

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

13. *Ath. Typikon: Typikon of Athanasios the Athonite for the Lavra Monastery*

Date: 973–975¹

Translator: George Dennis

Edition employed: Ph. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 102–22.

Manuscript: Lavra, unnumbered ms. (1814 A.D.); Codex Iveron 754 (16th c.)²

Other translations: None

Institutional History

For the institutional history of the Lavra Monastery, see (11) *Ath. Rule*, Institutional History.

Analysis

This document shares Athanasian authorship with (11) *Ath. Rule*, which it cross-references [39], and (14) *Ath. Testament*. Repetitious treatment of certain topics suggests multiple stages of composition.³ The document can be divided for analysis into four sections:

A. Foundation History

The document commences with a foundation history, [2]–[8] (cf. the earlier and less well developed example of the genre in (6) *Rila* [1], [2]). This is an official history from the author's viewpoint that eliminates certain episodes, such as his flight to Cyprus after the unexpected accession of the patron Nikephoros Phokas to the emperorship in 963 and the attempt to expel him from Athos in the Tragos affair of 971–972. There are also chronological differences with the account preserved in the Athanasian hagiographical tradition.⁴ The history is nevertheless of considerable interest, since it vividly portrays the nature of a traditional patronal relationship between a private founder, who provided the inspiration and funding, and a monastic holy man, who actually carried out the work of constructing what was then conceived of as a private monastery and its associated buildings. Moreover, the patron's elevation to the emperorship launched this foundation on a path different from that originally envisioned for it, as Lavra became a new kind of independent monastery under imperial patronage.

B. Constitutional Status and Succession to the Superiorship

Thanks to these circumstances, then, this is the earliest document in our collection composed for an “independent and autonomous” monastery, a category of constitutional organization of enduring significance for the rest of Byzantine history (see below, Chapter Four). (8) *John Xenos*, (9) *Galesios* (in part), and (10) *Eleousa* provide later examples of documents written for independent monasteries in the eleventh century. Athanasios quotes [12], [18] and summarizes [13], [20], [23],

[36], [42] a lost imperial chrysobull of Nikephoros Phokas, one of three awarded to Lavra in 964, that evidently served as a kind of proto-*typikon* and which granted the monastery its self-governing status.⁵ Papachryssanthou (*Prôtaton*, p. 82) has skillfully reconstructed the content of this chrysobull. Athanasios claims [13] he himself was behind the crucial passages on the foundation's constitutional status and the succession to the superiorship.

The possibility that someone might impose a future superior from outside Lavra on the monastery was appropriately Athanasios' greatest concern [20] for the future of his foundation, "For if it were permitted that the superior could be appointed by some stranger, then the Lavra would end up under the authority of that person." Perhaps Athanasios was already worried about the threat that the notorious public management program, the *charistike*, would pose to his and other privately founded monasteries by the end of the tenth century, as seems indicated in the later (14) *Ath. Testament*.⁶ Yet even earlier, there were other reasons to be concerned about the loss of a private foundation's autonomy from the public authorities, as Athanasios knew well, since in 964 he had exploited the system of imperial concessions to gain control of the wealthy, formerly private monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai near Thessalonike under *epidosis*, a program for the concession of ecclesiastical institutions to other religious authorities that had been in existence since at least the beginning of the tenth century.⁷

Whatever the precise nature of the threat Athanasios perceived, the independent and self-governing constitution that he had extracted from Nikephoros Phokas in 964 was his defense. This could well, as Athanasios comes close to claiming, have been an original concept of his own, though there are also some possible precedents.⁸ It would be a long time, however, before the implications of genuine self-rule became evident.⁹ Here, recognizing the traditional connection between the right to appoint the superior (which typically belonged to the founder or patron) and actual control of the institution itself, Athanasios insists [16] on his "absolute authority" to choose his own successor. As a practical matter, however, he was willing to exercise this right after consultation with the monastic community. Subsequent superiors were to choose their successors in the same way [15], [19], cf. [12], but without outside interference.

Yet the very provision [20] designed to protect Lavra from falling under outside control had created an unanticipated problem, since it could be interpreted to make any monk not actually tonsured at the monastery ineligible for the superiorship. Since the foundation was at this time not much more than a decade old, a strict interpretation of the chrysobull would have eliminated many of Athanasios' closest and oldest disciples from consideration. Athanasios therefore argues [21] ff. strenuously for the acceptability of "foreign" monks (*xenokouroi*) as future superiors, provided they had been living in the community for two or three years.

C. Studite Quotations

Although this document is self-described and functions as a *typikon*, it is textually linked to (3) *Theodore Studites*, a testament, just as (11) *Ath. Rule* is to (4) *Stoudios*. There are literal but unattributed quotations from 18 of the chapters in the Studite *Testament*.¹⁰ The integration of these quotations from a much earlier and rather different era of Byzantine monasticism into the text of the present document is not entirely satisfactory, though Athanasios does group them in a more logical order than in the original Studite *Testament*. Athanasios' reluctance to acknowledge

his debt to (3) *Theodore Studites* is curious; as in (11) *Ath. Rule*, however, he actually takes some trouble to refer instead to patristic sources that happened to underlie Studite observances.¹¹ In any event, Athanasios provides [30] an implicit endorsement of Theodore's prohibitions on changes in the rule, on worldly possessions, and on the diversion of monastic property to friends or relatives. Athanasios' bans [31] on personal and community slaves and female animals, his endorsement [32] of communal ownership of property, and the requirement that a superior should not administer finances directly are all derived from (3) *Theodore Studites* too. Following Theodore on other matters, Athanasios also urges his successors as superior not to adopt [33] a luxurious lifestyle and to refrain [34] from seeking higher office. In another implicit endorsement of the canons of the Studite tradition, Athanasios views worldly entanglements and sexual misconduct (with the one seen as leading to the other) as the primary threats to the morality of the monks.¹² Athanasios adds [33] a warning from Antony, the founder of Egyptian monasticism, against lengthy absences from the monastery in support of a like-minded (but unattributed) prohibition from the Studite *Testament*. Athanasios shared with the Studite tradition a concern with reconciling the mandate [35] to provide hospitality to strangers with the need [34] to isolate the monks from secular (and especially sexual) intercourse.

As Leroy ("Conversion," pp. 113–14) realized, it is also worth noticing what provisions of (3) *Theodore Studites* Athanasios chose not to adopt for the present document.¹³ The omission of (3) *Theodore Studites* [9], [15], [16], which deal with relations with women, is understandable since they were absent from Mount Athos; [12], prohibiting the distinction between the great and the small habit, was already a dead letter by the time (4) *Stoudios* [A2] was composed.¹⁴ Some other Studite provisions, like the ban [6] on the use of horses or mules for transport, the admonition [21] not to store up wealth in the monastery, and the recommendation [24] of consultative rule, must have been rejected because they were clearly opposed to Athanasios' own opinions on due privilege, extensive economic activity, and style of rule. The Studite endorsement [12] of patristic authority was perhaps redundant in view of Athanasios' own propensity to make direct citations. Finally, the omission of the provision [11] for the teaching of catechism is puzzling, but apparently deliberate, since references to catechetical instruction found in (4) *Stoudios* were not adopted in (11) *Ath. Rule* either, even though there is an attestation in the hagiographic tradition that Athanasios employed the Studite catecheses in the instruction of his monks.¹⁵

D. Administrative Dispositions

Such non-Studite legislation as appears in this document is to be found at the end, beginning with [36], along with a treatment of relations with Lavra's ascetics and various dependent communities elsewhere on Mount Athos.

In this document, Athanasios professes to be hostile to excessive entrepreneurial activity, an attitude that he may have picked up from the Basilian tradition. He explicitly rejects [11] economically expansionist foundations elsewhere on Mount Athos as suitable models for his own foundation. To back up his own more modest vision, he bans [53], cf. [45] the construction of additional detached cells (*kellia*) or the development of more cultivated fields or vineyards, making an exception [34] from a rule against further acquisitions of landed property only for an anticipated dependency to be located in the capital city of Constantinople.

Not only did Athanasios (and his successors) fail to observe these restrictions subsequently, but curiously, the hagiographic tradition depicts his aggressive pursuit of just the sort of economic development program here condemned as the primary reason his fellow Athonites sought his expulsion during the Tragos affair in 971–972.¹⁶ This complicates an analysis of the many links between the present document and the provisions of the slightly earlier (12) *Tzimiskes*.¹⁷

If the hagiographers, who were undoubtedly acquainted with Lavra's expansionist policies by the time they wrote in the eleventh century and later, simply erred in reading back these policies as the likely grievances of the Athonites against their hero in the Tragos affair, then perhaps Athanasios' very different policies as announced here in (13) *Ath. Typikon* may be taken at face value. In that event, Athanasios and the Lavriotes would have been a party arguing for restraint of mercenary activities at the Tragos inquest, and their policies an important influence on the provisions of (12) *Tzimiskes*.

If, on the other hand, the hagiographers have accurately represented the substance of the complaints of Athanasios' opponents, they and not he must be seen as the motive force behind such restraints on economic activity as (12) *Tzimiskes* did in fact impose, and similar provisions to it found here in (13) *Ath. Typikon* would have to be interpreted as a discreet bow to the former document's authority, to be set aside when circumstances might permit. Perhaps Athanasios traded acceptance of his own disciplinary observances (Studite in origin) in exchange for his own agreement, for a time, to abide by certain economic restrictions demanded by his Athonite neighbors.

Unlike the cautious John, the author of (6) *Rila* [7], who warily refused royal benefactions, Athanasios welcomed [36] cash annuities (*solemnia*), from both Nikephoros Phokas and his successor John Tzimiskes.¹⁸ He was also willing to accept entrance gifts [49] from postulants, but like some later reform-minded founders, e.g., the author of (22) *Evergetis* [37], he feared the divisive psychological effects they might have on the community. Athanasios resolved this by ordering such gifts to be given away. Charity then is here a convenient way of disposing of a problem rather than an imperative in its own right. Athanasios was unwilling, however, to allow [44] outsiders to purchase cells with entrance gifts. Eunuchs, young or old, were not acceptable [48] as postulants; other suitable applicants could be tonsured [50] as members of the community but only after a year of examination except for those with a well-attested reputation for piety.

Lavra's complexity obliged Athanasios to address certain institutional relationships not discussed in the Studite documents. These include a discussion of how Lavra as a cenobitical community would relate to its neighboring solitaries [40], [41], to the dependency (*metochion*) of St. Andrew of Peristerai [51], [52] and the group of cells [47] Athanasios had granted to his long-time friend and collaborator, John the Iberian. Athanasios' tolerance of a limited practice of solitary monasticism, carefully subordinated to the *koinobion* on the model of the traditional lavra, serves to distinguish him from the more militantly cenobitic Studite monasticism, at least as the latter was practiced during the lifetime of Theodore the Studite.¹⁹ Earlier in the document's foundation history, Athanasios makes [9] a reference to another dependency of St. Eustathios, then later on [34] also to a possible future dependency to be located in Constantinople.

The document concludes with a message [56] to the brothers urging them to give obedience to Athanasios' successor that is another unattributed quotation from (3) *Theodore Studites* [25]–[27].

13. ATH. TYPIKON

Notes on the Introduction

1. For dating, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 17, who assumes it was drawn up during the reign of John Tzimiskes (Dec. 969–Jan. 976) and after (12) *Tzimiskes*, which is commonly thought to date to 971–972.
2. See Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, pp. 270–73, and Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 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 J. Noret, *Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii Athonitae* (Louvain, 1982), p. xxxii, and another manuscript, reputedly of the 10th–11th c. that Panteleemon Lavriotes, “Sympleromatikos katalogos cheirographon kodikon Hieras Mones Megistes Lauras,” *EEBS* 28 (1958),” p. 115, claimed was “probably” from the hand of Athanasios himself. The former manuscript also contains *Vita A*, (11) *Ath. Rule*, and (14) *Ath. Testament*, while the latter contains just (14) *Ath. Testament*.
3. Note repetitive treatments of: [15] ff. the succession to the superiority, cf. [19]; [17] exclusion of *xenokouroi* from the succession, cf. [20]; [21] exceptions to this exclusion, cf. [23], with different terms of service for qualification; [25] punishment of discriminators against *xenokouroi*, cf. [29]; [31] ban on certain animals, [53]; [34] ban on youths, [48]; and [31] prohibition on construction of additional cells, cf. [53]. This pattern suggests the document was composed in at least five sittings.
4. See the discussion in Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 33–36, with proposed solution at 36.
5. Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 704; see above, (11) *Ath. Rule*, Institutional History, A 7. The excerpts are collected and translated in the introduction to this chapter.
6. Cf. the reference to *charistike* in (12) *Tzimiskes* [7], with discussion in note.
7. For the concession of this monastery, see *Vita A*, chap. 103, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 50, and *Vita B*, chap. 34., ed. Noret, p. 166, with discussion by Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 35–36, 82; for ecclesiastical *epidosis*, see my *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, D.C., 1987), pp. 156–57, cf. 146–47; above, (12) *Tzimiskes* [11] note.
8. See Basil I’s grant of immunity to the monastery of Kolobou and the monks of Athos (883), ed. Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, doc. 1, pp. 177–81, at 180, line 21, and a lost chrysobull of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (944–959) that denied the metropolitan of Thessalonike any rights in the monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai, mentioned in a chrysobull of Constantine X Doukas (1060), ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 33, pp. 195–99, at 197, line 35.
9. Note the difficulties that Manuel, bishop of Stroumitza had, even at the end of the next century, in attempting to reconcile traditional notions of private ownership in a religious institution with an independent constitution; see (10) *Eleousa*, Analysis, B. Constitutional Matters.
10. (3) *Theodore Studites* [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [7], [8], [10], [14], [17], [18], [19], [20], [22], [23], [25], [26], [27].
11. (11) *Ath. Rule* [19], [34]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [33].
12. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [31], [32], [33], [34], cf. [40].
13. (3) *Theodore Studites* [6], [9], [11], [12], [13], [15], [16], [21], [24].
14. Athanasios had himself received the small habit at Kyminas from Michael Maleinos and the great habit on Mount Athos from the hermit Elias, for which see *Vita A*, chaps. 24, 79, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 13, 36, and *Vita B*, chaps. 9, 25, ed. Noret, pp. 135, 151.
15. Note (4) *Stoudios* [B16], [AB21], [AB36], none of which were adopted in (11) *Ath. Rule*; for Athanasios’ use of the Studite *Catecheses*, see *Vita B*, chap. 65, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 200.
16. For Athanasios’ failure to observe his own restrictions, see Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 101; for the hagiographic account of the origins of the Tragos affair, see *Vita A*, chap. 114, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 54–55, and *Vita B*, chap. 36, ed. Noret, pp. 168–69; as Papachryssanthou, p. 96, observes, the list of Athonite grievances against Athanasios is a “virtual resume of Athanasios’ [economic] activities.”
17. Cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [3] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [50] on the length of the novitiate; (12) *Tzimiskes* [10], [18], [20] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [40], [42] on the regulation of solitaries; (12) *Tzimiskes* [13] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [10], [11] on restriction of mercenary pursuits; (12) *Tzimiskes* [14] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [32]

TENTH CENTURY

banning spiritual relationships; (12) *Tzimiskes* [15] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [10], [11], [53] prohibiting sales of wine to laymen; (12) *Tzimiskes* [16] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [34], [48] banning youths and eunuchs; (12) *Tzimiskes* [20] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [41] on exemption of solitaries from labor services; and (12) *Tzimiskes* [22] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [53] on the importation of animals.

18. See discussion above in (11) *Ath. Rule*, Institutional History, A 7–8.

19. Cf. the observation of Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 101, on the evolution of Studite monasticism towards a similarly tolerant view of invidual ascetic practice.

Bibliography

Lemerle, Paul, et al., *Actes de Lavra*, pt. 1: *Des origines à 1204* (= Archives de l'Athos 5) (Paris, 1970), pp. 13–18.

Leroy, J., “La conversion de Saint-Athanase l’Athonite à l’idéal cénobitique et l’influence studite,” *Millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), 101–120.

Meyer, Ph., *Die Hauptkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 270–73.

Morris, Rosemary, “The Two Faces of Nikephoros Phokas,” *B&MGS* 12 (1988), 83–115.

Peeters, P., “Histoires monastiques géorgiennes,” *AB* 36–37 (1917–19), 8–68. Includes a Latin translation of George the Hagiorite’s *Life* of Sts. John (the Iberian) and Euthymios.

Shepard, A. M., *The Byzantine Reconquest of Crete* (Annapolis, Md., 1941).

Tsougarakis, Dimitris, *Byzantine Crete from the 5th Century to the Venetian Conquest* (Athens, 1988).

Volk, Robert, *Gesundheitswesen und Wohltätigkeit im Spiegel der byzantinischen Klostertypika* (Munich, 1983), pp. 67–71.

Translation

As noted above, this document employs part of the text of (3) Theodore Studites. In our translation, the borrowings are indicated in boldface type.

Typikon or Canonical Rule of our holy, God-bearing Father Athanasios of Athos

[1.] Those who exert themselves in journeying along the single-minded way of the solitary life and who do not deviate in striving to attain its holy goal, who by purity of mind and soul and body have conditioned themselves for the brilliant enlightenment which comes from the Holy Spirit, end up by suffusing not only themselves with light, or, to put it more correctly, a godlike appearance, but also everyone in the world with whom they converse. They enlighten other people of any rank or calling whatever. They challenge them and incite them on to a like goal, drawing and attracting them as the light of a beacon fire or a magnet.

[2.] An ardent supporter and lover of this solitary life was the revered and great emperor Nikephoros [II Phokas (963–969)], famous for his valor and virtue, to whom God, the master craftsman, granted the reward he merited of subduing the barbarian cities of the foe. He would have sealed his devout intentions with a proper conclusion if he had not been hindered by those who then wielded the scepters of the Roman Empire. Impelled, therefore, by this holy zeal, he founded numerous centers of asceticism about the Mount Kyminas¹ and settled monks in them. He generously provided for their needs partly from his own abundant resources, and partly by intervening

13. ATH. TYPIKON

with successive emperors he provided them with support and assistance in the form of annual subsidies. He enthusiastically endowed them with gifts and donations at regular intervals. Indeed, he displayed the same largess in his benefactions to the monks on Mount Olympus. Even though he did not clothe himself with the monastic habit for the reason we mentioned, he nonetheless surpassed the monks spending their lives on the mountain because of his practice of virtue, his strict control over his mind, his lengthy fasts [p. 103], his strenuous vigils, and his continual sleeping on the ground. He carried on his struggle and controlled his desires to such an extent that we cannot even describe it in words.

[3.] As a matter of fact he came regularly to the lavra of his blessed nephew Michael,² the most holy monk, who was also my superior. This emperor, whose memory is eternal, thus became acquainted with me and placed some confidence in my lowly self, as well as a spiritual affection and an unexpected love. For there was no trace of evasiveness or hypocrisy in that holy and irreproachable soul. Therefore, since this was his disposition toward me, he disclosed his thoughts about how he would have preferred to live a solitary life and how he had been prevented by the emperors.

[4.] Later on, after some time had passed, not long after I had departed from Mount Kyminas and had crossed over to that of Athos, he was commanded by the most blessed emperor Romanos [II (959–963)] to lead an expedition against the godless Cretans,³ and so he encamped in the island. Engaged though he was in combat, several times he sent for me to cross over to the island of the barbarians and join him. When I refused to budge, he simply sent more letters and did not give in at all until I actually made the voyage there.

[5.] During my sojourn with the emperor in this island of the barbarians, he did not let up in his earnest entreaties and his efforts to persuade my lowly self to permit a lavra to be built by my humble cell, so that he might himself come to Mount Athos after he had completed the task assigned to him by imperial decree and had captured the barbarian city.⁴ If things went well he would renounce the world and live the life which had been his choice from way back. I was not easily persuaded to go along with his plans, because I wanted to live by myself and be left alone, to continue in my accustomed fashion, and to avoid being constantly preoccupied and bothered by disturbances and distractions. For I was thinking only of my own salvation, and perhaps I was not solicitous enough for the salvation of others. But, although I stoutly affirmed that I was to return to Mount Kyminas proper and that I would be unable to attend to any further dealings with friends, his eagerness did not abate, nor did his entreaties, as he advised me to take steps to bring his plan to fruition. [p. 104]

[6.] Now then, after all his triumphs and victories, he settled in Constantinople, while I returned to my cell. After some time he sent his servant, the monk Methodios, to me. He found me in the place which had been given to me by the most blessed and revered lord Stephen,⁵ at that time *protos* of Mount Athos, and by the rest of the elder monks, in accord with their custom. For when a person perseveres for two or three years on the holy mount and chooses to lead a solitary life, he is to

TENTH CENTURY

receive, with their approval, a location for himself wherever he likes. This Methodios⁶ handed me a letter from the emperor and some gold, amounting to six *litrai*. He then stayed with me in my cell for about six months. He put a great deal of pressure on me to accommodate myself to the wishes of the emperor, who had not yet assumed that rank, and to have the lavra built, and I finally agreed. While Methodios was still there, we quickly got the building started and completed the cells for the emperor, which are still standing there to this day. The man then happily departed as we were undertaking the construction of the church.

[7.] We kept on with the work, but four months had not elapsed when we heard that Nikephoros had been proclaimed emperor and had taken possession of the palace. I left the work on the church half finished and traveled to the capital city. On coming into his presence, I strongly reproached him, not without reason I believed. “The orders you gave me dealt with one thing,” I said, “but it would seem that you were thinking about and planning something else, as events have proven.” I treated the most revered emperor as though he were at fault, believing that he would bear all that I had to say meekly. But he replied by stubbornly defending himself, and he assured me on oath that he held the diadem in utter contempt, as well as the imperial majesty itself. He assured me, moreover, that he had no relations at all with his wife. When the time was propitious, he would escape from all that is now considered an obstacle and he would travel to the holy mountain and fulfill the compact he had made to the Lord. He concluded with this one remark: “Do not lose heart. Do not leave the church there only half built.” Let everyone, therefore, put aside any thought of disbelief and know for certain that, if the Lord, for reasons which he alone knows, had not decreed that he should conclude his life with a martyr’s death, he would have put a fitting seal on his compact and his promises to God. “All,” however, “that the Lord willed he did in heaven [p. 105] and on the earth” (Ps. 134 [135]:6),” as the prophet says.

[8.] With such assurance, then, and trusting in his words, I returned to my cell and again concentrated on the construction of the church. The emperor indeed contributed money, expenses for supplies, and grants of salaries for the workers who were toiling away at building the church. He certainly made his contribution. Nonetheless, compared to what I was spending, the amount given by the thrice-blessed emperor did not seem nearly enough. Most of the contributions, as if they were donations and requisitions of produce, were given to my lowly self for the completion of the church by other lovers of Christ. But how much hard work, the afflictions I suffered, the trials and hardships I endured, the expenditures I put out for quarrying of stone, excavating, heaping up earth, transporting stones, the rooting up, the cutting down, the removal of branches, bushes, and trees, in order to build the holy church of the most holy Mother of God,⁷ and setting the entire lavra in place, to discuss all this in detail would take longer than the time at my disposal. It is enough that the Lord alone knows exactly what I mean. For he gently guides all things from not being into existence.

[9.] There is another little place about ten miles distant from the Lavra, precipitous and overgrown, which has been named Mylopotamos. By clearing out the woods and rocks and leveling the site, I established a church and some cells there in the name of the holy, great martyr Eustathios

13. ATH. TYPIKON

to serve as a dependency. I also planted a vineyard to provide wine for the Eucharist, and so that the brothers persevering in the name of the Lord in the Lavra and the guests sojourning there might be able to have some wine.

[10.] Mindful of that pertinent and ancient precept of the fathers, I ought to have kept myself undistracted and free of preoccupations. For lack of distraction means fewer anxieties, and being free of anxiety means fewer disturbances, and the confluence of all this results in a better and more perfect state of being. Many reasons, though, led my lowly self to this decision. The seashore along the mountain was precipitous and without any harbors on both sides, to the north, that is, and to the south, for more than eighty miles. The mountain resembles a peninsula which extends toward the sea in the shape of a cross. The islands in the sea, Lemnos, Imbros, Thasos, and the rest are a great distance away. Because of this, when winter comes, [p. 106] a ship is unable to sail from the mountain to the mainland to procure necessary provisions or to sail back from there to the mountain. It cannot find any sort of anchorage because the seashore on both sides provides no shelter. On the other hand, there is absolutely no way for a person to transport his own provisions by dry land, partly because the road is so long, and partly because the mountain is practically impassable for pack animals. From the mainland to the tip of the mountain facing the rising sun, where the sea forms a deep gulf, and where the lavra is built, is a distance, more or less, of a hundred miles. For this reason I was moved to plant a vineyard, for the need had to be met, especially for the church offering. For even if I were to admit that some commercial activity could be carried on, although it is actually impossible, I do regard it as dishonorable and out of place to dispatch monks to sell wine in the villages and cities, to spend a lot of time visiting with secular persons, to intermingle with them, to sojourn in their houses, and in this connection to converse freely with women and to make no effort to run from the filth and harm produced by such encounters.

[11.] It is true that many here on the mountain have busied themselves with cultivating fields and have planted vineyards. Some have purchased ones already prepared and have worked hard to improve them and make them look more flourishing. But we do not look upon them as models, and may we never do so. Still, considering what is beneficial, harmless, and not injurious for the brothers assigned to these services, just as I would do in my own case, I was moved to take these steps. At any rate, enough has been said about these topics.

[12.] The blessed, Christ-loving emperor, whose public life was worthy of the name he bore,⁸ while he was still alive planned ahead for the needs and governance of the brothers who were serving in the newly constructed lavra. He issued a revered chrysobull, and decreed that dominion and ownership⁹ of [the Lavra and] its territory devolved upon my lowly self and my successors, as is clearly expressed in the words of the chrysobull:

“We decree that after us this Lavra is to be under the ownership of the most reverend monk Athanasios, and while my majesty is still alive we want this same most reverend monk Athanasios to be the undisturbed superior of the eighty monks in this Lavra and in the *kellia* round about the lavra. Everything is to be administered by him in accord with what is dear to God and consonant

with the monastic constitution. [p. 107] After his death, if my majesty is still alive, the person who has distinguished himself in that same Lavra and the *kellia* subject to it and in whom that same most reverend monk Athanasios before dying should have placed his trust, that man should be installed in the position of superior. But when God shall call us from this vain life and have us partake of the common chalice of death, we want nobody else at all to be appointed as superior of this Lavra except him whom the monks of the Lavra and the *kellia* subject to it, having gathered together and after careful examination, shall look upon as distinguished in virtue and capable of exercising this office, and they shall establish him as superior. Under no circumstances at all do we permit a person from a different lavra or monastery to become superior of this one. Even after our death we do not want anyone to be allowed to grant this Lavra to any secular or ecclesiastical person or even to a monk or to make it subject to another monastery. It is our will and command, rather, that it remain free and self-governing.”

[13.] This is what that marvelous and irreproachable soul decreed, and it was not far removed from my own views. Let no one think, therefore, that a mere word was included in the chrysobull without my full knowledge and approval, but it was as though I had suggested them to him. Since, then, according to the intent of the chrysobull, while he was still alive, he had referred everything to my judgment, I would be the one to choose how things were to be managed, to make arrangements, and to organize matters concerning this most holy Lavra. I was to exercise dominion and authority as I might wish. To the best of my ability, I was to set the standards, establish a regular order, and give serious thought to the ways in which the monastic enterprise is best served and put it into practice.

[14.] It is easy enough to imagine that after this blessed man departed this life, I would have a great deal more freedom and authority, since I would be in charge, to establish rules and standards. Moreover, on reaching the end of my own life, I would leave behind me the person whom God should have approved and who should appear satisfactory to me and worthy of this pastoral service. For I had been praying that the man would remain alive, not just for my own sake, but that his invincible leadership would serve the common good of the whole world. My prayer was that I could entrust my affairs and those of this Lavra to him so that his profound and prudent mind might better manage and order them. [p. 108] But what I was praying for did not come about as I had hoped, but as seemed good to God’s providence. Beyond any expectation or suspicion of mine, by an incomprehensible judgment known to God his providence took care to have him exchange life here for an untroubled and more perfect life, and granted him the undefiled and unshaken kingdom of heaven as a worthy reward for his many and great labors.¹⁰ Meanwhile, I was left to continue living this laborious and wretched life, filled as it is with countless adversities.

[15.] I enjoin, under threat of condemnation, upon the one to be chosen superior after myself, while at the same time commending and also earnestly entreating him, to be bound by the holy, consubstantial, immaculate, and life-giving Trinity and by my humble self that, when his turn comes to depart this perishable life, which contains nothing lasting or firm, he too may leave

13. ATH. TYPIKON

behind him a successor for the position of superior. He should be fully assured in the sight of God that this man is suitable and capable of assuming that position. He should be a man whom the light of his own virtues clearly places in the forefront and who is recognized as such by the more prominent and more devout brothers.

[16.] In my own case, now, I have absolute dominion, so that not even one person can gainsay my command, and yet I have no intention of leaving my successor behind without consulting the brothers. If, when it comes to choosing a superior, anyone, deceived by demonic thoughts and led astray by his own willfulness, should promote the candidacy of anyone else but the one whom the superior and the whole assemblage of the more preeminent brothers shall judge best and shall elect, and should be detected forming factions, unlawful gatherings, divisions, and schism, ought to be pursued and cut off from the community as a diseased limb, as not living in the community in the manner intended by God, and as not seeking what would aid its progress and would truly benefit it.

[17.] If it might happen, as is surely possible, that the superior should die while away from the Lavra, then the preeminent and more devout brothers, as said, should assemble, investigate matters, and so arrive at a decision and vote. For we do not grant this power of making the decision to everyone indiscriminately. We enjoin and command that the superior must be selected only from this particular community. He should not be a man who has come here from some other monastery, been formed anew in a single day, and right then and there be put in charge. For he brings with him nothing that would aid the brothers in the practice of virtue, except that he wants them to vote for him as their leader, although they know nothing of his manner of life. Let the holy assemblage of the brothers be sure of this [p. 109], that we regard it as essential that a stranger coming from another monastery should not straightaway assume the superiorship.

[18.] In fact, a chapter in the chrysobull expressly forbids this. "We do not want anyone advanced to the position of superior of this Lavra except that person whom the monks of the Lavra after careful investigation shall find to be outstanding in virtue and suitable for the task, and they shall install him as superior." For no other reason had I advised the thrice-blessed emperor to add this clause than to keep the Lavra from becoming subject to some other person. Neither the patriarch nor the [head of] the *sakellion*, nor any other person should arrogate to himself the authority to appoint the superior. The Lavra is to remain sovereign and independent, as I have said.

[19.] For if it were to be permitted that the superior could be appointed by some stranger, then the Lavra would end up under the authority of that person. But it is my judgment and my command that the superior at the time, when he comes to depart this life, ought to have the authority to leave behind him a most competent and suitable man as his successor to be in charge of the brothers. I have accordingly planned for this in advance. But if it should happen that the superior dies without having designated the person he would leave as his successor, then we prescribe that the monks should assemble, deliberate, and come to a decision on naming their superior. He must

TENTH CENTURY

definitely be chosen from this community. He should not be a man who has come here from some other monastery, be formed anew in a single day, and all of a sudden be put in charge. He should not be one who brings with him nothing to aid the brothers in the practice of virtue except that he wants them to vote for him as their leader, although they know nothing of his manner of life. In the event that I find myself at a loss in choosing a successor to leave behind as a shepherd to the brothers as I should wish, I intend to leave the selection of the superior to the judgment and to the vote of the monks.

[20.] This is also included in the chrysobull. By no means at any time at all do we receive a person from a foreign lavra or monastery as superior. I brought this to the attention of the revered emperor and suggested that it be made clear in the chrysobull to avoid any misunderstanding. That person we recognize as a stranger who, as has been clarified above, has not been in attendance here at the Lavra, who has not been conspicuous among the brothers, who has not struggled alongside them in their spiritual battles and meditations. He has given no evidence of the strength of his perseverance in the services, the stations, the prescribed observances, and the recitations of the psalter. Just recently arrived, almost this very day, as in that monstrous fable about the giants,¹¹ is he, on the spur of the moment, to be placed in charge [p. 110] who has been formed by some other sort of leadership, foreign to ours and not to be taken seriously?

[21.] Still, I also thought it might help to add this stipulation. A person who has persevered in our monastery and who has lived together with the brothers for three or even two years, even though he may have come to us from some other monastery, such a person I do not call a stranger, but look on him as a son, a member of the church, and one of my own community. He is no different from those whom I have tonsured but is equal to them. In every way they are honorable and true sons, especially those who have left their own monasteries and assigned all they had to my lowly self. Such men as these I consider sons and heirs and children of my heart and leave them behind together with the entire community. I therefore enjoin upon all future superiors, my successors, to give assurance under bond of punishment and to swear according to the most terrible fear of God, that they will make no distinction at all between these men and those in the Lavra who have received the holy habit from us. Even more so, if they are distinguished in virtue, they should be all the more kindly disposed toward them and offer them fitting encouragement corresponding to their virtue, and in like manner regard them and actually show preference for them because of their piety. This is my command to you.

[22.] If it is observed that one of these monks, I mean one of those who has come here from a different monastery, clearly stands out in the monastery, and is competent, suitable, and should appear deserving of leadership over the brothers, then without hesitation or further ado let him be put in charge. Not only should the superior who is approaching death testify that he wants to leave him behind as his successor, but that monk should also be the choice of all the brothers in the Lavra.

[23.] In no way does the above prescription contradict or weaken the stipulation in the revered

13. ATH. TYPIKON

chrysobull, although its words might convey that impression. Rather, it is in full harmony with it. Shortly before this it was explicitly declared that a person is defined as a stranger who without serious thought and of his own accord has moved from a different monastery in order to become superior of the Lavra or whom the hand of the powerful has brought in with the intention of becoming master of the Lavra. It is our desire that never should such a person be chosen by the brothers, or should they look for one until he has shared their manner of life and remained among them for at least a year, the shortest possible time. I thought I ought to explain these matters so that I could make the intentions of the most revered and most holy emperor very clear to everyone who wishes to read the present testament, and I have [p. 111] clearly set down my own views concerning the object of my efforts, the goal for which I have striven. To tell the truth, both of us share the same zeal and concern that the church too should not become subject to some unsuitable or unqualified person.

[24.] In addition to all these matters I enjoin and I order once more the superior and all the brothers, from the greatest to the least, and I declare subject to penance in the name of the Lord God Ruler of All and of the truly all-holy Mother of God that they must not speak maliciously or act arrogantly on any pretext at all toward those who transfer here to us from various monasteries because of the love of God and of ourselves, and who have been numbered and listed among the brothers of our community. They must not treat them with contempt or insult them as “foreign tonsure.”

[25.] I have heard that in certain communities some insecure men who have no fear of the Lord have often acted in such a manner. They make insulting remarks such as: “This individual was tonsured in a foreign monastery and for that reason is to be held in contempt. This individual is from our monastery and so must be treated with respect.” If anyone in our Lavra should be detected doing such a thing after my death, he should be subject to the punishment we have assigned in the name of the Lord God Ruler of All, and on the day of judgment may he have the most holy Mother of God condemning him, as well as my lowly self. For we look upon this illness of the soul as more injurious than a pestilential disease.

[26.] But why even call this a disease? It is a heresy and the most harmful of heresies. For to split asunder and to regard the habit of some monks as different is worse than heresy. That monk does not belong to a foreign race; he does not profess another doctrine; his soul was not created in a different manner than this one, nor does he have a different divine Lord. Both monks hold to sound doctrine, and both belong to the one Christ and Lord and to his church. “For the earth is the Lord’s and everything in it” (I Cor. 10:26 = Ps. 23:1), under one ruler and lord, as the saint has said. What then makes this monk different from that one except for the place where he made his profession and received the habit? In fact, this one will be no different from the other to justify calling one “tonsured at home” and the other “foreign tonsure.”

[27.] What we strive for is the eradication of our own will, this is our highest goal, and concentrating on virtue and on comprehending the fact that we have been called to sorrow, not to delights.

Each of us must not follow his own desires. Even if some monasteries were established out beyond Cadiz and some monks from those places visited here [p. 112] and then chose to be enlisted among our brothers, we would not call them foreigners. For I am reluctant to designate a monastery as foreign, since that word suggests to me a separation from God.

[28.] If, as some men affirm, the greatest act of righteousness, one which requires no further accomplishment or improvement, is the granting of the tonsure, this would be sufficient for everyone, and there would be absolutely no need for any other labor. Yet, I will not look favorably on the monk whom I myself have tonsured should he become careless, lazy, and mediocre, although I do approve one who has come from another place and been clothed with the monastic habit there, especially if he be adorned with all sorts of excellent virtues. Conversely, this one is my genuine son and heir and a child of the church. But this other here in this place who has been granted the tonsure and the cutting of his hair, but who is without virtues, is an absolute foreigner to me, completely alien, and an enemy of the church. For if we all belong to the one Christ, as by his grace we in fact do, and to one mother, the holy church of God; if we are of the same faith and the one profession, then let there be no quarrels among you, and let not one be called a foreigner and another an undoubted native. Virtue alone is to be held in honor.

[29.] I therefore enjoin upon the superior and those of my brothers who hold leading positions, as well as my sons and fathers, that they be watchful for anyone who is careless enough to utter insults of this sort against the brothers. If such a person, carried away by some misguided impulse or pettiness of spirit, be so boorish as to insult a brother by calling him “foreign tonsure,” let him be cut off from the church, that is, not partaking of the sacred mysteries, for three weeks. He should not come in and join the brothers at their common meals, but should eat by himself, abstaining from wine and oil, and thus do penance. If indeed he should correct himself, so that his tongue is reined in by silence and his hand is over his mouth, then thanks be to God. If, however, he should again be detected thinking such thoughts and uttering more insults, then he should be completely cut off from the Lavra and expelled as an unhealthy, gangrenous limb of the body of the church, so that his disease and corruption may not spread to the others.

[30.] After this, the man who succeeds me in charge of the community must be introduced to those matters which he is obliged to observe and to do. [p. 113] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [1]]: **Save for grave necessity, you shall not alter at all the constitution and rule which you have received from my lowliness.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [2]]: **You shall not possess anything of this world nor store up anything for yourself as your own, not even one piece of silver.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [3]]: **You shall not divide your soul and heart by attachments and cares other than for those whom God entrusted to you, your spiritual sons and brothers, not even for those who are yours according to the flesh—either your relatives or friends or associates. Neither in life nor after death shall you use the things of the monastery for the aforementioned people—neither according to the requirements of charity nor the rules of heredity. For you are not of the world so that you have to share with those of the world. But if some should cross over from ordinary life to our order, then you should take thought for them in imitation of the holy fathers.**

[31.] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [4]]: **You shall not possess a slave either for your use or for the monastery entrusted to you or for the fields since man was created in the image of God. This institution has been allowed only to those in worldly life just as marriage.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [5]]: **For necessary duties you shall not have an animal from among those of the female race since you have completely renounced the female sex.**

[32.] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [7]]: **You shall always be vigilant that all things in the community be held in common and be indivisible and that nothing be owned on the part of any individual, not even a needle. Your body and your soul, nothing else, should be divided up for all your spiritual children, brothers and fathers.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [8]]: **As a fugitive from the world and from marriage, you should have no part of adopting those of the world as brothers or engaging in spiritual relationships with them.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [22]]: **You shall not take charge of the treasury room nor assume the cares of stewardship, but let your key be the greatest care of souls, of loosing and binding according to the Scriptures. You should entrust the gold and other necessities to the stewards, the cellarers, and, as seems appropriate to each service, all under your manifest authority. Together with the foremost brothers, you can take an account of each administration and transfer the offices to whichever person you decide.**

[33.] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [19]]: **You shall not possess very distinctive or expensive clothing. Rather, you shall put on humble clothes and shoes in imitation of the fathers.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [20]]: **You shall not spend lavishly either for your own lifestyle or for the reception of guests. This will distract you since it belongs to the pleasurable side of the present life.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [10]]: **You should not go out frequently or roam about unnecessarily, leaving your own flock.** [p. 114] **For it is desirable that you have time to spend with the flock and be able to save these sheep endowed with reason, but most wily and given to straying.** Without due examination you should not permit the brothers under your charge to go off traveling anywhere at all, especially during the season of winter. During that time, even when they want to, they may not be able to return because of the difficulty of sailing. Be aware that sojourning outside one's cell and spending time with worldly people by its very nature produces, as the great Antony says, eternal death.¹²

[34.] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [14]]: **You shall not leave your flock and transfer to another one or return to a higher office.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [17]]: **You shall not make for yourself a lodging or a secular house for your spiritual children in which there are women and go there frequently. Rather you should choose to attend to your temporary and essential needs at the home of pious men.** [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [18]]: **You shall not have a disciple in your cell out of affection, for this can harm the unstable, but you shall be served by a person above suspicion.** You should not acquire an estate or field in the Lavra, which would be harmful and cause inopportune distraction to the community, except for a dependency in the City to provide a place to stay for our brothers going there. For what has been bequeathed to them by me, by the providence and grace of God, is sufficient for them if they take care of it.

[35.] You will not hinder the provisioning with necessities of those spending the winter in the hospice by the harbor for as many days or months as they may need. You shall not diminish the service offered to guests even if because of economic adversity the resources and needs of the Lavra should be reduced to one *modios*. [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [23]]: **You shall not place the person of any other man, eminent and powerful according to the present age, ahead of that which benefits the community. Nor shall you shrink from laying down your life even to the point of bloodshed in guarding these godly laws and commands.**

[36.] We command that in addition to the eighty monks, as laid down by order of the most blessed emperor lord Nikephoros in his revered chrysobull, that there be added another group of forty monks, so that with both groups the total number of monks will be a hundred and twenty, along with those residing in the dependency. Similar to the grant made by the most blessed emperor lord Nikephoros, the lord John [I Tzimiskes (969–976)], our most revered emperor, has added 244 *nomismata* to the donation made regularly to our Lavra. [p. 115] In his chrysobull emperor John decreed that this sum should be provided in perpetuity for our Lavra from the levy¹³ imposed on Lemnos, and at the same time he confirmed the general arrangement expressed in the chrysobull of the most blessed emperor lord Nikephoros.

[37.] Of these one hundred and twenty monks we desire that five monks, *kelliotai* of the Lavra, should dwell in solitude outside. They are to be accorded an annual stipend of up to three *nomismata* and five *modioi* of grain. We order that they are to be without possessions, exercising abstinence, and observing absolute reverence and humility toward the superior. We stipulate that if any of them are capable on their own to be in charge of a companion, they may have one, and only one, disciple. I do not want anyone to have two disciples, and even more so, no *kelliotai* should think of adding another cell without my knowledge and approval. Rather, if at some time one of these five should depart or should die, then, if another one is found who is suitable and capable of living such a life, let him be brought in to make up for the missing one. But, if not, let them remain as they are. I do not want these [cells] to be allocated to the *kelliotai* simply at random.

[38.] We decree that all the others should be under the obedience, as well as the guidance and care of one shepherd. After close study of the matter over a long period of time, as well as hard work and trial, I have found by experience that it is right and beneficial, in fact, it is my judgment, and I declare it best and less fraught with danger for all the brothers to live in common. All together they are to look to the same goal of salvation. Although the entire fullness of the community is joined together from diverse links, they form one heart in their common life, one will, one desire, and one body, as the apostle prescribes (Rom. 12:4; I Cor. 12:12). Let them show true, perfect, and unfeigned obedience to the superior. True and blameless obedience of subjects toward their superior is shown in this way, by not only refraining from what the superior regards as out of place, but also by not even letting themselves do what is praiseworthy without his knowledge. [p. 116] I would not want to contend that exercising abstinence and afflicting one's body does not have any beneficial effect, but if a person is doing what he thinks better for himself without having first asked about it, he is relying on his own initiative, and he will be making more of an error than

13. ATH. TYPIKON

doing something virtuous. But the reward of obedience is greater than what one achieves by abstinence.

[39.] We exhort all to share their meals in common and to celebrate the entire common service in the holy church of God both at night and during the day, as I have made clear to them by deed and have ordered and transmitted in writing.

[40.] If anyone with the support and cooperation of God should ever desire to exchange the bother of obedience for the solitude and individual residence in a *kellion*, let him inform the superior of his wish. Let him, in turn, carefully examine the man's condition. If indeed he does possess the strength and diligence required of those who reside in the *kellia*, if he has been previously exercised in obedience, if he has learned to stay in a cell with concentration and strict guard over his mind, if he has learned to pray and keep vigil, to control himself, to exercise abstinence, to meditate, to devote himself to the study of the Scriptures with humility, and attach some importance to working with his hands, then let him be permitted to do this. But if a person has no experience of this hard way of life, let him rather be put to work at serving and be instructed to keep himself busy, so that not even what he may appear to possess should be destroyed by his stupid idleness and he be struck down by the spirit of *akedia* and love of pleasure. Let such a man know precisely that he seeks to live apart and by himself for no other reason but to be able to go here and there whenever he wants and wander about outside his *kellion*, while having unlimited food, drink, and sleep, and no end of relaxation for his flesh, with the result, as the saying goes, of making his prison even more harsh for himself.

[41.] Moreover, I enjoin upon him who will be in charge of the brothers after me, having him swear by the living God, that in the course of time those to whom the Lord shall furnish the desire and the strength, I mean among those persevering in obedience within the monastery, shall not be hindered by anyone from living in solitude and serious meditation in their cells. They shall not be prevented or disturbed in a contentious or insulting manner, nor by the imposition of services, nor by murmurings, nor on any other pretext at all. [p. 117] They should, rather, strive and show great eagerness to put them at ease, both in the essential needs and in everything which is due to them. Their solitude and diligent [pursuit of virtue] ought not to be regarded as idleness. For frequently I myself have prayed to God, as I still pray, that all may become like them. They have remained consistently obedient to their father and superior and have not relinquished their solitude. In both respects, surely, they have acquired a twofold reward.

[42.] It was chiefly with this in mind that I saw to it that the most blessed emperor had it written, stated distinctly, and carefully noted in the chrysobull, that the regular donation of grain is to be apportioned between the church and the monks in the *kellia*, that is, the *kelliotai*. I also command and strongly urge that those monks who are persevering in their solitude under the obedience of their father the superior, and who are struggling, as it is said, with humility for the glory of God and for their own benefit and that of the community, as well as for the support of the Lavra, are to be taken care of in every way by both the superior and the brothers, so they need not be concerned

TENTH CENTURY

about their bodily needs and may be completely undisturbed. Just as I, while still alive, have made a special effort to take care of them superabundantly, so I want them to be taken care of by the one who will succeed me after I leave this life.

[43.] If God should grant some of them the strength to carry on greater struggles by withdrawing to a more remote and isolated solitude, they should not be prevented from making trial of this. For the cells of the most blessed and revered emperor¹⁴ are only a short distance from the Lavra, as are those of Saint John Chrysostom, as well as the church of the Holy Trinity with its complex of cells and other properties under the obedience of the Lavra, and these I reserve for the sake of those thus struggling.

[44.] If anyone should ever come forward offering an entrance gift for the purpose of residing in those cells, or like a tenant, giving a sum of money to the Lavra, or to certain individuals, in order to rent them out for a certain number of years, the superior may not be allowed to accede to that person's request. As we have laid down, we reiterate that these cells come under the authority and ownership of the Lavra and are for the benefit and repose of those selected disciples of ours to go out, to struggle, and to prove themselves, and [p. 118] to enter again into obedience.

[45.] I do not want other *kellia*, alleged places of retreat, to be constructed closer to the Lavra or anywhere in the surrounding area. For there are already enough for those who are capable of dwelling alone by themselves. I trust in God that if five such men should be found (cf. Gen. 18:32) the Lavra will be sustained and the brothers make rapid progress because of the prayers, counsel, and spiritual advice of these men. But it is possible that they may grow faint-hearted and subject to *akedia*, for it does happen that solitaries become discouraged and feel compelled to change their way of life for a while and be in need of a little consolation and renewal of spirit, so that they may once more take hold of their labors with greater intensity and stand firm on their own strength. In such a situation, let the superior allow that monk to move to Mylopotamos¹⁵ on the presumption that the very change of locale might provide an appropriate remedy and lead him back to a good frame of mind.

[46.] The monks who find they are not capable of leading such a life ought to stick to submission to the rule and carry on their struggle as athletes and martyrs, so they do not end up falling short of both goals. For before God and the angels I bear witness that those who persevere in genuine obedience and who remain firm in the love of God and in true affection for one another do not take second place to those carrying on the struggle special to solitude. But they shall be found to be superior and deemed worthy of eternal crowns by the good and impartial judge.

[47.] I want the cells of lord John the Iberian to be maintained just as I have set down in the grant I addressed to him. That is to say, his successors ought to preserve the good relationship existing between them and us. They ought to refrain from whatever is forbidden by the laws, especially regarding any extension beyond what has been decreed, either by going beyond the number of eight, or trying to sell them or make a donation of them, or in any other way at all to separate them from the Lavra.

13. ATH. TYPIKON

[48.] I also enjoin that every safeguard be taken to observe the following. I order the superior and the brothers who have positions of leadership after him never to receive a eunuch in our Lavra, even if he be an old man, nor [should they receive] a young boy, even though he should be the son of the man who holds in his hands the imperial scepter. If anyone transgresses this [p. 119] command of mine by receiving such forbidden persons, let him be separated from the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, from the holy, consubstantial, and life-giving Trinity; let him also receive the curse of our holy fathers and be anathematized from the inheritance of the just.

[49.] As far as others are concerned, if a person arrives and chooses to offer an entrance gift and be enrolled in our spiritual community and share the life and sufferings of its members according to the command of Christ, both in the service of the church and in the common fare at table, then he should certainly be received. But his entrance gift should be given to the poor, so he may not be constantly tempted on account of this gift and put on airs before the brothers as though he had done some great deed which serves as a reproach to his brothers, and so causes friction among them. But if he comes with testimonials concerning his good behavior, and his reputation is such that the superior foresees that no harm will result for any such reason, and if the man wishes to make an offering to God from his possessions, this ought not to be rejected. Of course, not even this should be allowed without some testing.

[50.] This now is what we have to advise and prescribe concerning the tonsure of the brothers. The superior is not allowed to tonsure anyone immediately, without any preliminaries, but only after an entire year. An exception might be made in the case of some who are pious and well known and whose religious way of life is well attested. For I regard it as a desirable work of extreme and primary importance to accept such persons and to attend to their special needs.

[51.] Let it also be known that the Peristerai, that is, the monastery of Saint Andrew, the leader of the holy apostles, comes under our authority and ownership, as is included and decreed in the two venerable chrysobulls, that of the revered, thrice-blessed emperor lord Nikephoros and that of our present devout emperor lord John, the one who now holds the scepter of the empire of the Romans. We have, therefore, determined to make the following arrangement. It is our wish that Stephen, the most devout monk and superior, remain absolutely undisturbed in his position of caring for and governing this monastery, and not be accountable to anyone. None of my successors has authority to remove him or to terminate his governance of this monastery of Peristerai for the rest of his life. For he has served us with all his strength [p. 120], as far as possible he has been of great comfort to us, he has accorded proper honor and displayed the submission one would expect. He also seems to have made many and great improvements in the monastery. After I depart this life anyone attempting to remove him from the governance of this monastery or otherwise in any manner at all causing him any sort of trouble shall be cut off from the holy, life-giving, and consubstantial Trinity, and shall fall under my own curse. Indeed now, I order that he be commemorated continuously in the sacred liturgies celebrated by the priests of the Lavra while he is alive, and that after his death a memorial service be held for him every year. After the departure from this life of the monk and most reverend superior Stephen, we want another superior appointed to succeed him by the superior of the Lavra.

TENTH CENTURY

[52.] Since, however, the essentials of monastic life had been totally neglected by previous superiors in this monastery for a long time, and practically all the monks in the monastery had yielded to complete indifference and carelessness, I realize that economy must be employed in having everyone in this monastery look toward one man and serve under one man, namely, the superior of the Lavra. Under the rule of one man they might be drawn together toward more spiritual goals in their prayers, psalmody, and readings, and also in their food and drink, as the service and labor of each, their travel and age, or the illness and health of each shall demand at different times. I therefore order that very competent stewards and priests be dispatched from the Lavra by its superior. They should be thoroughly examined and tested by him, as well as by the monks subject to him. [The stewards] will attend to the proper management of more corporeal needs, while [the priests] will associate the brothers with them and make them perfect in virtuous words and manners and in actions pleasing to God. When this shall have happened, I am convinced that, with God's help, they will benefit and derive great profit from one another and in one another, both as a community and as a single entity. For neither those from the Lavra nor those from the oft-mentioned monastery will differ from one another because of a twofold government, but they will continue to work together toward the unity of love [p. 121] and the union of minds by fixing their gaze on being under one sole and primary rule. If anyone should ever attempt to break up this beneficial and salutary arrangement of ours, let him be cut off from love, inasmuch as love is God (1 John 4: 8).

[53.] Let this too be added to the prescriptions I have set down. If any of our brothers persevering in the Lavra or any who have come here from a different monastery should wish to build additional cells or to dig up a field and cultivate it, by no means is this to be permitted in the entire circumference of the Lavra, I mean from the cape of the storehouses as far as Antiathos.¹⁶ This sort of thing generally gives rise to disturbances and scandals. In particular, such activity nearby will of its very nature eat away bit by bit at the basic elements of isolation and solitude. For this reason I forbid the superior of the Lavra or any other person to allow a cell or a cultivated field. Furthermore, I do not want another vineyard planted, not even to the extent of a flower-bed-sized piece of land,¹⁷ either in the entire circumference of the Lavra or in Mylopotamos. For, as already mentioned, by God's providence, what I have left behind is enough. I thought it superfluous to make special mention of sheep and goats, since I believe it is completely out of place for monks to possess them, especially the monks residing on the mountain.

[54.] You have now received all of this and whatever else I have to pass on, written and unwritten, my father and brother, whoever you may be, who, to put it briefly, as superior have received from God and from my lowly self that power and complete authority over the Lavra which I too had. [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [24]]: **You shall observe and guard** it for the glory of God, for my honor, for the assistance of those wishing to learn and for instilling divine zeal in those who shall see and hear. **May you do well and may you prosper** in the Lord. **Far be it from [me] to say or even to think of the opposite.**

[55.] Behold, therefore, I commit to you, in the presence of God and his chosen angels, the entire community in Christ. Welcome them, take them to yourself, guide and protect them as lambs of Christ, as beloved members, tend each one of them with respect and loving care, with an equal measure of love for each, for each man loves all the members of his body equally. [p. 122]

[56.] [= (3) *Theodore Studites* [25]]: **But now it is time for you, my children, brothers, and fathers, to hear my most pitiful voice. Accept and welcome the lord your superior as I have myself selected him. Looking upon him with respect and honor, embrace him as my successor. Just as you did with me, so with him too observe the lawful rule of obedience and do not think less of him because he has been recently appointed in the Lord. Nor should you expect anything more than the gifts which were given to him by the Holy Spirit. It is sufficient that he maintain that which was laid down by my humility. “If you love me,” my children, and you bear in mind my love, “you will keep my commandments” (John 14:15). Keep peace among yourselves.** Preserve a good disposition, humility, and obedience to your superior until death, not contradicting or annoying him in any respect. **Preserve your angelic profession inviolate.**

[= (3) *Theodore Studites* [26]]: **Hating the world, do not return to the works of the world. Having been loosed from the bonds of physical attachments, do not be bound again to the affections of the flesh. Having denied all pleasures and perishable things of the present life, do not depart from your struggle with obedience through negligence and become the sport of demons.**

[= (3) *Theodore Studites* [27]]: **Stick to the race of obedience until the end so that you will obtain the “unfading crown of righteousness” (cf. I Peter 5:4 and II Tim. 4:8). Led by humility, you should always deny your own will and pattern yourselves only after the judgment of your superior. If you keep these things in mind and if you should guard them to the end, you will be blessed. For the chorus of martyrs will receive you. Wearing your crowns in the kingdom of heaven, you will enjoy the eternal blessings in Christ Jesus our Lord. So farewell now, my children, and remember my lowly self.**

Notes on the Translation

1. On this monastic center in Bithynia, see Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 2, pp. 116–18.
2. Michael Maleinos, Nikephoros Phokas’ nephew and the founder of the above-mentioned Kyminas monastery, for whom see Louis Petit, “Vie de saint Michel Maléinos,” *ROC* 7 (1902), 543–603.
3. The Arab rulers of Crete, originally refugees from al-Hakam, the Umayyad ruler of Spain, who conquered this Byzantine possession circa 828.
4. Chandax (Candia), capital of the island of Crete under Arab rule.
5. For the *protos* Stephen, see the Athanasian *Vita A*, chap. 44, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 22–23, with Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 129.
6. For Methodios, a monk and future superior of the Kyminas monastery, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 34.
7. The Lavra *katholikon*.

TENTH CENTURY

8. That is “Nikephoros,” lit. “bearer of victory.”
9. *Kyriotes* and *despoteia*; for which, see R. Morris, “Legal Terminology in Monastic Documents of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries,” *JÖB* 32.2 (1982), 281–90, at 284–85.
10. Nikephoros Phokas was murdered on December 10, 969, in the course of a coup d’état engineered by his successor John Tzimiskes.
11. See Hesiod, *Theogony*, 185.
12. Cf. *Apophthegmata patrum* 10, *PG* 65, col. 77BC.
13. *Epeixis* means a pressing need or an emergency, but here it must refer to an “imposition” or tax.
14. Nikephoros Phokas, cf. [6].
15. That is, the dependency of St. Eustathios mentioned in [9]; cf. [53].
16. Mountain top on the Athonite peninsula, between the monasteries of Simonos Petra and St. Paul.
17. For this meaning of the word *plinthion*, see *Megale Hellenike Enkyklopaideia* (Athens, 1932), vol. 20, p. 348, s.v. *plinthion*. It is obvious from the context that Athanasios is not referring to the land measure by the same name which was the equivalent of 3 *modioi* (E. Schilbach, *Byzantinische Metrologische Quellen* [Thessalonike, 1982], p. 186).

Document Notes

- [1] Praise of the solitary life. Applicability for most monks limited in [38]; see [37], [40], and [43] below for preservation of a role for solitaries within Lavra’s cenobitic constitution.
- [2] Nikephoros Phokas and his patronage of monasteries. For this emperor, see Morris, “Two Faces of Nikephoros Phokas,” 83–115, esp. 100–11; for his patronage of his uncle Michael Maleinos’ monastery on Kyminas, see the Athanasian *Vita A*, chaps. 28–30, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 15, and *Vita B*, chap. 11, ed. Noret, pp. 136–38.
- [3] Athanasios’ relationship with Nikephoros Phokas. There is a parallel account in *Vita A*, chap. 30, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 15, and *Vita B*, chap. 11, ed. Noret, p. 137.
- [4] Nikephoros Phokas’ conquest of Crete. For a general discussion, see Shepherd, *Byzantine Reconquest of Crete*. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 33, dates the departure of the Byzantine fleet from Constantinople to conquer Crete to the summer of 960. According to the parallel account in *Vita A*, chaps. 60–67, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 30–32, and *Vita B*, chap. 22, ed. Noret, pp. 147–48, Athanasios was successfully pressured to go to Crete by the Athonite elders, who were anxious to obtain the release of some monks who had been taken captive to Crete.
- [5] Discussion of plans for Lavra. These discussions are placed here before the fall of the Cretan capital Chandax, which occurred on March 7, 961, but the parallel account in *Vita A*, chap. 68, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 32, and *Vita B*, chap. 22, ed. Noret, pp. 148–49, has Athanasios arriving in Crete after the fall of the enemy capital; see discussion in Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 33. According to *Vita A*, chap. 70, ed. Noret, p. 33, and *Vita B*, chap. 21, p. 47, Nikephoros Phokas offered money at this time for the construction of Lavra, but Athanasios refused to accept it.
- [6] Athanasios agrees to begin construction. There is a parallel account with many more details in *Vita A*, chaps. 71–83, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 33–38, and *Vita B*, chaps. 23–25, ed. Noret, pp. 149–53. The implied chronology of the account here of Methodios’ visit and the commencement of construction differs from that of the hagiographic tradition; see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 33–35, who proposes that Methodios’ six-month visit occurred from autumn 962 to spring 963, during which time the first construction work took place.
- [7] Nikephoros Phokas acclaimed emperor; Athanasios journeys to Constantinople to reproach him. This chapter telescopes a series of events after Nikephoros Phokas’ proclamation by his army at Kaisareia, July 3, 963, and his coronation in Constantinople a month later on August 16 (for dates, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 33). Here Athanasios suppresses his flight to Cyprus and his return to Lavra, for which see the parallel account in *Vita A*, chaps. 90–100, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 42–48, and *Vita B*, chaps. 31–33, ed. Noret, pp. 161–65. Athanasios is thought to have fled Athos in distress soon after the news

13. ATH. TYPIKON

of the emperor's accession reached Athos, perhaps in September; he was absent in Cyprus for at least four or five months, returning to Lavra by the end of 963 or early 964 (see Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 77). Athanasios' audience with Nikephoros Phokas took place sometime in early 964, before May (Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 35).

- [8] Account of Lavra's construction. The hagiographic tradition differs in placing all the construction work, including that for the *katholikon* (see *Vita A*, chap. 81, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 36–37, and *Vita B*, chap. 25, ed. Noret, p. 151), before Nikephoros Phokas' accession. Modern scholars, including Mylonas ("Le plan initial du catholicon de la Grande-Lavra au Mont Athos et la genèse du type du catholicon athonite," *CA* 32 [1984], p. 103), accept the implication that work resumed in 964 after Athanasios' return from Constantinople.
- [9] The dependency of St. Eustathios at Mylopotamos. The church and *kellia* established here were intended to help Lavra control a detached property; see (8) *John Xenos*, Institutional History, (9) *Galesios* [144], and (35) *Skoteine* [10]. There is a cross-reference below in [45] to the use of this dependency by solitaries.
- [10] Lavra's isolated location. According to *Vita A*, chaps. 106–10, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 50–52, and *Vita B*, chap. 35, ed. Noret, pp. 166–67, Athanasios later rectified the lack of an anchorage by building a port for the convenience of Lavra's visitors.
- [11] Condemnation of commercial activity elsewhere. This chapter shows a sensitivity to the condemnation of "mercenary pursuits" in (12) *Tzimiskes* [13].
- [12] First quotation from Nikephoros Phokas' chrysobull. The document is Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 704; see discussion by Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 37–38, and Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 81–83, with reconstruction of probable contents at 82. See the second quotation in [18] below and other references to this chrysobull in [13], [20], [23], [36], and [42]; the surviving fragments are translated in the introduction to Chapter Two.
- [13] Athanasios' role in the formulation of the chrysobull. A novel approach to a traditional problem of monastic organization is implied here, but see above, Analysis, n. 7, for possible precedents.
- [14] Original plans for Lavra's administration. A gradual transformation from a directly administered private monastery to a more genuinely independent foundation was contemplated, perhaps like the arrangements outlined in (10) *Eleousa* [11], [16]. Athanasios discreetly passes over the circumstances of Nikephoros Phokas' violent death at the hands of his successor John Tzimiskes, the reigning emperor.
- [15] Future superiors to designate their successors. The implication, for which see also [16] below, is that the superior was to consult with the "more prominent brothers" in making his choice, as in (10) *Eleousa* [16], though the quotation from Nikephoros Phokas' chrysobull in [12] above hints at a somewhat broader conception of this informal electorate. A formal election, like those that would take place in reform monasteries of the twelfth century (for which see Chapters Five and Six), is not contemplated here except under the circumstances outlined below in [17].
- [16] Assertion of patronal authority to designate a successor; warning against factionalism. Athanasios' rights derive from Nikephoros Phokas' chrysobull as quoted above in [12]; for another such exercise of patronal rights, see (10) *Eleousa* [11]. (22) *Evergetis* [14] provides a discussion of the evil consequences of factionalism from a monastic reform perspective.
- [17] Procedure for election of a new superior if the incumbent dies suddenly. The franchise is restricted to the "preeminent and more devout" monks, cf. [15], [16] above; *xenokouroi* are excluded from consideration, cf. [13] above and [20] below. This procedure is amended later by (14) *Ath. Testament* [12], [13].
- [18] Second quotation from Nikephoros Phokas' chrysobull. This excerpt recognizes Lavra's right to choose its own leader, the key to effective self-government. In rejecting claims to this right by the imperial treasury and the patriarchate, Athanasios likely had in mind the recent award of the monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai, an imperial monastery listed in the inventory of the treasury (*sakelle*) according to a chrysobull of Constantine X Doukas, ed. Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, doc. 33, pp. 195–99, at 197, line 39, under (patriarchal) *epidosis* to Lavra at the bequest of Nikephoros Phokas in 964 (for which see *Vita A*,

TENTH CENTURY

- chap. 103, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 50, and *Vita B*, chap. 34, ed. Noret, p. 166).
- [19] Recapitulation of arrangements for the succession. Summarizes [15], [16], and [17] above.
- [20] Exclusion of *xenokouroi* from the succession in the chrysobull. This is a reference to a provision in the chrysobull as quoted above in [12]; Athanasios has made the same point already in [17].
- [21] Exception for monks resident for two or three years. See discussion above in Analysis, 2. Constitutional Status and Succession to the Superiorship. Circumstances under which such monks could be chosen are discussed below in [22], where the prescribed probationary status is decreased to as little as a year.
- [22] Eligibility of such *xenokouroi* for the superiorship. Athanasios addresses the apparent contradiction with the chrysobull below in [23].
- [23] Exception does not contradict Nikephoros Phokas' chrysobull. There is no quotation here since Athanasios' assertion is based on the intent rather than the letter of the law.
- [24] Injunction not to discriminate against *xenokouros*. For one such *xenokouros*, Antony, a monk tonsured in the Kyminas monastery, see (14) *Ath. Testament* [18].
- [25] Punishment appropriate for those who so discriminate. Details of the punishment are provided below in [29].
- [26] Such discrimination is heretical. Although Athanasios asserts here the equivalence of monks "tonsured at home" (an *esokouros*) and a monk "foreign tonsure" (a *xenokouros*), a distinction in favor of the former had evidently taken root, perhaps linked to the charisma of tonsure by the holy man himself, for which see [28] below.
- [27] Even monasteries founded beyond Cadiz not "foreign." Cf. the wide geographic appeal of Athanasios as reported in the hagiographic tradition, *Vita A*, chap. 158, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 64–75, and *Vita B*, chap. 43, ed. Noret, p. 176, including monks from Italy, Georgia, and Armenia.
- [28] Monks Athanasios has tonsured not to be preferred to others. See comments in [26] above.
- [29] Specific punishment for those who discriminate against *xenokouros*. Cf. [25] above. This passage is partly quoted and summarized in *Vita A*, chap. 89, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, pp. 41–42, and *Vita B*, chap. 29, ed. Noret, p. 158, an indication of its importance.
- [30] No unnecessary changes in the rule; ban on worldly possessions; prohibition on alienation of monastic property to friends or relatives. These provisions are literal but unattributed quotations from (3) *Theodore Studites* [1], [2], and [3], respectively.
- [31] Prohibition of individual or collective ownership of slaves; ban on female animals. These rules are literal, unattributed quotations from (3) *Theodore Studites* [4] and [5]. A ban on sheep and goats is found below in [53].
- [32] All possessions to be held in common; prohibition of adoptions and spiritual relationships; superior not to administer finances directly. These are literal, unattributed quotations from (3) *Theodore Studites* [1], [7], and [22] respectively. The injunction to hold all possessions in common is discussed also in *Vita A*, chap. 88, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 41, and *Vita B*, chap. 29, ed. Noret, p. 158.
- [33] Guidelines for the superior's life. These are literal quotations from (3) *Theodore Studites* [20], [10], with an additional regulation by the author particular to Lavra.
- [34] Superior is not to seek higher office, lodge in places where women live, nor have a disciple or servant; prohibition on further acquisitions of property. (12) *Tzimiskes* [16] banned youths—who commonly served monks—entirely, but as Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 84, n. 221, observed, this provision was frequently transgressed. The last provision on property acquisitions is original to this document and is reinforced by [45] and [53] below; the others are derived from (3) *Theodore Studites* [14], [17], and [18], respectively. (3) *Theodore Studites* [18] has "adolescent disciple."
- [35] Hospitality for guests enjoined; injunction not to give preference to powerful persons. The last provision is an unattributed quotation from (3) *Theodore Studites* [23].
- [36] Number of monks increased to 120. The reference is to Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 744; see also the account of how this chrysobull was secured in *Vita A*, chap. 116, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 56, and *Vita B*, chap. 36, ed. Noret, p. 169; with discussion by Lemerle, "La vie ancienne de saint Athanase l'Athonite

13. ATH. TYPIKON

- composéé au debut du XI^e siècle par Athanase de Lavra,” *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963*, vol. 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), p. 79, and *Lavra*, pt. 1, pp. 39, 43. According to Athanasios’ account in his donation to John the Iberian in 984, ed. Lefort et al., *Actes de Iviron*, pt. 1, doc. 6, however, it was John who actually obtained this chrysobull from John Tzimiskes.
- [37] Provision for five kelliotic monks. See also [40] below for rules for transfer to the *kellia* and [43] for the identification of some of the sites; cf. the treatment of solitaries in (12) *Tzimiskes* [10], [12], [18], [20].
- [38] Most monks to observe communal living. (11) *Ath. Rule* [28] is more tolerant of self-imposed ascetic observances.
- [39] Common meals and liturgical services. There is an apparent reference to Athanasios’ prior legislation on these matters in (11) *Ath. Rule*, helpful for confirming his authorship of that document.
- [40] Qualifications for transfer from communal to solitary life. Cf. Athanasios’ own promotion by Michael Maleinos to the solitary life at Kyminas as discussed in *Vita A*, chap. 26, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 14, and *Vita B*, chap. 9, ed. Noret, pp. 135–36.
- [41] Solitaries not to be harassed. For the imposition of (labor) services on the solitaries, see (12) *Tzimiskes* [20].
- [42] Apportionment of the imperial grain donation. The reference is to an otherwise unattested benefaction of Nikephoros Phokas, presumably granted to Lavra in 964, for which see Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 82.
- [43] Description of cells available for use by kelliotic monks. For the cells of the emperor, see *Vita A*, chap. 73, ed. Noret, *Vitae duae*, p. 35, and *Vita B*, chap. 23, ed. Noret, p. 149; according to P. Dumont, “Vie cénobitique ou vie hésychaste dans quelques ‘typica’ byzantins,” *L’Église et les Églises*, vol. 2 (Chevetogne, 1955), p. 487, n. 1, an oratory associated with this facility still exists under the name of the *kathisma* of St. John the Forerunner a short distance from Lavra. Among the available cells not mentioned specifically here were those located [9] at the dependency of St. Euthymios at Mylopotamos.
- [44] Rental of cells in exchange for entrance gifts not permitted. Cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [6], permitting superiors to sell, donate or bequeath personal property, and [2], permissions required for settlement of non-Athonite monks in *kellia*; here Athanasios is determined to bring the residents of these cells under the superior of Lavra’s discipline. The general acceptability of an entrance gift (*apotage*) is indicated in [49] below.
- [45] No other cells to be constructed. This is consonant with Athanasios’ disinclination (in this document at any rate) to permit Lavra’s continued expansion, for which see also [34] above and [53] below. For Mylopotamos, see [9] above and [53] below.
- [46] Unsuccessful solitaries to return to the community. For a compulsory return of solitaries to the *koinobion* see (24) *Christodoulos* [A24].
- [47] Grant of cells to John the Iberian. For this individual, one of Athanasios’ closest collaborators who would be designated in (14) *Ath. Testament* [4] as one of Lavra’s administrators, see Lemerle, *Lavra*, pt. 1, p. 42, with n. 151, and Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 83–85. Athanasios’ grant of these cells is discussed in George the Hagiorite’s *Georgian Life* of John and his son Euthymios, trans. Peeters, “Histoires,” *Vie de Jean et d’Euthyme*, chap. 8, p. 19.
- [48] No eunuchs, young or old. Cf. the equivalent provision in (12) *Tzimiskes* [16] and the Studite-derived ban on adolescent disciples in [34] above. In referring to a eunuch son of the emperor, Athanasios may have had in mind the example of Romanos Lekapenos’ son Theophylaktos (933–56), who was the patriarch of Constantinople during the author’s residence as a monk at the Kyminas monastery.
- [49] Disposition of entrance gifts. The concern over the deleterious effects that entrance gifts could have on the discipline of their donors despite their obvious value to the foundations who were their beneficiaries was heightened during the monastic reform; see the discussions in (9) *Galesios* [192] and (22) *Evergetis* [37]. The alternative of banning entrance gifts completely appears only very late in (60) *Charsianeites* [B16]; here Athanasios leaves open the possibility of accepting them under appropriate circumstances.

TENTH CENTURY

- [50] Novitiate of one year. Cf. the equivalent provision in (12) *Tzimiskes* [3]; Athanasios' exception for the "pious and well-known" would be adopted later by the monastic reform movement via (22) *Evergetis* [37].
- [51] Relations with dependency of St. Andrew of Peristerai. For this foundation, an imperial monastery granted by Nikephoros Phokas to Athanasios in 964 under ecclesiastical *epidosis*, see Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, pp. 35–36.
- [52] Reform of the dependency. The implication is that this monastery, founded as a cenobitic institution by Euthymios the Younger, for whom see L. Petit, "Vie et office de saint Euthyme le Jeune," *BHO* 5 (1904), 39–46, in 871 and given a rule (now lost) by him, had subsequently abandoned cenobiticism for some alternative form of monastic organization.
- [53] No new cells, cultivated fields, or vineyards; sheep and goats banned. In a Studite-derived provision [31] above, Athanasios bans the use of female animals. Earlier, (12) *Tzimiskes* [22] had banned the importation of animals to Mount Athos, with an exception [23] for a yoke permitted to Lavra. See [34] and [45] above for additional provisions foreclosing future growth of the Athonite community.
- [54] Superior obliged to preserve Athanasios' commands. Cf. similar provisions in (3) *Theodore Studites* [24], (5) *Euthymios* [2], (6) *Rila* [5], (8) *John Xenos* [3], (9) *Galesios* [246], and (10) *Eleousa* [22].
- [55] Entire community committed to Athanasios' successor. For the traditional notion of the monastery as a mystical body, also employed by Theodore the Studite, see the pseudo-Basilian *Constitutiones asceticae*, *PG* 31, cols. 1381B, 1396B, 1417BD, 1421A.
- [56] Valedictory message to brothers. This chapter is a direct, unattributed quotation from (3) *Theodore Studites* [25], [26], [27].