combination of benefits from among those listed above.

8. Lavra and Its Athonite Neighbors

As Papachryssanthou (*Prôtaton*, p. 83) notes, these concessions and grants made Lavra a rich and powerful monastery, especially within the context of the other generally smaller, differently organized monastic foundations on Mount Athos. Perhaps conscious of the jealousy Lavra's good fortune might provoke or else to honor prior engagements to neighboring institutions, Athanasios also got the emperor to increase the annual pension for all of Mount Athos from three to seven pounds of gold and to make a promise to rebuild the Protaton church at Athos' administrative headquarters at Karyes.¹⁶ Yet these benefactions would not suffice to win Athanasios the good will of his neighbors. The murder of Nikephoros Phokas by his successor John Tzimiskes (969–976) four years later left Lavra without a patron and encouraged opponents of Athanasios on Mount Athos to hope to enlist the support of the emperor for his expulsion from the mountain.

9. The Tragos Affair

Athanasios' opponents included not only the solitaries whose traditional way of life his expansionist cenobitic monastery threatened, but also the Athonite elders who objected to his promotion of large-scale farming and viticulture, seen as a reversal of "ancient usages and customs." Eventually the new emperor dispatched Euthymios the Studite to the mountain to investigate the complaints. The inquest led to the issuance in late 971 or early 972 of the first *typikon* to govern Athos, (12) *Tzimiskes*, nicknamed the "Tragos" or "billy goat" after the parchment on which it was written, which sought (so Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 100) to safeguard the interests of each of the groups, the solitary hermits, the leaders of small bands of monks in *kellia*, and the burgeoning cenobitic monasteries like Lavra, so that all could share the mountain harmoniously.¹⁷ In his own writings, Athanasios ignores the inquest; the hagiographic tradition treats this, the most serious threat Athanasios ever faced to his position on Mount Athos, with a certain disingenuousness, turning the inquest into a favor granted by Tzimiskes to Athanasios to promote good-will among his Athonite opponents, who allegedly had been overawed by the results of a quick visit Athanasios had made to the capital that won the emperor over to his side. Regardless of the intent of (12) *Tzimiskes*, the result was a victory for Athanasios and his cenobitic version of monasticism, to the detriment of more traditional forms. Either personally or through the agency of his trusted collaborator John the Iberian, Athanasios secured from John Tzimiskes a doubling of his predecessor's cash annuity, which made it possible now to support up to 120 monks at Lavra.¹⁸

10. Continued Athonite Opposition to Athanasios

Both the hagiographic tradition and modern scholars view Athanasios' successful survival of the imperial inquest as a turning point, but opposition to Athanasios seems to have remained strong for the rest of his life.¹⁹ There was an attempted assassination by a monk in his own community

11. ATH. RULE

who hated the cenobitic life, while another monk, whose grievance is not stated, sought to employ sorcery against him.

11. Athanasios' Political Skills

Athanasios drew up (13) *Ath. Typikon*, his foundation's *typikon*, later in the reign of John Tzimiskes, probably sometime between 973 and 975.²⁰ Like (11) *Ath. Rule*, it is textually linked to an earlier Studite document, (3) *Theodore Studites*, but once again without explicit acknowledgement. While most founders drew up their *typika* at the ends of their lives, Athanasios was far from finished with his career. Gifted with impressive political skills, Athanasios ably charted a course for his foundation during the troubled last quarter of the tenth century, getting the next emperor Basil II (976–1025) to confirm the chrysobulls of his predecessors Nikephoros Phokas and John Tzimiskes as well as to bestow others that left Lavra richer and more populated.²¹ In 978, the government of Basil II and Constantine VIII issued one such chrysobull that increased Lavra's financial assistance to the level where 500 monks could be supported. Athanasios even managed to benefit from one of the era's controversial programs for the management of religious institutions by obtaining from Patriarch Nicholas II Chrysoberges in 989 the donation under *epidosis* of a dilapidated monastery of Gomatou near Hierissos which he later converted into a Lavriote dependency.²²

12. Athanasios' Provision for a Protectorate over Lavra

It was at least a decade after the composition of (13) *Ath. Typikon* that Athanasios drew up what was to be the last of his three foundation documents, (14) *Ath. Testament*, sometime after 984. Accommodating himself skillfully, as usual, to changed political circumstances, he made a provision in this document, to be kept secret until his death, for a dual protectorate for Lavra, to be filled by two administrators (*epitropoi*), Nikephoros, the emperor's *epi tou kanikleiou* or chancellor in Constantinople, and Athanasios' old collaborator John the Iberian. The latter appointment was the culmination of a long friendly relationship between Athanasios and the Georgian community on Mount Athos, which had by this time been established in the Monastery of Iveron.²³

13. Last Challenge to Athanasios' Authority

Athanasios faced one more serious challenge to his authority on Mount Athos, the revolt of the "young superiors."²⁴ According to the account in the hagiographic tradition, certain superiors of the younger generation, jealous of Athanasios and resentful of his success in reducing the authority of the *protos*, the nominal leader of Athos, succeeded in persuading Phakenos, who held that office in the last decade of the tenth century, to join them in a personal appeal against Athanasios to Basil II, who was then in the vicinity with his troops in Macedonia. Athanasios quickly divined their intentions, but allowed them to proceed on their way to the emperor. As it happened, they were set upon by Turkish mercenaries allied to the Byzantines who robbed them and left them stripped naked on the road, where Athanasios discovered them later and took pity on them. These superiors are said to have still been alive when *Life A* was composed in the first quarter of the eleventh century.

14. Circumstances of Athanasios' Death

It was appropriately ironic that Athanasios should meet his death while engaged in an ambitious project to rebuild Lavra's *katholikon* to accommodate the sixfold increase in the number of monks

since 964.²⁵ Along with six other monks Athanasios fell from the scaffolding on which he was standing to make a work inspection, and was crushed on a pile of building debris. The sudden, violent, and unconventional manner of his death may have pleased some of his enemies, for the author of *Life A* was motivated to assert at length that such a death was not always a sign of divine displeasure. Athanasios died on July 5, but the year is unknown. Judging from documents in Lavra's cartulary, he was still alive in 996 but deceased in 1012; he is also known to have predeceased John the Iberian, who himself died in 1008.²⁶ Lemerle (*Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 48) supposes that he died in the first years of the eleventh century, perhaps in 1001.

B. The History of Lavra after Athanasios

1. Athanasios' Legacy

When Athanasios died, his designated successor Antony was in Constantinople conducting business for the monastery. This Antony was likely, but not certainly, Athanasios' companion on the latter's flight to Cyprus back in 963–964.²⁷ There is no direct attestation in the sources, but it appears that Antony later resigned his superiorship to become director (and possibly founder) of the monastery of *Panagios* at Constantinople.²⁸ If this monastery was not a formal dependency of Lavra, as Noret (*Vitae duae*, p. cxxiv) supposed, it was at least an alternative (and possibly rival) center for the Athanasian tradition; sometime before 1025, Antony's disciple, Athanasios of Panagiou, wrote here the first of the hagiographic lives of the late Athanasios the Athonite, *Life A*.²⁹ *Panagios'* own *typikon*, now lost, would serve as the model for the important reform *typikon*, (23) *Pakourianos*, towards the end of the eleventh century (see below, Chapter Four).

At Lavra, rivalries between the Greek monks there and the Georgians at Iveron frustrated Athanasios' hopes for utility of the protectorate under John the Iberian († 1008) and his son and successor Euthymios († 1028).³⁰ Turnover in the office of superior was frequent, and we do not even know the names of the incumbents during the 1020s. A dispute between the administrator (*epitropos*) Euthymios and the monks of Lavra over some administrative matter led the latter to appeal for relief to Constantine VIII (1025–1028), who summoned Euthymios to Constantinople for an inquiry. The enlargement of the *katholikon* begun by Athanasios was completed by 1004, however, with the financial assistance of the other administrator, Nikephoros *epi tou kanikleiou*. Mylonas ("Catholicon," p. 104) believes that the two side chapels dedicated to the Forty Saints and St. Nicholas, mentioned in *Life B* as well as in (11) *Ath. Rule* [1] but not in *Life A*, were built subsequent to the composition of the last-named document, i.e., after 1025.³¹ Mylonas' supposition that (11) *Ath. Rule* must have been re-edited or at least interpolated in the 1020s to reflect the existence of these side chapels is certainly possible, as it is a document in the Studite tradition that was itself a product of evolutionary change over more than a century since the original composition of (4) *Stoudios*.

2. Chrysobulls of Constantine IX Monomachos

By the mid-eleventh century, reform currents stirring in monastic circles emboldened opponents of the great Athonite monasteries like Lavra, Vatopedi, and perhaps also Iveron, to appeal to the emperor for a return to the provisions of (12) *Tzimiskes* as issued three-quarters of a century earlier. As will be seen in the discussion of (15) *Constantine IX* in this chapter, neither side won a complete victory in this second imperial inquest, conducted this time by the monk Kosmas

11. ATH. RULE

Tzinziloukes, which led to the issuance of the second *typikon* governing the monastic communities on Mount Athos in 1045.³²

Although Lavra's superior Kosmas succeeded in preventing the imperial inquest from returning Athos to the terms of (12) *Tzimiskes*, an outcome that would have been disastrous for this very large monastery so dependent on extensive economic enterprise for its support, Lavra continued to be troubled by the demands of local imperial officials as well as the disorder and indiscipline of its own monks. Attributing these troubles to the lapse of its protectorate after the deaths of Euthymios († 1028) and Nikephoros the *epi tou kanikleiou*, Lavra's monks requested Constantine IX Monomachos to appoint a new lay administrator; the local administrator's position on Mount Athos was not proposed for revival, however. The emperor obliged, issuing a chrysobull in 1052, appointing John, the current incumbent of the office of *epi tou kanikleiou*, to the office.³³

3. Lavra's Imperial Relations down to Alexios I Komnenos

Judging from (15) *Constantine IX* [4], Lavra was able to support as many as 700 monks by mid-century. Exploiting its status as an imperial monastery without effectively surrendering its claim to independence, Lavra continued to accumulate donations and privileges for the balance of the eleventh century. Michael VI Stratiotikos (1056–1057) issued a chrysobull in 1057, of which an original copy is preserved, increasing Lavra's *solemnion* to the equivalent of 812 *nomismata*.³⁴ Originally set by Nikephoros Phokas at 244 *nomismata*, it was increased as we have seen by John Tzimiskes to 488 and then by Basil II to 596 *nomismata*.

In 1060, in another document still preserved in the original, Constantine X Doukas (1059–1067) acceded to a request by the Athonite monks that he confirm both Constantine IX Monomachos' (second) chrysobull restoring the protectorate over Lavra as well as another chrysobull (now lost) of Constantine VII Porphyrogennitos (944–959) that granted privileges to Lavra's dependency, the monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai.³⁵ This last chrysobull, evidently granted to St. Andrew's before that monastery was subordinated to Lavra under *epidosis* by Nikephoros Phokas in 964, is said to have recognized Peristerai as an imperial monastery exempt from the control of the metropolitan of Thessalonike, and may therefore have served as a model for Lavra's own charter of independence. In Constantine X Doukas' chrysobull here, Lavra's protectorate is described for the first time as an *ephoreia* (see discussion below in Chapter Three).

4. Lavra in the Era of the Monastic Reform

Although at the time of its foundation in the tenth century, Lavra could be considered as a kind of "reform" monastery in the Studite tradition, its astounding growth thanks to generous imperial patronage and its willingness to engage in extensive commercial activity made it a very different kind of institution by the mid-eleventh century at the time of Constantine IX Monomachos' imperial inquest in 1045. The vigorous dissent of Athonite reformers against the Lavriote brand of "big monasticism" detectable in (15) *Constantine IX* did not succeed at that time in curbing Lavra's continued growth, nor that of similar large cenobitic institutions, yet the seeds of a successful monastic reform eventually took root elsewhere. As will be seen below in the discussion accompanying Chapter Four, the Constantinopolitan monastery represented by (22) *Evergetis* would eclipse Lavra and indeed all of Mount Athos as the most important center of Byzantine monasticism in the twelfth century.

The nature of the monastic reform's impact on Lavra, which had become by the end of the

eleventh century a rich but ideologically conservative institution, has not yet been studied. Yet some indications of the reform's impact on Lavra and on Mount Athos generally are readily apparent. A serious moral scandal, the "Vlach Question," due to consequences of the settlement of Vlach shepherds on the mountain, was uncovered circa 1100, resulting in the expulsion of these lay settlers at the instigation of the ecclesiastical reform party.³⁶ Also, the reform-minded Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084–1111) tried to impose punishments and excommunications as part of an attempt to establish his jurisdiction over the monasteries of Mount Athos.³⁷

Though Lavra continued to receive benefits from the emperors, including a donation of an additional annual revenue of 100 *nomismata* awarded by Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) on the occasion of his installation of Theodore Kephalas as Lavra's superior,³⁸ both the monastery's imperial stipends and the growth in its landed estates must have come to a halt with the Latin conquest of 1204.

5. Lavra in Late Byzantine Times³⁹

Lavra's fortunes resumed with the growing power of the Nicaean Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–82), who in 1259 confirmed Lavra's existing properties and added another village to its endowment. This emperor, despite his recovery of Constantinople in 1261, was generally unpopular on Mount Athos because of his determination to enforce compliance with his Unionist policy towards the Latin church. Under Andronikos II (1282–1328), Lavra benefited from generous imperial donations, but also witnessed the attempt by Patriarch Athanasios I (1289–93 and 1303–9), circa 1303–5, to convert it into a patriarchal monastery (see below, Chapter Nine, (55) *Athanasios I*), and had to accept the imposition of the requirement of its superiors' obtaining patriarchal investiture that this emperor imposed in 1312. Several important figures in the late Byzantine church, such as the hesychast theologian Gregory Palamas and Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (1354–55 and 1364–76), had served as superiors of Lavra at early points in their careers. Generally speaking, Lavra continued to prosper economically through the first half of the fourteenth century, then suffered along with all of Mount Athos as political conditions deteriorated with the slow but inexorable collapse of the Byzantine Empire during the latter half of that century.

6. Lavra under Ottoman Rule⁴⁰

Like the rest of Mount Athos, Lavra passed under Ottoman hegemony in 1423/24, a few years before the fall of Thessalonike in 1430 to Sultan Murad II.⁴¹ Despite the sultan's recognition of Athonite autonomy in exchange for the payment of annual tribute, Lavra inevitably lost many, if not all, of its far-flung estates outside Athos itself. By the early sixteenth century, the number of monks had become dangerously low, and at that time, if not earlier, the cenobitic regime was abandoned for an idiorhythmic form of monasticism that, by permitting the monks to earn their own livings generally as they saw fit, proved less burdensome on the monastery's resources. Circa 1525 a patron, Neophytos, metropolitan of Serres, commissioned the mural decoration of the *katholikon* by Theophanes of Crete. An earthquake destroyed the cupola of Lavra's *katholikon* in 1526, but the monastery was able to get it repaired thanks to the generosity of another patron, either a certain Vladislav or else Gennadios, another metropolitan of Serres who rehabilitated the refectory a year later in 1527. Theophanes of Crete also decorated the refectory, circa 1527–30. A second earthquake of 1584–85, which damaged the cupola again as well as the two choirs, was

11. ATH. RULE

likewise repaired by a benefactor, Anthimos, metropolitan of Adrianople, who later became patriarch of Constantinople.

Sylvester, the orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, is said to have attempted a restoration of cenobitic life in 1579, but without enduring success. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, Lavra was reduced to only five or six monks, but the monastery was rescued when Patriarch Dionysios III decided to retire here in 1665, bequeathing all of his property to the monastery. Sometime before 1744, extensive additions to the *katholikon* were undertaken, with the open colonnade between the two side chapels being blocked off to create a second narthex, in front of which an exonarthex was constructed.

7. Lavra in Modern Times⁴²

Lavra still functions as a monastery, though it now follows an idiorhythmic form of organization. Of the twenty monasteries recognized by the Athonite constitutional charter of 1924, the Great Lavra holds the first rank of honor. In 1980, there were 376 monks, including 56 living at the Lavra itself and 320 living at the various dependencies, including Lavra's three *sketae*.⁴³ There was a major rehabilitation of the *katholikon* in 1899, with the three entrances being redecorated in neo-renaissance style, giving the building its present form. The building is now dedicated to the Dormition of St. Athanasios the Athonite, probably having been reconsecrated in the fifteenth century. The treasury, a freestanding building behind the *katholikon*, also houses the library, which contains some 2,046 manuscripts, of which at least 800 are from the Byzantine era, as well as 172 Byzantine charters.⁴⁴

Analysis

Although only the scribal title identifies the author of this document, Athanasios cross-references it in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [39] and in (14) *Ath. Testament* [3] which are undoubtedly his work. The document is undated, but the hagiographic tradition associates it with Lavra's foundation.⁴⁵ Indeed, as Lemerle (*Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 21) observed, it would be surprising if this, the most fundamental of Athanasios' three foundation documents, was not instituted in the first years of Lavra's existence.

A. Use of the Model Typikon

As Leroy ("Conversion," p. 115) realized, (11) *Ath. Rule* is modelled very closely on the Studite *typikon*, (4) *Stoudios*. Athanasios certainly had some version of that document in front of him while composing his own *Rule*. This document, therefore, is an important testimony to the continued influence and prestige of Studite monasticism nearly a century and a half after the death of Theodore the Studite. Of the 37 chapters into which our translation of this document has been divided for ease of cross-reference, 23 chapters contain quotations from (4) *Stoudios*. Within the chapters of the Athanasian *Rule*, there are many more quotations—all of them unacknowledged—the precise number and delimitations of which are difficult to determine. Only two, to be found in [25] and [26], can be traced solely to (4) *Stoudios* Version [A], while just five, located in [3], [6], [7], [15], and [24], can be traced exclusively to Version [B]. All the rest, with the exception of some found in [1], are shared with both Versions [A] and [B]. (11) *Ath. Rule* [1] is a special case,

weaving back and forth from line to line from a dependence on both Versions [A] and [B] to an exclusive dependence on Version [B].

In our presentation of the translation of (11) *Ath. Rule* below, we have endeavored to illustrate the linkages between this document and (4) *Stoudios* by presenting the former's quotations from the latter's Version [A] in boldface, those from Version [B] in italic, and those from both versions in boldface italic type. As even a cursory examination of our sourcing of (11) *Ath. Rule* will demonstrate, the textual variants of (4) *Stoudios* represented by [A] and [B] had thoroughly interpenetrated one another by the time Athanasios was ready to use that document as his model in the middle of the tenth century. This complex pattern of textual dependency suggests that the precise Studite model for the Athanasian *Rule* was neither [A] nor [B], but rather another, subsequent version of (4) *Stoudios*, either lost or presently unedited. This version was more heavily influenced by [B] than [A], yet it also drew independently on the latter.

Despite the generally very close correspondence between (11) *Ath. Rule* and its model, some 18 chapters of (4) *Stoudios* are missing from the Athanasian *Rule* entirely.⁴⁶ Some of these are the chapters that relate most specifically to the Stoudios monastery itself and its patron Theodore.⁴⁷ On the other hand, there are 14 new chapters in the Athanasian *Rule* that cannot be traced to any currently known Studite predecessors.⁴⁸ Nine of these are to be found in the most original portion of the Athanasian *Rule* which begins with [27]. Indeed, in [28] Athanasios alludes to the prior treatment of the common life of the community "as has already been discussed" immediately after what turns out to be the penultimate quotation from the Studite *Rule*. This sort of redundant treatment is a sure sign of a break in authorship.⁴⁹ Thereafter, there is only one brief quotation [35] on the subject of garments. It seems safe then to attribute these last ten chapters (from [27] through [37], excepting [35]) to the author of the Athanasian *Rule*.

Yet it is also evident that, in using his Studite model, Athanasios made some changes in the earlier portion of his own *Rule* too, certainly including the references to the side chapels in [1] and [27] as well as the distinctive list of monastic officials in [17]. The deletion in [26] of *eukraton*, the Lenten beverage that the Studites employed to substitute for wine, as well as his indignant banning [20] of the use of staffs and footstools in the church may also have occurred in Athanasios' final edit of his model for the *Rule*.

However, not all of the substantial differences between the two edited versions of (4) *Stoudios* on the one hand and (11) *Ath. Rule* on the other can be prudently attributed to Athanasios' editorial discretion. The model text he used quite likely reflected the evolution of certain aspects of Studite monasticism in the first half of the tenth century, particularly in terms of regulation of the liturgy and dietary observances.⁵⁰

The liturgical and disciplinary regime presented here by the Athanasian *Rule* then is a complex composite of Studite observances endorsed either unreservedly or, more typically, in modified form, to which the author has added certain new provisions of his own.

B. Lives of the Monks

The disciplinary regime of (4) *Stoudios* strongly influenced the provisions of this document governing the lives of the monks. The length of time for testing newcomers [18], the practice of

11. ATH. RULE

scriptural readings at mealtimes [21], the veneration of the Holy Cross [28], prescriptions for clothing and shoes [35], and even the endorsement of monastic prisons [19] all have Studite precedents.⁵¹ Even in some cases where there is no direct textual dependency between the respective rules, Studite observances can be seen as models for the declaration of hostility [34] to personal property, as in (3) *Theodore Studites* [7], requiring [33] the monks to offer their confessions to the superior, as in (4) *Stoudios* [22], and for alternating [32] manual labors and spiritual reading, as in (4) *Stoudios* [26].

Sometimes, however, the Athanasian *Rule* cites Basil of Caesarea [19], [34] or patristic tradition generally [33], [34] as authorities even when the regulations in question have solid Studite precedents with which the author was undoubtedly acquainted. This is an indication of an increasing acquaintance with and appreciation for the patristic traditions that lay behind the disciplinary practices of Theodore the Studite.

1. Liturgical Duties

The Athanasian *Rule*'s indebtedness to the Studite *Rule* is most evident in the former's adaptation of many Studite liturgical prescriptions. Like its model, this is primarily a liturgical text, starting with regulations for the Easter service [1], [2]. Despite the indebtedness to the Studite *Rule* in matters of liturgical observance, there are some chapters [5], [10], [11], [14] on the subject not found in the published exemplars of that rule, though some of these additions, as noted above, may predate the composition of the Athanasian *Rule*. The outdoor procession [27] before vespers, however, is almost surely a new liturgical observance particular to Lavra.

2. Manual Labor

Perhaps the most important feature of this document is its testimony [29], [30] to a greater practice of diversified, manual labor, noted also by Leroy ("Conversion," p. 115, n. 88), than can be seen in the model Studite *Rule*. This alone required the author to allow the superior considerable flexibility [30], [31] in determining appropriate diets for the monastery's metal workers, muleteers, shipwrights, carpenters, vineyard and bakery workers. The hagiographic tradition abundantly confirms the importance Athanasios placed on manual labor (he himself was a calligrapher),⁵² and of course the commercial activity portrayed (critically) in (12) *Tzimiskes* [15], [22], [24], etc. would have been impossible in its absence.

3. Sacramental Life

Curiously, the parallel Studite provisions related to this subject are prominent among those not adopted by the Athanasian *Rule*,⁵³ though there is a provision [33] for confession to the superior analogous to but textually independent of (4) *Stoudios* [22].

4. Diet

In the typical fashion of a *typikon leitourgikon*, the Athanasian *Rule*'s dietary regulations ([22] through [26]) lend themselves to a discussion paralleling the annual liturgical cycle. Here too Studite observances are influential, though there are many minor variations, and perhaps a greater willingness to concede [30], [31] a considerable amount of discretion to the superior in moderating the rules.

5. Importance of Reading

If the Athanasian *Rule* placed a greater emphasis on manual labor than its model, it also apparently placed a lesser emphasis on reading, for (4) *Stoudios*' chapters on the alternation of reading with manual work [26], on copyists and the library [33], and on teaching monks the psalter are all missing in (11) *Ath. Rule*. As at the Stoudios monastery, however, at least some monks are presumed to be literate [29], [32], cf. [21], and the hagiographic tradition is nonetheless eager to assert Athanasios' interest in teaching his illiterate monks how to read.⁵⁴

6. Disciplinary Regime

It is unclear if the deletion of the Studite ban on corporal punishment in the chapter [19] endorsing monastic confinement is significant; elsewhere there is a provision [17] for the use of "moderate punishments." Like others before and after him, Athanasios was concerned to restrict [34] departures by disgruntled monks, preferring to place them with another spiritual director or make "other arrangements for their welfare."

C. Constitutional Matters

Like its Studite model, the Athanasian *Rule* was not much concerned about administrative and constitutional matters, which Athanasios would treat adequately later in his (13) *Ath. Typikon* and (14) *Ath. Testament*. Here he employs (4) *Stoudios* [18] for the designation [17] of some of the monastery's functional officials: disciplinarians, a waker, and an overseer. Perhaps a heightened concern for security motivates him to add both a doorkeeper [17] for the church and a gatekeeper [36] for the entrance to the monastery; the latter is specifically responsible for the prevention of theft.

Finally, there is a provision [37] for reading the rules in assembly which was to have many imitators among founders of later eras anxious to see their prescriptions for community life endure.

Notes on the Introduction

1. For dating, see the apparent reference to this document in *Vita A*, chap. 84; cf. *Vita B*, chap. 26, which would have occurred before the news of Nikephoros Phokas' elevation to the throne (963) reached Mount Athos. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 21, however, proposes a dating of 964–973, interpreting (11) *Ath. Rule* [28] as a reference to the relic of the Holy Cross donated by Nikephoros Phokas in his chrysobull of May 964 (Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 706, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, no. 5, pp. 103–6), considering that our document must be subsequent to that chrysobull and prior to (13) *Ath. Typikon*, which is thought to date to 973–75. The relevant passage of (11) *Ath. Rule* [28], however, is a borrowing from (4) *Stoudios* [AB32], so it cannot be used to establish a *terminus post quem*. Mylonas, "Catholicon," pp. 95–96, 104, arguing from archaeological evidence, is inclined to accept a much later date of 1020 as originally proposed by Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, pp. viii, 273 for the document "as it now exists," or, alternatively, to postulate the reference to subsidiary chapels in (11) *Ath. Rule* [1] as an interpolation of the text as originally drawn up at the time of Lavra's foundation.
2. See Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, pp. 270–73, and Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 21, cf. 13–14; as Lemerle notes, a true critical edition remains to be done on the basis of Lavra ms. E 194 (14th–15th c.), for which see Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. xxxii. This manuscript also contains *Vita A*, an *Enkomion* (= Halkin, *BHG* 189), (13) *Ath. Typikon*, and (14) *Ath. Testament* as well as some other documents associated with Athanasios.
3. Athanasian *Vitae*, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*; the Georgian *Life* of John the Iberian and Euthymios by George

11. ATH. RULE

- the Hagiorite (from before 1044) is accessible through the Latin translation of P. Peeters, "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," *AB* 36–37 (1917–19), 8–68.
4. Petit, "Vie," believed that *Vita B* was dependent upon *Vita A*; Lemerle, "Vie ancienne," pp. 61–63, accepted this conclusion enthusiastically and thought that *Vita A* was written on Mount Athos by a Lavriote monk named Athanasios in the first decade of the eleventh century; Leroy, "Deux vies," pp. 411–28, argued for the importance of *Vita B* and implied that it might actually be older than *Vita A*, which he thought was written not on Mount Athos but at the Constantinopolitan monastery of the *Panagios* by a monk named Athanasios who was the disciple of Athanasios the Athonite's successor Antony; in *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 24–26, Lemerle defended his original views against Leroy's proposals; Mossay, "Note," p. 124, sided with Leroy on the Constantinopolitan origin of *Vita A*, but thought that it was impossible to establish a priority of *Vita A* over *Vita B* solely on the basis of internal evidence.
 5. For Athanasios' early life and his monastic profession, see *Vita A*, chaps. 4–37, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 4–18, and *Vita B*, chaps. 2–12, ed. Noret, pp. 128–39; with Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 30–31, and Leroy, "Conversion," pp. 106–8.
 6. *Vita*, ed. Louis Petit, "Vie de saint Michel Maléinos," *ROC* 7 (1902), 543–603 (= Halkin, *BHG* 1295); for the *typikon*, see Petit, p. 560, cf. the *hypotyposis* of Basil, one of Michael's successors, pp. 598–603; for the foundation, see Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 115–18; general discussion by Leroy, "Conversion," pp. 106–8.
 7. For Athanasios' arrival on Mount Athos, see *Vita A*, chaps. 38–59, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 18–29, and *Vita B*, chap. 13–21, ed. Noret, pp. 139–47; with Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 32–33, and "Vie ancienne," pp. 72–75.
 8. For the foundation of Lavra, see (13) *Ath. Typikon* [2] – [8]; *Vita A*, chaps. 68–81, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 32–38, and *Vita B*, chaps. 22–25, ed. Noret, pp. 147–53, with Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 33–35, and "Vie ancienne," pp. 75–76.
 9. See discussion in Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 34–35.
 10. See Mylonas, "Trapéza," p. 154, and "Catholicon," p. 103.
 11. See *Vita A*, chaps. 84, 86–89, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 39–42, and *Vita B*, chaps. 26, 29, ed. Noret, pp. 153–54, 157–59, with Lemerle, "Vie ancienne," p. 76, n. 55, and the discussion below in Analysis.
 12. For this troubled period, see *Vita A*, chaps. 90–95, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 42–45, and *Vita B*, chaps. 30–32, ed. Noret, pp. 159–63; cf. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [7]; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 35, and "Vie ancienne," pp. 77–78.
 13. For Athanasios' visit to Constantinople, see (13) *Ath. Typikon* [7], *Vita A*, chaps. 100–101, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 48–49, and *Vita B*, chap. 34, ed. Noret, pp. 165–66; for the chrysobull, see Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 706, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 5, pp. 103–6.
 14. For Nikephoros Phokas' original intent, see (13) *Ath. Typikon* [5], *Vita A*, chap. 70, p. 33, and *Vita B*, chap. 22, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 148, with discussion by Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 77–78; see also the emperor's views on monasticism in general in his *Novella de monasteriis* of 964 (*JGR* 3.292–96) = Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 699, a general prohibition on the founding of new monasteries, with *kellia* and *lavrai* conspicuously excepted.
 15. For the concessions obtained from Nikephoros Phokas, see *Vita A*, chap. 103, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 49–50; *Vita B*, chap. 34, ed. Noret, pp. 165–66; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [12], [13], [18], [20], [23], [36], [42]; (14) *Ath. Testament* [3]; Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 5, pp. 103–6, and doc. 6, pp. 106–10; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 36–39, and Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 81–83. Two of these chrysobulls are in Dölger, *Regesten*, nos. 704, 706.
 16. For the concessions obtained for Mount Athos, see Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 705; *Vita A*, chap. 104, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 50, and *Vita B*, chap. 34, p. 166; with discussion by Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 83.
 17. For the Tragos affair, so called after the nickname for Tzimsikes' *typikon*, Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 745, ed. Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, doc. 7, pp. 202–15, see (12) *Tzimsikes*, *Vita A*, chaps. 114–23, ed. Noret,

TENTH CENTURY

- Vitae duae*, pp. 54–58, and *Vita B*, chap. 36, ed. Noret, pp. 168–69; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 39–41, and “Vie ancienne,” pp. 79–80, and by Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 95–102.
18. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 744, mentioned in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [36], [51], in *Vita A*, chap. 116, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 56, and in *Vita B*, chap. 36, ed. Noret, p. 169; in a document of 984, Athanasios himself attributes this increase to the efforts of John the Iberian in Lefort et al., *Iviron*, pt. 1, doc. 6; cf. comment by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 43, n. 156: “So it is possible that despite the *Vita*, Athanasios never met this emperor.”
 19. See *Vita A*, chaps. 125–28, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 59–62, and *Vita B*, chaps. 38–39, ed. Noret, pp. 170–72; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 41.
 20. For dating, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 17.
 21. For Athanasios’ relations with Basil II, see Dölger, *Regesten*, nos. 758 and 760, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 7, pp. 111–14; with discussion by Lemerle, p. 46.
 22. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 8, pp. 115–17.
 23. For Athanasios’ relations with John the Iberian, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 43–44, and Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 83–85.
 24. For the revolt of the young superiors, see *Vita A*, chaps. 209–11, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 100–102, and *Vita B*, chap. 58, ed. Noret, pp. 194–95; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 46–47, and “Vie ancienne,” p. 81.
 25. For Athanasios’ death, see *Vita A*, chaps. 234–46, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 112–17, and *Vita B*, chaps. 65–68, ed. Noret, pp. 200–203; for the discussion of its implications, see *Vita A*, chaps. 231–33, ed. Noret, pp. 110–12.
 26. For the parameters for Athanasios’ death, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 13 (996), pp. 130–33, and doc. 16 (1012), pp. 141–44.
 27. For Athanasios’ successor, see (14) *Ath. Testament* [17], *Vita A*, chap. 247, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 118–18, and *Vita B*, chap. 69, ed. Noret, pp. 203–4; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 48.
 28. Antony’s resignation and transfer to *Panagios* was first suggested by Leroy, “Deux vies,” to reconcile the apparent Constantinopolitan origin of *Vita A*, self-attributed to a certain Athanasios, who identifies himself in chap. 213, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 105, as a disciple of Antony, with the testimony of *Vita B*, chap. 78, ed. Noret, pp. 211–12, in which Antony, the superior of *Panagios*, is identified as a disciple of Athanasios (the Athonite). Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 26, rejected the hypothesis, but Noret, p. cxvii, accepts it as a reasonable way of reconciling our evidence.
 29. For Athanasios the Athonite, see Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. cxxx–cxlv.
 30. For *Lavra* in this era, see the discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 48–49; a list of *Lavra*’s superiors after Athanasios down to 1218 is to be found at p. 55; for the administrator Nikephoros, see Mylonas, “Catholicon,” p. 104.
 31. For the side chapels, see (11) *Ath. Rule* [1], [27], and *Vita B*, chap. 25, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 151; if one is to believe that the chapels postdate Athanasios, both references must be seen as anachronistic. Moreover, since *Vita A* was apparently written at Constantinople, the absence of the side chapels in its parallel account, chap. 81, ed. Noret, p. 37, cannot be considered really firm evidence for their subsequent construction.
 32. Ed. Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, doc. 8, pp. 216–32, with commentary, pp. 102–7; translated below in this chapter as (14) *Constantine IX*. See also the emperor’s confirmation issued in 1046, doc. 9, pp. 233–38.
 33. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 907, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 31, pp. 189–92, with discussion, pp. 45, 52.
 34. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 932, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 32, pp. 192–94, with discussion, pp. 52–53; for the number of monks at mid-century, see Talbot and Kazhdan, “*Lavra*,” p. 1190.
 35. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 946, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 33, pp. 195–99, with discussion, p. 45; note the similar protectorate assigned to the logothete of the drome for Iveron by Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81) in a chrysobull of 1079, ed. Lefort et al., *Iviron*, pt. 2, doc. 41 [= old Dölger, *Schatzkammer*, no. 35].

11. ATH. RULE

36. The central document for the “Vlach Question” is the *Diegesis merike*, ed. Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, pp. 163–84, with commentary, pp. 38–47; see also Ferdinand Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d’Alexis I^{er} Comnène (1081–1118)* (Paris, 1900), pp. 288–89, and Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 53.
37. Alexander Kazhdan and Alice-Mary Talbot, “Protos,” *ODB* p. 1747.
38. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1227, with a proposed date of 1105; see discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 53, who dates the grant provisionally to 1107.
39. For the late Byzantine period, see Lemerle et al., *Lavra*, pt. 4, “Chronologie de Lavra de 1204 à 1500,” pp. 3–64, with a list of Lavra’s superiors during these centuries at pp. 61–64; in the same work, Nicolas Svoronos, “Le domaine de Lavra sous le Paléologue,” pp. 65–173; Kadas, *Mount Athos*, pp. 31, 36; Talbot and Kazhdan, “Lavra,” p. 1190.
40. For the *Turkokratia*, see Kadas, *Mount Athos*, pp. 15, 32–36; Mylonas, “Catholicon,” pp. 91–94, 104–5.
41. Nicolas Oikonomidès, “Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane,” *SF* 35 (1976), 1–10, at 10.
42. For Lavra and its buildings in modern times, see Kadas, *Mount Athos*, pp. 16, 36, 38, 40; Mylonas, “Catholicon,” pp. 89–91, 106, and “Trapéza,” p. 155.
43. Kadas, *Mount Athos*, p. 40.
44. Kadas, *Mount Athos*, pp. 39–40; Talbot and Kazhdan, “Lavra,” p. 1191.
45. *Vita A*, chaps. 84, 86–89, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 39–42, and *Vita B*, chaps. 26, 29, ed. Noret, pp. 153–54, 157–59; with discussion in Leroy, “S. Benoît,” p. 115.
46. (4) *Stoudios* [1], [8], [12], [13], [16], [17], [19], [20], [21], [22], [26], [31], [33], [34], [35], [36], [B37], [A38].
47. E.g., (4) *Stoudios* [1], [19], and [36]; so also Leroy, “Conversion,” p. 115.
48. (11) *Ath. Rule* [5], [10], [11], [14], [20], [27], [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [36], and [37].
49. See the discussion below in Chapter Five, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, Analysis, Stages of Composition.
50. See, in connection with the subject of (4) *Stoudios*’s once militantly pro-cenobitic outlook, the warning of Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 100, against assuming that the customs of Studite monasticism as practiced in Athanasios’ lifetime and later were essentially unchanged from Theodore’s time.
51. See (4) *Stoudios* [24] for testing of newcomers, [28] for scriptural readings, [32] for veneration of the Holy Cross, [A37] and [B38] for clothing.
52. See *Vita A*, chaps. 53, 138, 139, 172, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 26–27, 65–66, 81, and *Vita A*, chaps. 19, 40, ed. Noret, pp. 144–45, 172–73; with discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 80.
53. (4) *Stoudios* [B37] and [A38] on communion; [B16], [21], and [36] on catechetical instruction, this despite the evidence of *Vita B*, chap. 65, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 200, that at the end of his life Athanasios was employing Theodore of Studios’ *Catecheses* of his monks. The hagiographical tradition also records Athanasios’ encouragement of confession: see *Vita A*, chaps. 173–74, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 81–82, and *Vita B*, chap. 45, ed. Noret, pp. 181–82.
54. See *Vita A*, chap. 165, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 78–79, and *Vita B*, chap. 45, ed. Noret, pp. 179–80.

Biography of the Author

A. Hagiography

- Dumont, Pierre, “Vie de saint Athanase l’Athonite,” *Irenikon* 8 (1931), 457–99, 667–89; 9 (1932), 71–95, 240–64. French translation of *Vita B*.
- Halkin, François, *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, 3rd ed. (Brussels, 1957), pp. 187, 188.
- Noret, J., ed., *Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae* (Louvain, 1982). Modern critical edition of *Vitae A* and *B*.

B. Secondary Works

- Kazhdan, Alexander, and Ševčenko, Nancy, “Athanasios of Athos,” *ODB*, p. 219.
- Lemerle, Paul, “La vie ancienne de saint Athanase l’Athonite composée au début du XI^e siècle par Athanase

TENTH CENTURY

- de Lavra,” in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), pp. 60–100. Study of *Vita A*.
- Leroy, Julien, “Les deux vies de S. Athanase l’Athonite,” *AB* 82 (1964), 409–29.
- Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963); vol. 2 (Venice-Chevetogne, 1965).
- Mossay, Justin, “A propos des ‘Actes de Lavra.’ Note sur les deux *Vies* de Saint Athanase l’Athonite,” *AB* 91 (1973), 121–32.
- Noret, J., “La vie la plus ancienne d’Athanase l’Athonite confrontée à d’autres vies de saints,” *AB* 103 (1985), 243–52.
- Petit, Louis, “Vie de saint Athanase l’Athonite,” *AB* 25 (1906), 5–89.

Bibliography

- Darrouzès, Jean, “Liste des protes de l’Athos,” in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), pp. 407–47.
- Doens, Irénée, “Bibliographie de la Sainte Montagne de l’Athos,” in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 2 (Venice-Chevetogne, 1965), pp. 336–495. A comprehensive bibliography on Athonite monasticism.
- Dumont, Pierre, “L’higoumène dans la règle de Saint Athanase l’Athonite,” in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), pp. 121–34.
- , “Vie cénobitique ou vie hésychaste dans quelques ‘typica’ byzantins,” in *L’Église et les Églises*, vol. 2 (Chevetogne, 1955), pp. 3–13.
- Kadas, Sotiris, *Mount Athos: An Illustrated Guide to the Monasteries and Their History* (Athens, 1980), pp. 35–41.
- Lefort, Jacques, Oikonomidès, Nicolas, and Papachryssanthou, Denise, *Actes d’Ivion*, pt. 1: *Des origines au milieu du XI^e siècle* (= Archives de l’Athos 14) (Paris, 1985).
- Lemerle, Paul, et al., *Actes de Lavra*, pt. 1: *Des origines à 1204* (= Archives de l’Athos 5) (Paris, 1970), esp. pp. 13–55.
- Lemerle, Paul, et al., *Actes de Lavra*, pt. 4: *Études historiques-Actes serbes-Compléments et Index* (= Archives de l’Athos 11) (Paris, 1982), esp. pp. 3–64.
- Leroy, Julien, “S. Athanase l’Athonite et la Règle de S. Benoît,” *RAM* 29 (1953), 108–22.
- , “La conversion de Saint Athanase l’Athonite à l’idéal cénobitique et l’influence studite,” *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), pp. 101–20.
- Mamalakes, John, *To Hagion Oros (Athos) dia Mesou ton Aionon* (Thessalonike, 1971).
- Mylonas, Paul, “Le plan initial du catholicon de la Grande-Lavra au Mont Athos et la genèse du type du catholicon athonite,” *CA* 32 (1984), 89–112.
- , “La trapéza de la Grand Lavra au Mont Athos,” *CA* 35 (1987), 143–57.
- Panteleemon Lavriotes, “Sympleromatikos katalogos cheirographon kodikon Hieras Mones Megistes Lauras,” *EEBS* 28 (1958), 87–203, esp. 118–20.
- Papachryssanthou, Denise, *Actes de Prôtaton* (= Archives de l’Athos 7) (Paris, 1975), esp. pp. 69–85.
- Rezac, Giovanni, “Le diverse forme di unione fra i monasteri orientali,” *OCA* 153 (1958), 99–135.
- Talbot, Alice-Mary, and Kazhdan, Alexander, “Lavra, Great,” *ODB*, pp. 1190–91.
- Vassilopoulos, A. E., “L’organisation et l’administration du saint Mont Athos,” *RDC* 13 (1963), 19–47.
- Volk, Robert, *Gesundheitswesen und Wohltätigkeit im Spiegel der byzantinischen Kloostertypika* (Munich, 1983), pp. 67–71.

Translation

Key to Sources

Boldface Type = (4) *Stoudios* Vers. [A]*Italic Type* = (4) *Stoudios* Vers. [B]**Boldface Italic Type** = (4) *Stoudios* Vers. [A] & [B][**Rule of Observance** of the Lavra of the holy Athanasios.][= (4) *Stoudios* [B2]]: *How we conduct services for the holy and glorious resurrection of our savior Jesus Christ on the third day.*

[1.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB2]]: It must be noted **that after the third watch of the night, that is the ninth hour, has passed**, and the tenth is beginning, [p. 131] **the signal of the water clock strikes, and at this signal** they immediately arise and **sound the wooden semantra**.¹ **While all the brothers assemble in the narthex of the main church and pray silently**, the priest takes the censer in his hands and censes first the holy sanctuary and **from there, with a large candle being borne in front of him, he walks through the screen in front and passes along the north side of the church** by the Forty Saints. **Arriving at the royal gate he censes the brothers and immediately returns by the south side.** The brothers then enter the church behind him carrying large candles, while the priest enters the sanctuary through the oratory on the right. He **puts aside the censer in the sanctuary, and then comes out and stands with his face towards the sanctuary** to begin the troparion in the first plagal mode: “Christ is risen from the dead.” After this has been sung three times by himself and the brothers, the priest **recites the verse: “This is the day which the Lord has made”** (Ps. 117 [118]:24). The brothers repeat the troparion, and then the priest recites the second verse: “Celebrate the feast” (Ps. 117 [118]:27) to its conclusion. Again the congregation repeats the troparion and concludes with the doxology. After this has been completed, the canon begins immediately, **since during this whole week we do not chant the Six Psalms**.² One reading follows the third [ode], and we sing the **kontakion after the sixth [ode], followed by the fiftieth psalm.** When matins has been completed, the embrace takes place as **the brothers sing the “Christ is risen.”** Then the **“Day of the resurrection”** is read, followed immediately by the great synapte and **the dismissal**.

[2.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB2]]: **During this week** at the **office of lamplighting**,³ we recite the **“Christ is risen from the dead,”** followed **immediately** by **“Oh Lord I have cried [to thee]”** (Ps. 140 [141]). **At the dismissal** we repeat the **“Christ is risen.”** Similarly, **at compline** the **“Christ is risen,” the trisagion hymn, and the “Kyrie eleison”** twenty times.

[3.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB2]]: **On the Saturday of Renovation**⁴ **at the vespers, we begin [to sing] the customary psalm** (Ps. 102 [103]), **and immediately the “O Lord I have cried to thee”** (Ps. 140 [141]:1), **and at compline “God is with us”** (Is. 8:9) and the rest. [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB3]]: **On**

the Sunday of the Radiant Week⁵ the Six Psalms begin, and we sing the “God is the Lord” (Ps. 117 [118]:27) *in the grave mode and then only the canon* of the day. *There is one reading, the holy gospel* after the conclusion of the morning office. *In the evening the “Blessed is the man”* (Ps. 31 [32]:2) is followed by the rest of the service and the resurrection *troparia*⁶ in the first mode as prescribed for Sunday. At compline we say “He who dwells” (Ps. 2:4) and the *prokeimenon* “God is with us,” and so forth. [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB4]]: *On Monday at matins we again sing the “God is the Lord”* [p. 132] *in the first mode, and we also sing one kathisma, then the gradual antiphons in the same mode, the prokeimenon, “Let everything that has breath [praise the Lord]”* (Ps. 150:6), *the first gospel of the morning, the fiftieth psalm, and then the canon* of the resurrection. For we celebrate Monday as though it were Sunday without any change. There are two readings. [= (4) *Stoudios* [B3]]: *From that time on, we carry out the full compline service, except on Saturday evening, a feast of the Lord, and the commemoration of a saint, which brings for us rest from our work, our hours, and our prostrations whenever they occur. On these days we sing “He who dwells,” and what follows.*

[4.] It should also be known that after celebrating the feast of Low Sunday, immediately after compline we begin the night office. Until All Saints we do only the canon, followed by the [psalm] “Blameless” (Ps. 118 [119]). From that time until the Exaltation [of the Cross] we add six psalms, during which we make three prostrations and standings. After the Exaltation we chant twelve [psalms], and we carry out the rest of the service until great Lent. Then at each single *trisagion* we do the prostrations and the standings. [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB20]]: *On the vigil of the Nativity of Christ and Epiphany, as well as on the evenings of Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday we do not sing compline, but only a trisagion.* [= (4) *Stoudios* [B3]]: *We begin performing our tasks again beginning on Tuesday morning of the second week [after Easter].* Until All Saints we chant the *prokeimenon* of each day at the office of lamplighting. [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB5] and [B6]]: *Until the feast of the Ascension the kathismata and stichera for the resurrection precede the penitential ones and those of the apostles and of the martyrs in the psalmody, but not those dealing with the crucifixion.*

[5.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [B4]]: *It should be known that at the office of lamplighting on all the feasts of the Lord, of [St. John] the Forerunner, of the Holy Apostles, and of the rest of the more notable saints on which we are not busy with our labors, “Blessed is the man” is begun in the fourth plagal mode, then “O Lord I have cried to thee” in the mode of the stichera of the feast.* On all the other days we do “To the Lord” (Ps. 140 [141] and 141 [142]) in the mode assigned to be sung.

[6.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [A6] and [B7]]: It must be noted *that until Pentecost we do not sing the hours nor genuflect.* [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB7]]: *On Saturdays we do not sing the canons for the dead.* [= (4) *Stoudios* [B8]]: *It should be known that on the Saturday of Pentecost at the exaposteilarion we sing “The remembrance of those who are at rest.” Singing this we go out to the graves of the brothers, and while standing there, we sing the stichera of the day and likewise the other hymns for the dead.* [p. 133] *This concludes matins.* We observe this also on the Saturday of *Meatfare*.

11. ATH. RULE

[7.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [B9]]: *It should be known that in the evening on the Sunday of holy Pentecost at the office of lamplighting we make three genuflections and say immediately after the proimion the “O Lord I have cried [to thee]” (Ps. 140 [141]) and in the morning at matins after the Six Psalms we say the “God is the Lord ” (Ps. 117 [118]: 27). Immediately, the canon and two readings follow. We pass this week as well without singing the hours. [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB10]]: **Then the fast of the Holy Apostles arrives and we begin to sing the hours with the kathismata**, but leave out the first and the ninth hours. These we recite only in the great Lent. We also say the ninth hour in the fast of saint Philip,⁷ and at its conclusion *we recite “Kyrie eleison”* thirty times. **At first we make three prostrations at the same rate all following the superior.** During this we also keep up our prostrations for a little while. Standing erect once again *we stretch our hands out towards God, then we do twelve more* in the same way following the lead of the superior. We then stand for a longer period in prayer, and this is immediately followed by the dismissal. Such, therefore, is our observance for each service during the year in which we do not celebrate a feast. During the great Lent, moreover, we add twelve more prostrations and another period of standing.*

[8.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB27]]: *It should be known that when we are not performing the hours and are working, the signal for the divine liturgy is at the beginning of the fourth hour. When the liturgy is finished, the wooden semantron sounds three times and all the brothers assemble in the same place and after singing the required verses and receiving the blessed bread, they leave for the refectory.* When we do the hours, the divine liturgy is celebrated after the chanting of the third hour. [The brothers] in a file⁸ enter [the refectory] at the fifth hour; while the sixth and the ninth hours are sung at the same time after the liturgy, the first with a *kathisma* and the other plain. In the fast of Saint Philip when we sing the ninth hour, the divine liturgy is celebrated at the sixth. Joining vespers with the ninth hour, we omit the recitation of the vesper [psalms].

[9.] Let it be noted that we do two hundred prostrations each day in the course of all the services during the day and night. This comes to [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB10]]: **forty at matins**, twenty during each of the hours, thirty at vespers, and **fifty at compline**. During great Lent we even [p. 134] increase them by doubling the number at compline and matins and adding up to ten at the other services.

[10.] In each vesper service it should be noted, at the “O Lord I have cried [to thee]” (Ps. 140 [141]), we intercalate six verses and repeat the *stichera* of the saints. On Saturday and on feasts of the Lord we intercalate eight verses, and we repeat the first of the resurrection *troparia*, but not the others. We recite those of the feasts three times.

[11.] It must be noted that in each matins service the signal of the water clock strikes after the conclusion of the seventh hour, on Sundays after the sixth, and on feasts of the Lord at the beginning of the fifth.

[12.] It must also be kept in mind that in each matins office we intercalate eight verses on weekdays and ten on Sundays and on feast days. [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB11]]: **After the reading is com-**

pleted, we rise up and say “Kyrie eleison” twelve times, and then the psalmody takes up again. This same number and selection of psalms lasts until the Exaltation of the life-giving wood [of the cross].

[13.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB13]]: *It should be known that on the Dormition of the all-holy Mother of God, that is, in the evening at the office of lamplighting of the after feast, after the prokeimenon psalms, we sing “O Lord I have cried [to thee]” (Ps. 140 [141]), and in the morning at matins after the Six Psalms again the “God is Lord” (Ps. 117 [118]:27), followed immediately by the canon and two readings. The same order is followed on her Nativity and on her Entrance [into the temple], in like manner also for the Nativity of Christ, for the Epiphany, and for the feast of the Presentation of the Lord in the Temple, and for the Exaltation [of the Holy Cross]. The other feasts besides those listed above are not celebrated in two days. From the Exaltation to the Paschal Celebration another kathisma is added to the matins service, as well as one reading. We intercalate ten or more verses in the canon, depending on how many are prescribed for the canon and the day.*

Holy Lent

[14.] Let it be noted that on the Monday of the first week, since the brothers have been enjoying some relaxation, we sing only two antiphons and do two readings and the *triodia*. Thereafter we do three antiphons and three readings. We rise at the end of the fifth hour, then we relax a little after matins, and at daybreak we begin the first hour. If indeed the canon for Monday happens to be for an anniversary observance, then we sing one *kathisma* after the Six Psalms, then the [p. 135] fiftieth psalm, then the canon and the *triodia*, and there are two readings.

[15.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [A10, B14]]: *It should be known that during this period of Lent if we sing a canon, we do the first hour all together with a kathisma but without a reading in it. We do have readings at the third, sixth, and ninth hours.* [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [B15]]: *It should be known that during Holy Week until Holy Thursday we sing the hours and do the prostrations just as in the days before that.* But then on the Holy Thursday, as also on Holy Friday, we chant the [hours] in a plain fashion. We join the *troparia* of the holy passion together with the hours, along with the rest of the entire service for that day, and we chant the [hours] in a plain fashion.

[16.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB23]]: *It should be known that during the Holy Lent a prudent brother is chosen who should at the third hour visit each of the ministries, and making a deep bow, say: “Brothers and fathers, let us take thought for ourselves since we shall die, we shall die, we shall die. Let us also be mindful of the eternal punishment.”* The brothers immediately drop what they have in their hands, arise, recite the *trisagion*, and sit down again.

[17.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB18]]: *It should be known that there are two disciplinarians, one in each choir, who are to remind the brothers to stand in an orderly manner in the choirs. After the wooden semantron sounds, they urge on the slothful to run to the service. From those who have stayed behind they demand the reason for their doing so. By means of rather moderate punish-*

11. ATH. RULE

ments they provide an incentive for those who have been tardy to do better. *In addition, there is the waker who at the matins readings goes quietly around to the brothers and wakes those sleeping. There is also the overseer who* night and day wanders among the cells, places of service, and the other places of the Lavra, and *with fitting severity* and an appropriate penance *breaks up those who are meeting at an improper time.* There is also a doorkeeper who guards the entrance to the church, whose first task is to demand of those who come late a reason for their tardiness, and then, after one exit, he forbids those who want to leave at an inopportune moment from going out again.

[18.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB24]]: *It should be known that when we receive brothers* whom we do not know *either those from another monastery or even laymen seeking the monastic life, we require them to stay in the hospice for two weeks or even* [p. 136] *three to see and experience the monastery. Then, if they remain steadfast in their decision, after the superior informs them of what awaits them,* once and then a second time, *he thereupon introduces them to instruction and enrolls them into his flock. With the permission of the superior the newly arrived prostrates himself before the brothers while they pray for him.*

[19.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB25]]: We must admit that *we have places of confinement,* in accord with the precept of the great Basil⁹ in which, after many warnings and admonitions, the *disobedient and refractory brothers are confined,* put on *a diet of dry food and disciplined in virtue.* Those, however, who do not improve their attitudes even by these means, but persist in the same behavior even after lengthy punishment, as diseased limbs should be cut off from the rest of the body of the community, so that their own contagion may not spread to their neighbors.

[20.] This too must be known. Standing with staffs or entering the church with them and likewise making genuflections on footstools is far removed from us altogether as a sign of laziness and contempt for God.

The quantity and the quality of the food and drink
Proper order at table

[21.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB28]]: It must be known that at the signal given by the bell, *when the brothers come down to the midday meal, they should carry a verse* [of the psalms] *upon their lips,* just as [they should] after rising [from the table] until they have gone over to the narthex to perform the thanksgiving for the food they have shared. They take their seats in the order which they have received. *A monitor ensures that the tables are filled up in an orderly fashion without commotion. A reading then takes place.* The ecclesiarch, that is, divides up the readings. He makes sure that none of the material that there was no time to read in the church is left out. *The signal for the ending of this reading is the sound of the spoons at the last serving when all together toss them on their dishes. Similarly, at a signal the wine is poured and at another signal food is served.*

[22.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB29]]: ***It should be known that from Eastertide until All Saints we eat two cooked dishes—garden vegetables and legumes*** and season them both *with* three *litrai* of olive *oil*. On feasts of the Lord, unless there is also a relish dish, we add one more [*litra*] [p. 137], since another cooked dish is added, of course. On these days ***we also eat fish***, if available, ***cheese, and eggs. We drink three [measures of wine]***. In the evening ***when the signal is struck the brothers*** who so wish ***come out to eat their bread as well as any food that may have been left over from the morning. For the community has no food prepared especially for the evening;*** [they also drink] ***two servings of wine.***

[23.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB29]]: On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday ***during the fast of the Holy Apostles we do not use*** oil and we do not drink wine. As on ordinary days we partake of these on the remaining days of the week, but we abstain from ***fish***, apart from Sundays and feasts when we relax from labor and the recitation of the hours.

[24.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB29]]: It should be known that even though on the above-mentioned three days of the week we do not use olive oil, the dishes are the customary ones, those which we always have, I mean vegetables and legumes. This rule also applies for *the fast of St. Philip*, except that sometimes, as in Great Lent, ***we eat one meal a day***. From the memorial of the Holy Apostles to that of St. Philip, on Wednesday and Friday we do not partake of olive oil or wine. But ***if*** a feast of the Lord or ***the commemoration of a saint falls on one of these days***, which grants us a holiday, then, if available, ***we eat cheese, eggs, and fish***. As on the other days there are ***three servings of wine at midday and two in the evening***. From the Nativity of Christ to the end of the twelfth day our diet is like that of the pentecostal season. After that the rule of the previous days is again observed until Cheesefare Week. The week of Cheesefare is absolutely free [of fasting].

[25.] [= (4) *Stoudios* [AB30]]: ***During Great Lent we have only one meal a day except for Saturday and Sunday. In the first and the fourth weeks our meals are unvaried, that is, beans or boiled chick peas***, on occasion ***almaia without oil***, or ***chestnuts*** or some other boiled fruit. ***In the second, third, fifth, and sixth weeks this is what we eat: boiled beans and a dish*** [seasoned with] ***ground nutmeg***, except that on Wednesday and Friday the food we eat is the same as that of the first week. ***Throughout the entire Holy Lent we do not drink*** wine apart from Saturday and Sunday ***with the exception of the sick and the aged.***

[26.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB30]]: ***It should be known that on the first Saturday, starting on Friday evening, we do not perform prostrations. Also on Saturday and Sunday we use*** [p. 138] olive ***oil and wine***, up to ***two servings at the midday meal and one in the evening***, just as on the other Saturdays and Sundays, and for the Forty Saints, and ***when we sing the Akathistos*** hymn and the great ***canon***. ***On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday*** of Holy Week ***the food is similar to that of the first week. On Holy Thursday*** we may use olive oil and ***wine***. ***On Holy Saturday*** in the middle of the twelfth hour we ***begin vespers, and the dismissal will come*** at whatever time [the service is concluded], but the refectory is not opened because the liturgy finishes so late and because a large meal would weigh heavily on the stomach and on the mind. We are content with the blessed bread, and can partake of about two servings of wine in the narthex.

11. ATH. RULE

[27.] It must be noted that at the completion of the fourth hour the wood is struck and we are led into the church. Taking up the litany we go off to St. Nicholas, if the weather is clear, and to the Forerunner. There we turn around and begin vespers, without reciting the psalter. Then we enter for the complete liturgy. We can then have fish, oil, and wine.

[28.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [AB32]]: ***It should be known that in the middle week of Holy Lent the life-giving wood*** [of the cross] ***is presented*** on that Holy Sunday after matins, ***and we all do reverence***. We do the same thing on Wednesday. The order of the common life of the community has already been discussed. Each individual has permission in accord with his own ability and enthusiasm to carry on his struggle with the aid of the words and the advice of his spiritual father and superior.

[29.] Also recall that in the first week of Holy and Great Lent the brothers are excused from their duties outside and are free to take part in the services in the church and in concentrating on themselves and in reading. They should not go out to their tasks outside unless there should be some necessity or unless the superior should command some of the brothers to go out. In like manner they should be excused during the week of Renovation, especially until that Wednesday. On the rest of the days of Holy Lent, when the signal for the first hour is given, those who are assigned should go out to their tasks, each to his own work. Those who are laboring in the vicinity of the monastery should assemble in the church at the doxology of the office of lamplighting and then go in to table. Those who have gone further away should come for compline.

[30.] When they are working, the metal workers, the muleteers, the shipwrights, and the carpenters should be given on the third hour [p. 139] bread and wine, up to two measures of wine, except on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, for on those days we do not want anyone to drink wine unless they are infirm. Those who go out to perform the rest of the chores and who are unable to eat once a day should take some bread and eat it with water, not with wine. In the evening they may be served whatever happens to have been put aside at table. After Holy Lent has passed, the muleteers and metal workers are given bread and a measure of wine before the main meal each day, since they are engaged in heavy labor. The same applies to the carpenters and shipwrights when they are working. The workers in the vineyard shall also be given one measure, but only on the days when they are pruning the branches, and likewise for those who work in the bakery when they have kneading [to do]. All the rest should be content with the common fare.

[31.] The arrangements to be made for those faint of heart and weak persons are left entirely to the judgment of the superior. On Wednesday and Friday during the fast before Christ's Nativity wine should not be permitted except to the infirm, even though the superior may decide in favor of some receiving wine. On the remaining days of this fast, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, when the brothers eat only one meal a day, then before the meal the metal workers, muleteers, carpenters, and shipwrights may be given two measures. When there is a memorial of a saint which frees us from reciting the hours, and meals are served twice, then the above-mentioned craftsmen receive an additional measure if they are laboring. If they happen to be without work, they too should be

TENTH CENTURY

content with the diet of the community. For the brothers who are in ill health there is no fixed rule, but depending on the gravity of the illness of each we ought to give them proper care and encouragement.

[32.] It should be noted that we must not spend the days on which we are free from manual labor in idleness and laughter, but rather in prayer and reading, so that on feasts such as these we may receive enlightenment of soul and spiritual grace, and not condemnation.

[33.] Remember that it is an ancient tradition and precept of the holy fathers that the brothers ought to [p. 140] lay before the superior their thoughts and hidden deeds, and they should conform to whatever the superior determines.

[34.] No brother is allowed to possess any personal property and private funds or coins or currency without the approval and knowledge of the superior. This is absolutely forbidden by our holy fathers and by the great Basil.¹⁰ In the same way the holy fathers have judged that secretly leaving the monastery is utterly alien to the monastic promise. Nobody, therefore, is allowed to leave secretly. But if a person finds that his soul is not at ease in our Lavra, let him inform the superior of the reason. If the man appears to have good cause to seek a change, then the superior should transfer him to another spiritual director or make some other arrangements for his welfare. In this way his departure from the monastery will be accompanied by prayer and blessing, and will not be the sort that was forbidden, cursed, and condemned by the holy fathers.

[35.] [cf. (4) *Stoudios* [A37] and [B38]]: ***It should be known that each brother ought to have two undergarments, two outer garments, one woolen garment, one cowl, two monastic cloaks, a shorter one for work and another more copious one which according to custom must be used in church, a heavy cloak, shoes, boots, and his bed clothing.***

[36.] At the gate of the monastery station a wise old monk, or if not an old one, at least a monk who knows with good sense how to reply to inquiries as well as to answer them. This gatekeeper ought to have a cell close to the gate, so the visitor will always find someone to answer his questions right away. He should also be there to prevent anyone from stealing from what belongs to the craftsmen and then going out the gate. Whoever commits such a theft of the goods, the products, and services of the monastery should undergo the death of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5: 1–11), who indeed underwent bodily death, whereas these will end up under a curse with the death of their souls.

[37.] In conclusion, I want all of these regulations which I have laid down to be read regularly in the assembly so that none of the brothers may be able to plead ignorance. May the Lord grant my request that, having received these rules with full confidence, you will produce worthy fruits of the spirit with the blessing of God and the cooperation of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory together with the Father and the Holy Spirit forever and ever. Amen.

11. ATH. RULE

Notes on the Translation

1. “They” must refer to the waker (*aphypnistes*) and perhaps his assistants, for whom see *Vita A*, chap. 84, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 39, *Vita B*, chap. 26, ed. Noret, p. 153, and below, [17]. These monks would be aroused by a signal or alarm in the water clock and would then awaken the others by banging with a mallet on a wooden semantron.
2. Ps. 3, 37 [38], 62 [63], 87 [88], 102 [103], 142 [143].
3. *Lychnika*, the first part of the office of vespers, when the lamps were lit, sometimes synonymous with vespers; see Lampe, *PGL*, p. 817.
4. Week of Renovation, name given to the week after Easter.
5. Sunday after Easter or “Low Sunday.”
6. *Anastasima: troparia* stressing the theme of the Resurrection.
7. Also known as the Christmas fast, which begins on the day after the feast of St. Philip (November 14).
8. The meaning of this passage is clarified by (4) *Stoudios* [38], where the word *stichos* refers to the “file” of monks entering the refectory.
9. The monastic prison does not seem to be a genuine Basilian institution; see Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae brevius tractatae* 44 ([SR 44]), *PG* 31, col. 1109D for his preferred method of punishment.
10. Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae brevius tractatae* 85 ([SR 85]), *PG* 31, col. 1144A; cf. his *Regulae fusius tractatae* 8 ([LR 8]), *PG* 31, cols. 933–41 and the patristic citations in E. Herman, “Die Regelung der Armut in den byzantinischen Klöstern,” *OCP* 7 (1941), 406–60, here 406–9.

Document Notes

- [1] Regulations for the Easter Service. The text appears to draw alternately on (4) *Stoudios* [AB2] and [B2], with a brief portion towards the end coming exclusively from [A2]. Most likely an intermediary Studite *typikon* has developed this particular synthesis. The references to the chapel of the Forty Saints (see also below, [26]) and the oratory on the right (of St. Nicholas, also in [27] below) reflect the topography of Lavra’s *katholikon*; see the site plan in Mylonas, “Catholicon,” p. 90. Mylonas, p. 96, believes that these references are interpolations or else an indication that this document was revised ca. 1020 at which time he believes that these chapels were added to the *katholikon*.
- [2] Regulation of hymnody for Easter week. Text shared with (4) *Stoudios* [AB2].
- [3] Liturgical prescriptions for Renovation Sunday services. Renovation Sunday is the first Sunday after Easter. This complex chapter has been formed (probably by an intermediary) utilizing parts of (4) *Stoudios* [A2], [AB2], [AB3], [B3], and [A4].
- [4] Regulation of hymnody for the rest of the year. This is another complex chapter formed out of (4) *Stoudios* [AB20], [B3], [AB5], and [B6].
- [5] Regulation of hymnody for feasts of the Lord. This is a new chapter not traceable to the edited versions of (4) *Stoudios*.
- [6] Special observances for Easter season and Pentecost. This chapter has been formed out of (4) *Stoudios* [A6], [B7], [AB7], and [B8]. The prohibition on singing canons for the dead on Saturdays (during Easter season) is at variance with (4) *Stoudios* [AB7].
- [7] Vesper service on Pentecost Sunday; liturgical prescriptions for the fasts of the Holy Apostles and of St. Philip. This chapter has been formed out of (4) *Stoudios* [B3] and [AB10]; other portions may be original to Athanasios or derived from an unknown version of the Studite *typikon*.
- [8] Timing of the liturgy and meals. The first portion of this chapter is identical to (4) *Stoudios* [AB27], except that the liturgy here starts at the fourth hour instead of at the sixth hour at *Stoudios* on those days free from the recitation of the hours.
- [9] Number of prostrations during performance of the hours. This chapter has only a minor textual link to (4) *Stoudios* [AB10]. Note the increase in the importance and number of prostrations.
- [10] Specifications for the vesper service. This is a new chapter not traceable to the edited versions of (4) *Stoudios*.

TENTH CENTURY

- [11] Timing of the morning office. This is another new chapter independent of the edited versions of (4) *Stoudios*; for the water clock, see also (4) *Stoudios* [2].
- [12] Hymnody at the morning office. This chapter utilizes part of (4) *Stoudios* [AB11].
- [13] Order of psalms at feasts of the Lord and those of the Mother of God. This chapter follows (4) *Stoudios* [AB13] closely, except for the addition here of the Virgin's feast of the Entrance into the Temple.
- [14] Daily routine for Lent. This is an apparently new chapter not traceable to the edited versions of (4) *Stoudios*.
- [15] Liturgical prescriptions for Lent. This chapter is derived from (4) *Stoudios* [B14] and [B15]; there is no parallel treatment in [A]. In the Studite tradition of [B], the regular performance of the hours and prostrations continues until Holy Saturday.
- [16] Lenten reminder of death. This chapter follows (4) *Stoudios* [AB23] closely; here a "prudent" brother substitutes as the messenger for the "elderly" monk found in the Studite tradition.
- [17] Officers of the monastery. This chapter makes considerable use of (4) *Stoudios* [AB18], but the author has adapted his source for his own needs, authorizing the use of punishments (cf. [19] below), adding a doorkeeper and making a reference to the cells (*kellia*), places of service, i.e., workshops (*diakoniai*), etc. that were particular to Lavra. There is also a discussion of the officers of the monastery in *Vita A*, chap. 84, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 39–40, and *Vita B*, chap. 26, pp. 153–54.
- [18] Testing of novices. This chapter follows (4) *Stoudios* [AB24] closely, but the superior is obliged to repeat his synopsis of the novices' obligations as monks. For the sensitive topic of the treatment of monks tonsured in other monasteries, see *Vita A*, chap. 89, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 41–42, *Vita B*, chap. 29, ed. Noret, p. 159, and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [22] through [29].
- [19] Place of confinement. This provision is adopted from (4) *Stoudios* [AB25] but attributed to Basil of Caesarea. The failure to include the Studite ban on corporal punishment, like the new provision for expulsion, may be significant.
- [20] Use of staffs and footstools in church prohibited. A new chapter; compare to the rigorist attitude found much later in (36) *Blemmydes* [13]; (22) *Evergetis* [4] and related documents, however, permit the use of footstools.
- [21] Refectory procedures. This chapter is based on (4) *Stoudios* [AB28] with substantial additions. See also the description of refectory procedures in *Vita A*, chaps. 86–87, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 40–41, and *Vita B*, chap. 29, ed. Noret, pp. 157–59. The references to a single narthex (only) here and below in [26] have implications for dating architectural features of Lavra's *katholikon*; see Mylonas, "Catholicon," p. 95. The specification that the ecclesiarch is to perform the reading is not found in the Studite *Rule*.
- [22] Diet from Easter to the feast of All Saints (first Sunday after Pentecost). This chapter is based on (4) *Stoudios* [AB29], with the addition of concessionary supplements to the diet on feasts of the Lord occurring during the Easter season.
- [23] Diet for the fast of the Holy Apostles. This chapter makes a very slight use of (4) *Stoudios* [AB29] but the diet is prescribed more succinctly and may be less strict than in the Studite tradition.
- [24] Dietary regulations for the fast of St. Philip and for the Christmas season. This mostly new chapter makes some minor use of (4) *Stoudios* [B29] and [AB29].
- [25] Diet for the Lenten fast. This chapter is based closely on [AB30], with a brief quotation found only in [A30]. The Athanasian regulation here follows [B30] in requiring that the strict fast of the first week of Lent be observed again during the fourth week.
- [26] Special Lenten regulations; diet for Holy Week. This is a chapter of complex derivation, employing (4) *Stoudios* [A30], then [B30], and then [AB30]; considered with [1], [3], and [4] above, this suggests Athanasios' reliance on some intermediary Studite *typikon* for the drafting of this document rather than a direct use of either or both of the versions on which our printed editions are based. The dietary concession for the feast of the Forty Saints (Martyrs), on March 9, which was to be only a minor feast in (20) *Black Mountain* [89], must have been in honor of the dedicatees of the north side chapel of Lavra's *katholikon*.

11. ATH. RULE

- [27] Procession before vespers and the liturgy. This is a new chapter, specific to Lavra. The reference to St. Nicholas is to the south side chapel of Lavra's *katholikon* or perhaps, as implied here, some predecessor structure detached from the main church; the other topographical reference is to the free-standing oratory of St. John [the Baptist] the Forerunner, mentioned in *Vita A*, chap. 73, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 35, and *Vita B*, chap. 23, ed. Noret, p. 149, as having been built by Athanasios at the instructions of Nikephoros Phokas; cf. Mylonas, "Catholicon," p. 103.
- [28] Veneration of the Holy Cross; permission for individual ascetic observances. The first part of this chapter is derived from (4) *Stoudios* [AB32], the penultimate Studite quotation in this document, after which (except for [35] below) the remaining materials appear to be original to Athanasios. His cross-reference to an earlier discussion of the common life probably refers to preceding treatment of dietary observances, beginning with [21]. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [38] is more critical of self-imposed ascetic observances, while in the late eleventh century, (20) *Black Mountain* [72] was to encourage and (23) *Pakourianos* [15] was to discourage them.
- [29] Suspension of outside work during first week of Lent and Easter week. For a contemporary example of the practice of seclusion during all of Lent, see (7) *Latros* [6]. Note the differentiation among laborers who report back at different times depending on the distance of their worksites from the monastery.
- [30] Special arrangements for feeding laborers; dietary concessions for same. In (43) *Kasoulon* [19], monks absent on assignments have a share of food saved for them until their return, while [25] allows that monastery's fishermen to eat fish, use oil, and drink wine during Lent, a concession that apparently was later withdrawn.
- [31] Dietary concessions for the sick; additional concessions for laborers. See (22) *Evergetis* [33], some comparable laborers in another monastic community.
- [32] Prayer and reading on feast days. This is a new chapter, but it is analogous to (4) *Stoudios* [AB26] without the latter's provisions for a lending library and a structured time for reading.
- [33] Confession to the superior. Again, this is a new chapter, but analogous to (4) *Stoudios* [22]. The focus here, however, is on obligatory confession, which is taken up later by (22) *Evergetis* [7], [15] and related documents of the monastic reform movement.
- [34] Prohibition of personal property; procedures for leaving the monastery. The former was to be one of the principles of the militantly cenobitic monastic reform movement: see (22) *Evergetis* [22] and related documents. For the condemnation of unauthorized departures, see Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractatae* 14 ([LR 14]), *PG* 31, cols. 949–52, along with the references to canonical legislation on this subject in E. Herman, "La 'Stabilitas loci' nel monachesimo bizantino," *OCP* 21 (1955), 115–42.
- [35] Regulation of clothing. This chapter is a condensation of the analogous Studite regulations, (4) *Stoudios* [A37] and [B38], providing for essentially the same items of clothing. For some later descriptions of monastic clothing, see (22) *Evergetis* [25], (28) *Pantokrator* [22], (31) *Areia* [T4], (32) *Mamas* [28], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [28].
- [36] Gatekeeper and his responsibilities. Provision for a gatekeeper. See description of this officer's responsibilities in (27) *Kecharitomene* [29], (32) *Mamas* [12], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [12]. The focus of responsibilities here on prevention of theft is unprecedented elsewhere in the documents in our collection. Leroy, "S. Benoît," pp. 117–19, believed that this chapter contains unattributed quotations from the *Rule of St. Benedict*; cf. *Regula monasteriorum*, chaps. 57, 66, ed. Cuthbert Butler (Downside, 1912), pp. 99, 116.
- [37] Reading of the rules in assembly. Seen here for the first time, this was to become a very popular custom as monastic *typika* became institutionalized in Byzantine monasteries, though usually in the context of a seasonal recitation at mealtime. See (22) *Evergetis* [43], (27) *Kecharitomene* [65], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [59], (30) *Phoberos* [59], (32) *Mamas* [16], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [16], etc. Leroy, "S. Benoît," pp. 117–19, believed that this chapter contains an unattributed quotation from the *Rule of St. Benedict*; cf. *Regula monasteriorum*, chap. 66, ed. Butler, p. 117.