

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

21. *Roidion: Typikon* of Nikon of the Black Mountain for the Monastery and Hospice of the Mother of God *tou Roidiou*

Date: first decade of the 12th c.¹

Translator: Robert Allison

Edition employed: Vladimir Benešević, *Taktikon Nikona Chernogortsa* (Petrograd, 1917), pp. 68–80.

Manuscript: Codex Sinaiticus graecus 441 (St. Catherine’s Monastery)

Other translations: Arabic, Slavonic²

Institutional History

In the current state of research, the history of this foundation, dedicated to the Mother of God *tou Roidiou*, “of the Pomegranate,” is poorly understood.³ Nikon’s charge of its spiritual care perhaps was part of his assignment to reform the monks of North Syria that had originally been entrusted to him by the patriarch of Antioch Theodosios III (1057–1059), subsequently confirmed by the exarchs of the patriarchate during the long interregnum of 1059–1089. Nikon is known to have taken refuge in this monastery after the Seljuk conquest of Antioch in 1084. It was located in Armenian territory ruled by the Tzatoi who were Chalcedonian in their faith.⁴ Nikon is known to have been active during the patriarchate of the militantly reformist John V the Oxite (1089–1100), better known as John of Antioch; the particular reform program Nikon pursued at this foundation fits in well with what is known about the latter’s own program from his tract against the *charistike*, *De monasteriis laicis non tradendis*.⁵ The references to Franks in [B3] and to the foundation’s role [B2] in facilitating the travel of pilgrims to Jerusalem, however, suggest that the document dates from after the Crusader conquest of the Holy City in 1099. Solignac (“Nicon,” col. 319) maintains that Nikon died here; this was sometime in the first decade of the twelfth century.

Analysis

This remarkable document is not an idealized portrayal of a foundation at the time of its creation, like (19) *Attaleiates*, nor a proud summation of an institution’s way of life by a leader of a later generation, like (4) *Stoudios* or (22) *Evergetis*. Rather, like (12) *Tzimiskes* and (15) *Constantine IX*, it portrays a monastic community at a point of crisis. In the last-named Athonite texts, representatives of the emperor mediated a program of reforms with the active support of at least some of the resident monks. Here, Nikon, representative of the patriarch of Antioch, possibly the fervent monastic reformer John V the Oxite, imposes a reform against the wishes of the foundation’s monks. The document enables us to observe the foundation at an awkward point, as Nikon’s reform program—including the revival of cenobitical life, the easing out of officials termed “spiritually destroyed,” and the redirection of the foundation’s income to “correct” purposes—has been

determined but has not yet been implemented. Instead, certain circumstances, perhaps including the monks' active opposition, have forced Nikon to make the best of what was from his perspective a bad situation. By examining the compromises he announces in this document, we gain valuable insight into how some recalcitrant institutions in the process of being reformed operated at the beginning of the twelfth century.

The document is divided into two sections, a brief *typikon* [A] and a longer *Treatise* [B] addressed to the foundation's residents.

A. *The Typikon*

The addressee of the *typikon* was an unnamed individual [A1], cf. [A5] who had been appointed by the secular ruler (also unnamed) to look after the physical needs of the monastery. This addressee was probably a protector (cf. Nikon's own title in [A2]); a *charistikarios* seems unlikely, particularly if John V, the most notable contemporary opponent of the *charistike*, was the patriarch responsible for the appointment. Nikon had also been appointed [A1] by the patriarch, specifically to look after the spiritual affairs of the foundation. The abandonment of common meals in the refectory and other aspects of the cenobitic life, glimpsed elsewhere in (9) *Galesios* [147], [189] a half-century earlier, had been completed [A1] long ago here. After condemning [A1] previous superiors as "spiritually destroyed," Nikon declares [A4] the office (and its presumably irremovable incumbent) to be superfluous. Other reputable officials (who were not Nikon's own appointees—cf. [B1]) were to minister [A1] to guests in the refectory and to attend to the church. The foundation had originally been endowed [A2] with landed properties intended to support the church and hospice, much like (16) *Mount Tmolos* [1]. Nikon anticipated [A2], [A5] additional (and unencumbered) gifts for this purpose from the addressee. This was necessary because the current residents, *kelliotai* and "others" (possibly the imposed guests known as *katapemptoi*), had established [A2] entitlements to some of the revenues of the earlier endowed properties.

Nikon charges [A2] a steward with handling the distributions to the foundation's residents (cf. the arrangements for the payment of salaries and other gratuities in (19) *Attaleiates* [33]), but he was unwilling to allow [A3] this official any authority over the hospice or the church "for the sake of freedom from offense and scandal." Citing a regulation (*typos*) of the monastery of Symeon the Wonderworker (cf. (20) *Black Mountain* [84]), Nikon also rejects [A4], cf. [B19] the superior's right to any authority over these units of the foundation. Instead he prefers to rely [A3] on the administrator of the church and the head of the hospice (the *xenodochos*) to administer these parts of the foundation. Citing a regulation of another institution, the Jerusalemite monastery of St. Sabas, as precedent, Nikon hoped to establish [A3] the entitlement of the attendants in the hospice and the administrator of the church to support from the foundation's land holdings. He vaguely indicates [A3] his preference that those so supported should live and eat communally. Lacking an equivalent precedent, Nikon was uncertain about the right of others, e.g., those attendants who took care of the church, to a similar entitlement.

After payment of all these claimants, there may have been very little left over from the foundation's income to support [A1] its avowed purpose of providing hospitality to visitors; Nikon makes [A5] this a special responsibility of the protector along with support for the monks (perhaps those without specific incomes) "if it is appropriate and God is pleased." With his character-

istic humility and tentativeness, Nikon closes [A6] this first portion of the document with the declaration “If someone else knows the greater and pleasing and perfect will of God, let it prevail, and not these things.”

B. The Treatise Addressed to the Foundation’s Residents

In the second part [B] of this document, Nikon undertakes to address the very monks of whose leadership and lifestyle he was so critical in the *typikon* proper. This part starts with a discussion of appropriate hospitality to be extended to pilgrim monks and laymen [B2], Franks [B3], and dignitaries [B7], even unbelievers. The head of the hospice was to eat with or serve guests personally [B4], cf. [B8], except for Franks of “unsound thinking.” Nikon maintains [B5] that monks who wished to entertain guests privately in their cells must do so from their private resources.⁶

Refusing to acknowledge the validity of the kelliotic lifestyle for monks, Nikon declares [B6] that ordinarily “it is not permitted for a brother privately to possess anything at all, however small or large, neither for (entertaining) a friend nor for any other reason whatsoever.” Apparently powerless to institute a moral reform of the foundation’s current residents, Nikon evidently determined to recover the foundation’s assets from them by attrition. In [B11] we see Nikon pressuring the residents to get them to agree to donate these assets back to the foundation. Failing that, Nikon was prepared to authorize [B11] seizures of residents’ assets when they died. Through these confiscations, Nikon hoped to forestall claims by any of the other brothers or a lay relative to a deceased monk’s properties. Borrowing contemporary reform terminology, Nikon maintains [B11] that any such attempt to claim ecclesiastical property was sacrilegious (cf. (19) *Attaleiates* [INV 11]). In the meantime, Nikon attempted to limit what were in effect “beneficed” monks to a “self-sufficiency” of income, specifically “what befits monks.” The implication is that any additional revenue was to be confiscated for the benefit of the foundation.

Nikon seeks [B12], cf. [B11] to trade off pledges of memorial commemorations for residents who cooperated with his plans to reconsolidate the foundation’s original assets under its own management. He also encourages [B15] residents to make voluntary donations to the foundation before they died in the name of helping the “poor,” loosely interpreted to mean any visitor passing through who was in need of food and shelter. Nikon discourages [B17] the residents from acquiring additional private properties. After all this firmness of purpose, however, Nikon lapses into his typical ambivalence (or is it just pragmatism?) when he declares [B19]: “Ignore these things and others that I may say if they do not lead to the salvation of souls.”

Finally, Nikon provides [B20] contingency plans to be put into effect if it should prove to be impossible to eliminate or abolish the authority of the superior. Alluding perhaps to a court suit over the rights to manage the foundation’s endowed properties, Nikon urges that they be abandoned to the claimants (the superior’s relatives?) so that the foundation will be free to be managed by the Mother of God herself (see (19) *Attaleiates* [3] for the legal fiction of heavenly administration). The expectation that the foundation will be able to operate somehow without “any earthly revenues” is rationalized by reference to a bygone era when Sabas, the author of the regulation cited here and elsewhere [A4] in this document, was said to have managed without “receiving revenues or donations from the emperor or anywhere else.” This statement likely stems more from the reformer’s understandable sense of frustration at the entangling complications of financial

patronage than from any realistic recollection of the past. Yet as if to underline his determination to break free from these entanglements, Nikon concludes with a declaration of his willingness to forfeit even the hospice itself “if [it] is sought after in the manner of the lands.” The hospice is in that event to be replaced with another, presumably relying on the generosity of the protector for patronal support.

C. Relationship to the Monastic Reform Movement

In this, a later document than (20) *Black Mountain*, Nikon’s reform program and its indebtedness to the contemporary concerns of the reform movement is much more evident than in his earlier *typikon*. The hostility to non-cenobitic monasticism [B6], the denunciation of the alienation of ecclesiastical property [B11] as sacrilege, the reluctance to accept ownership of private property [B17] by monks, and the promotion of memorial services [B12] as an acceptable form of patronal privilege are some of the salient links to the reform program of Nikon’s Evergetian contemporaries (see discussions in Chapters Four and Five below). This document indicates how difficult of realization this reform program must have been, at least in pre-existing institutions affected by the powerful secularizing influences of the eleventh century. On the whole we see Nikon adopting a tough but still very pragmatic policy well matched to the difficult situation he faced in attempting to reform this foundation.

Notes on the Introduction

1. See discussion below in Institutional History.
2. For details, see (20) *Black Mountain*, Biography of the Author, B. His Works.
3. Nikon’s unpublished works appear to be the source for what little is known currently about this foundation: see Doens, “Nicon,” pp. 132–35; Kazhdan, “Nikon,” p. 1484; Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, vol. 4, pp. 155–68; Nasrallah, “Auteur antiochien,” pp. 151–52; and Solignac, “Nicon,” cols. 319–20. The foundation’s correct name of Roidiou, not Raithou, was first read by V. Grumel, “Le jeûne de l’Assomption dans l’Église grecque. Étude historique,” *EO* 32 (1933,) 174 (see above, (20) *Black Mountain*, Document Notes [87] [88]).
4. For general information on the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia in Cilicia and northern Syria, see C. Toumanoff, “Armenia and Georgia,” in *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 628–37.
5. See Grumel, “Nicon,” pp. 270–72; for an analysis of John of Antioch’s *De monasteriis*, see my *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, D.C., 1987), pp. 186–92.
6. Cf. the contrary regulation, drawing on a common source, in (23) *Pakourianos* [8], in the context of a cenobitic monastery.

Bibliography

- Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 600.
- Benešević, Vladimir, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catharinae in Monte Sina asservantur*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1911), pp. 237–46. Includes also an edition of five chapters of Nikon’s *Taktikon*, pp. 561–601.
- Brock, S., “Syriac Manuscripts Copied on the Black Mountain, near Antioch,” *Lingua Restituta Orientalis: Festgabe für Julius Assfalg* (Wiesbaden, 1990), pp. 59–67.
- Clercq, Carlo de, “Les Pandectes de Nicon de la Montagne Noire,” *AHDO* 4 (1949), 187–203. Includes an edition and translation of the first chapter of Nikon’s *Pandects*.

21. ROIDION

- , *Les textes juridiques dans les Pandectes de Nikon de la Montagne Noire* (Venice, 1942). Includes a resume of the contents of Nikon's *Pandects*, pp. 23–74.
- Doens, Irénée, "Nicon de la Montagne Noire," *Byzantion* 24 (1954), 131–40.
- Grumel, Venance, "Nicon de la Montagne Noire et Jean IV (V) l'Oxite. Remarques chronologiques," *REB* 21 (1963), 270–72.
- Kazhdan, Alexander, "Nikon of the Black Mountain," *ODB*, p. 1484.
- Mai, Angelo, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e vaticanis codicibus edita*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1831), pp. 155–70. A summary of the contents of the Arabic version of Nikon's *Taktikon*.
- Nasrallah, J., "Un auteur antiochien du XI^e siècle: Nicon de la Montagne Noire (vers 1025–début du XII^e s.)," *POC* 19 (1969), 150–61.
- Richard, M., "Florilèges spirituels," *DS*, vol. 5. (Paris, 1962), cols. 435–511, esp. 503–4.
- Solignac, Aimé, "Nicon de la Montagne-Noire," *DS*, vol. 11 (Paris, 1982), cols. 319–20.
- Yiankou, Th. X., *Nikon ho Mauroreites. Bios—Syngraphiko Ergo—Kanonike Didaskalia* (Thessalonike, 1991) (= *Aristoteleio Panepistemio Thessalonikes, Epistemonike Epeterida Theologikes Scholes, Tmema Poimantikes, Parartema Arith.* 2). Known but not available to the editors and the translator of this document.

Translation

[A] Another *typikon* by the same author well documented from the divine scriptures in the holy monastery of the supremely glorious Mother of God, concerning hospitality and the church and other necessary subjects conducive to the salvation of souls. Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us through the intercessions of her who gave birth to thee, the blameless Mother of God. By her [intercessions] we dwell [here] in thy name and [in the name of] thy blameless mother. If these things are in keeping with thy pleasure, establish them.

For the one charged by him who currently has secular authority to preside over the physical needs of the holy monastery of our blameless Mistress the Mother of God called locally *tou Roidiou*.

[A] 1. My spiritual brother. Behold, by the grace of God, just as at first, in spite of my unworthiness, God nevertheless entrusted [me] with spiritual affairs through the patriarchal see of the Catholic Church.¹ Recently again the ruler, he who rules and has authority [by the will of] God over secular affairs, entrusted to me, the unworthy, the whole spiritual administration [by the will of] God. What he did is worthy of his godly understanding and piety, as I often wrote to him. May God protect him and all of you under his rule from every evil thing. But although I also wrote to him before concerning the poor and strangers and friends and enemies who come to the monastery and likewise about the church and similar matters, I did not write to him concerning the refectory and cenobitic order, because just as we find in the sacred writings, this way of life disintegrated many years ago, and where they observe it still, they observe it for their own personal will and not as the cenobitic law and the will of God require. But the divine scripture [p. 69] decrees that "he saves who saves his own soul"² (Gen. 19:17).

Since I follow this injunction of the Holy Scripture and the rest of God's laws, and since, unworthy though I am, I was entrusted with spiritual matters, as I said before, for these reasons, with the help of God and our holy Virgin the Mother of God, there is no need any longer for a

superior. For just as we already said before concerning the cenobitic order, its inner dynamic was destroyed spiritually, and so [those holding positions as] superiors were spiritually destroyed, and are moved by carnal and illegal motives.

For this reason there is no need for a superior, but there is need for [monastic] officials to minister properly for God's satisfaction under the protection of our blameless and holy Lady, the Mother of God. They are to minister at the refectory to the visiting poor and strangers, both friends and enemies, and generally in all such circumstances as well as in the church, just as the law of God holds with the "You shall love the Lord your God and your neighbor as yourself" (Matt. 22:37).

[A] 2. Behold, the church and the house of hospitality: the one for the worship and correctness of right faith and praise of the love of God and so on, the other for the love of neighbor (and "neighbor" means all humankind) and for the "I was a stranger and you welcomed me" (Matt. 25:35) and other similar commandments of the Lord. As the Lord himself says, "On these two commandments depend the whole law and the prophets" (Matt. 22:40), [that is] on the love of God and neighbor. For these things the church was provided and the hospice; and for them were dedicated all the lands which were around the monastery, and whatever there was of any sort for the use of the church and the hospice, and also whatever you may offer.

This was provided by [the help of] God and the blameless Mother of God, and spiritual guardianship and management was entrusted to me, unworthy as I am, with the help of God, and [there is] no refectory or anything else central, because, as I said before, [the cenobitic order] is now destroyed and is not working for the salvation of the soul, but for harm. But if you provide the brethren individually each in his own cell anything [p. 70] that is fitting, let it be to please God, and may it be, as it pleases God, for your own salvation and theirs.

Since [some] brethren live in the place as kelliotic brothers, each taking care of himself, and also some other [persons], and [since], accordingly, something different is appropriate—namely, there is need for a steward [to be in charge of] this task and responsibility—let this be enacted to the pleasure of God, for everything that is autonomous and follows its own will is dangerous and disorderly, and is counted as wickedness, just as also the apostle, when enumerating the offshoots of evil, also numbers this one with the words, "disorderly and slanderers" (cf. Tim. 3:3), and so on.

[A] 3. The steward should have no authority at all over any matter whatsoever either internally or externally in the hospice, nor [any authority] in the church, for the sake of freedom from offense and scandal. But it is fitting for the one in charge of the church and the one in charge of the hospice each to take care of his respective duties.

Just as it is fitting according to the regulation of the monastery of our holy father Sabas,³ those serving in the hospice ought to be provided with their food and clothing and other necessities from there. Likewise, he who is in charge of the church—he alone since [only] he shares this service and occupation together with the host of the hospice—[ought to be provided] in like fashion with all his bodily requirements. As for [their] dwelling and eating together, let what is acceptable for the salvation of the soul [be done].

21. ROIDION

On the other hand, with regard to whether it is appropriate to provide from the dedicated land holdings for the nourishment of the attendants and those who take care of the church and so on, whatever [rules] are extant in writing in the divine regulations and laws, let them be [carried out] to the pleasure of God.

[A] 4. Just as was also written before⁴ concerning the superior that there is no need [of one], and seeking what is pleasing to God we established in writing the cause, here in turn, [we stated] what happens in reverse to those who seek their own will and not that of God, and to these are here added in writing with [the help of] God and the blameless Mother of God that, just as written concerning the steward before,⁵ so [be it] also concerning the superior, [namely] that in the church and in the hospice let him have no authority over the church and hospice in accordance with the regulation of the monastery [p. 71] of our holy father and wonderworker Symeon.⁶ From now on let no one harass my humility on account of these things.

[A] 5. Behold, my spiritual brother, this I contributed to the spiritual [life of the brotherhood] and the salvation of the soul, and this was appropriate for me. To the extent that I was able I did it with [the help of] God and our blameless Lady the Mother of God. But since you were entrusted to minister to physical needs, be not careless, but carry out whatever you were commanded and above all what is conducive to God's satisfaction with respect to the need for administration of the poor and the strangers and sojourners as well as the brothers individually, if it is appropriate and God is pleased.

The Lord himself protect you and all those with you and him who rules with [the consent of] God. Yes, yes, we exhort the one who rules by divine [authority] and his divine piety and all of you who are under him, and even if we are unworthy, still we advise you not to be careless regarding salvation of the soul, and through the intercessions of the supremely glorious Mother of God by which we dwell as sojourners [we pray], let God shield and protect all for the salvation of soul and body. Amen.

[A] 6. All these things, whatever I knew, I wrote. But if some one else knows the greater and pleasing and perfect will of God, let it prevail, and not these things. But if also God is pleased with these, then let them prevail. Behold, by the grace of God I am innocent of every impending danger from every side.

[B] *Treatise* by the same author to those dwelling in this holy monastery

[B] 1. My spiritual fathers and brothers, since I dwell here in your midst and for this reason you asked me, both you and others, what is conducive to the salvation of souls; I, as you see me, am careful to expound to the best of my ability the holy scriptures if anyone asks me. Moreover, because it is my duty from the patriarchal see of the Catholic Church, [to expound the scriptures] comprehensively to all, how much more is it fitting for me [to expound them] to you who are close to me, since I dwell here in your midst? But now since you also selected and [appointed] the one

TWELFTH CENTURY

who will administer the hospice, it is fitting to remind you, my beloved [brethren] in the Lord [p. 72] of what is appropriate with [the help of] God and our blameless Lady the Mother of God by whose help we dwell as sojourners. It is as follows:

[B] 2. There is a regulation from the holy fathers, if a foreign monk or layman from another place passes through toward Jerusalem or departing to some other place, to keep him and host him for three days of rest, and after this to give him a blessing of bread and dismiss him. But if he is ill, keep him until he recovers, but if he wants to depart promptly, to provision him and feed him and give him blessing and dismiss him. It is necessary for foreigners to eat with the host of the hospice what is appropriate for each day, whether a fast day or an ordinary one, and whenever the meal-time happens to be. Unless it should happen that the foreigner recovers and is eager to depart, and [then] it is necessary to provision him and dismiss [him] on whatever day it falls, as I also said above.

[B] 3. But if he is a Frank, host him one day and give him blessing and dismiss him. But if he is ill, keep him until he recovers. But nevertheless, if it is also appropriate for the Franks to rest for the three days and it is necessary for the salvation of soul and body, let it be so. But to all persons let whatever is pleasing to God be; but at least let nothing unpleasing to God prevail.

[B] 4. The host of the hospice should not eat separately apart from the foreign monks or lay persons, unless those being offered hospitality are many and he wishes to serve them, except for the Franks due to the unsoundness of [their] thinking. Nevertheless [he should eat] even with these, if [their] thinking is sound.

[B] 5. If one of the brothers should invite a guest, it is fitting [for that brother] to serve him from [the contents of] his own cell. But if, on the other hand, it is a friend [of the brotherhood], the host of the hospice ought to invite him and, if there is need, he ought to host him three days. But if a brother brings another [guest], it is necessary for that [brother] to serve him.

[B] 6. This regulation regarding a brother's bringing [someone] to his cell is on account of its not being a cenobitic community, but each brother separately takes care of his own [cell], and the need of a hospice is administered separately. [p. 73] It has nothing at all in common with the brothers, nor again do the brothers have any authority over the hospice whatsoever, not anything in common with the hospice, except for what is conducive to the salvation of the soul in accord with the love and command of Christ. But the cenobitic law and canon has another tradition. It is not permitted for a brother privately to possess anything at all, however small or large, neither for [entertaining] a friend nor for any other reason whatsoever. Let this suffice on this topic.

[B] 7. It is necessary to give all persons blessing, whenever they depart, just bread only. But if the visitor is from among the dignitaries of the world, it is necessary to attend to him and serve him whatever he might be, whether a believer or an unbeliever, as the Apostle says: "Give all men what is owed, honor to whom honor is due, respect to whom respect is due, tax to whom tax is due"(cf. Rom. 13:7).

21. ROIDION

[B] 8. As for the hospice host's eating with the guests, as we said above,⁷ if it is appropriate, let it be so, but if it is not beneficial for any good reason, let what is beneficial and fitting be done, only let all things be done to the pleasure of God. I, unworthy as I am, am agreeable to things that are pleasing to God. But if the hospice host is striving for greater fasting and abstinence, let him extend to the guests the appropriate hospitality, but let [him] himself do as Abraham, the archetype of hosts, did in the Old [Testament], who served as host, but did not eat together with them, and so on, as is written (Deut. 18:8) and as some of the fathers in the New [Testament] did.

Nevertheless it is necessary that the hospice host be watchful and exacting, lest, owing to carelessness, the occasion of the command of hospitality lead to injury to the soul, as it also says in the divine *Ladder*, that "Gluttony follows upon hospitality, and fornication upon love."⁸

[B] 9. It is necessary also [that the hospice host be watchful and exacting] concerning the feast that it is the custom to celebrate herein on the Dormition of the supremely glorious Mother of God, that it not be celebrated in disregard or ignorance of its purpose, as indeed has become the custom among carnal persons, and indeed is for blasphemy and not to the glory of God. But as the great Gregory the Theologian [p. 74] decrees in the *Discourse on Christmas*⁹ how the feasts of Christians ought to be, [that is] not with revelry and inebriation and the rest, but with psalms and hymns and what he says there. Every divine scripture thus defines this rule for feasts.

[B] 10. The things appropriate and necessary to the nourishment of the flesh are what is available, as also the Lord permitted the arriving crowds to eat barley bread that was on hand. Indeed, as Basil the Great says, "Being able through miracle to welcome the multitudes with abundance of foods, but giving to us a prototype and model in such things."¹⁰ Basil the Great himself in his *Ascetical Treatises* prescribes in compliance with these things, and so does every other divine scripture.

So it is necessary for us to follow and emulate the holy scriptures and [the prescription of] "only what is available"—bread and a single course of boiled legumes with olive oil in the evening on whatever day [the feast of the Dormition] falls because of the assembly of the congregation, and on the next day two courses of mashed legumes and vegetables boiled or [served] in whatever manner is acceptable.

Holy scripture does not urge us to be concerned with a side dish and wine. But if it is given by someone and God bestows it, again even in this case it is still necessary to [eat] these things to the glory of God, in accordance with what is appropriate and pleasing to God—not in the evening, but on the morrow, on the very day of the feast, as also the regulation and tradition holds regarding the remaining feasts of the Lord that have anticipatory fasts. But if God does not bestow it from someone else, as we said before, nothing else [is to be eaten]. But if some lover of Christ offers something for sustenance, let these not be received in the evening, but let the donor hold these until the next day and then let him give these things free from offense.

The following was left out, and it must be added because it is necessary:

[B] 11. If one of the brothers is dying, in this case it is necessary to cooperate with him for the

TWELFTH CENTURY

salvation of his soul, and if he so chooses, if he possesses anything, he who is in charge of the service of the church and the hospice must lock the cell of the dying man and offer everything [p. 75] to the hospice and to the church. [He must] lock the cell lest any of the brothers or even the heirs from ignorance or boorishness or even from jealousy fall into the sin of sacrilege and offend against God, because such things are dedicated to God and are put aside for the sustenance of the needy and for the church for the redemption of the soul of the deceased, as the Lord pronounced in all the divine scriptures.

We are not speaking of persons who have excessive [possessions] such that through these means harm takes place, but of persons who possess self-sufficiency and what befits monks, nothing more, and if it is fitting, [let this be done] at the time. Only let all these [procedures] be to the glory of God for the salvation of the soul, and not for blasphemy of God and for injury to the soul. But if also it leads to injury for the soul, let such things not be.

If, however, a fellow brother also cohabits with [the dying man], he has authority over whatever belongs to [the dying monk's] lot. But if his [spiritual] father cohabits with him, let what is fitting and pleasing to God prevail. If the dying man chooses to act in accordance with all that was written above, he must also [express his] cooperation and consent in a written document and in whatever other way God is pleased. But if the dying brother does not so choose, we do not set forth these things according to any commandment or tradition, but in accord with personal will and preference . . .¹¹ we stave off harm to those who serve God.

Let there be no concurrence or advice in any other way on such matters, because the laws of God do not permit monks to administer such matters on account of the evils that lie ahead. Nevertheless, just as above [we spoke] about those who have excessive possessions, [so here] in order not to shut the door to their salvation, [we say let them do] as we said above to the rest, or [let them do] as they choose. But we say that they must avoid harming the soul, and to all those who are so inclined [we say] to do precisely what we said.

[B] 12. If there is a priest in the monastery, let there be liturgies for the deceased on the third, the ninth, and the fortieth days and on the anniversary, in accord with tradition among orthodox Christians. But if there is no priest in the monastery, it is necessary to send out eucharistic offerings [p. 76] where there is a priest and to offer them on behalf of the deceased. But within the holy monastery let what is appropriate prevail, as we also said above.

[B] 13. These things were issued with [the help of] God in keeping with the intent of the divine scriptures. For your information, then, we cite explicitly the divine scripture as well as tradition. It says in the *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, "let the third and ninth and fortieth days and the anniversary be celebrated on behalf of the deceased; and let donation be given to the poor from [the deceased's] possessions for their [the deceased's] redemption."¹² It says here only "to the poor," nothing more. But in the regulations of the holy apostles Peter and Paul concerning the invitations [extended] by lay people to lay people for commemorations on behalf of the deceased, it says to clergy, "When you are invited to commemorations of [lay people], eat in an orderly fashion and with fear of God, so that you can intercede on behalf of the departed; for being elders and deacons of Christ you ought always to observe moderation both for the sake of yourselves and for others, so that you may be able to admonish the disorderly."¹³

21. ROIDION

So with respect to this subject in divine scripture, in the former passage it speaks about the poor only, nothing else, and thus to a public where there is no permanent hospice; but in the latter [it speaks] about priests and clergy and not about the common people and conducting memorial feasts. Hence it appears that [the divine writings] permit only priests and deacons who celebrate [the memorial service] to eat and the rest to be given to the poor. So, as we said also above, [it is addressed] to laymen and to a community, at that, where there is no permanent hospice. For the things dedicated to hospices are in perpetuity for the nourishment of the poor. But if it is fitting [to adopt] some particular [procedure] in this case also, let it be so, as long as it is pleasing to God.

[B] 14. Let us speak also about things which exist from common custom among the fathers without attestation in the divine writings, just as also in the *Gerontikon* it tells how, when they were at such a feast, the *Abba* John Kolobos was there too, and as they were seated one of the brothers laughed and the *Abba* John said to him, “Are you laughing, [p. 77] brother? Don’t you know that you are eating the memorial repast and you ought rather to be weeping because you ate the memorial repast?”¹⁴ Here also we cited things without attestation of divine scriptures. Since in eating the memorial repast he was to weep, it seems that such [customs] have no legal sanction and justification.

For all these reasons let him who is able with [the help of] God to know what is the perfect will of God and what is to God’s satisfaction consider what is best. For without the divine scriptures I can neither do nor teach anything; but by interpreting the divine writings in which the will of God is revealed, by the grace of God I do not defile my ministry. Yet if a practice is observed, whether by believers or unbelievers, if harm is suspected, it is necessary for all the writings to declare it. If they permit these things to be, behold, all is well; but if they do not, it is necessary to abandon them on account of injury to the soul, just as also the Lord said that “to the one that seizes your goods, do not demand them back, and to the one wishing to sue you and possess your coat, give your cloak as well” (cf. Luke 6:30; Matt. 5:40, 42) and so on similarly. For one ought not to endure pretexts for sin to the point of injury to the soul.

[B] 15. If someone who is healthy chooses to make a charitable donation to the poor, we say—as advice, not as a decree—to make this donation to the hospice for the sake of freedom from care, because often a monk falls into harm in such cases. I mean, into [the habit of] making his virtue manifest and seeking to have a name prominent among men, [and thus] conceit and other vices of the soul [follow] especially among the [spiritually] weak. Then [is fulfilled] the saying of the Lord stating that “You do not have reward from your father who is in heaven” (Matt. 6:1) because of snatching and seeking the glory of men and not of God, because he who desires to escape such dangers needs great spiritual power. But let the reader consider correctly the rest.

Again frequently he who gives charity does not know with certainty who are truly poor from those who are pretending, and falls, just as Basil the Great says: “Associating with the greedy and increasing their vice.”¹⁵ The Lord did not say, “I had and you gave to me” [p. 78] and so on, and he did not say “when I was full you nourished [me],” but “you saw me hungry and you fed [me],” and so on.

For these reasons at the hospice whoever passes through there, whoever he may be, whether poor or rich, he is certainly at that time still in urgent need of food and shelter, and the command

TWELFTH CENTURY

of the Lord is completely fulfilled that says, “For I was hungry and you gave me food, a stranger and you welcomed me” (Matt. 25:35) and the like. Besides, the donation is given in secret and is not just temporary, but it also abides for the future.

We say this as advice for those who are still living and healthy and choose early [in life] to make charitable donations. But if it is not beneficial thus [to make charitable donations], let what the Apostle says be, “Test all things, hold fast what is good, abstain from every form of evil” (I Thess. 5:21).

[B] 16. One should not keep any kind of animal whatsoever, neither birds nor quadrupeds, except those that hunt the loathsome [mice]¹⁶ [which should be] male for the sake of freedom from care. Indeed, it is necessary to place one’s hope in God and in the blameless Mother of God, and not in animals and lands. As God himself and the blameless Mother of God provide whenever there is need, at any time, let it be.

[B] 17. Nor again is it necessary to acquire possession of additional lands besides those already in existence now, since they do not contribute to the benefit of souls, but rather to [their] harm, and God is not pleased. It is necessary to give up these [possessions], all of them, just as we said above.¹⁷ When the above-written rule applies, let a donation to the hospice be given either after death or while in good health, if this happens to be appropriate and they choose [to make the donation]. But if the regulation does not apply, again in this case let the best thing be done so long as God is pleased.

[B] 18. Whatever else I left out, I will be living here in your midst, and indeed even if I am unworthy, still as one whose service is to the word, if you command something and ask me about what is conducive to salvation of souls, to the extent of my ability, as long as [p. 79] my soul is unharmed, I will not neglect to speak the word of God from the divine scriptures.

[B] 19. But you and all others, ignore these things and others that I may say if they do not lead to the salvation of souls, just as also the Apostle says, “If we or an angel from heaven evangelize you beyond what you have received, let it be anathema” (cf. Gal. 1:8). But if they are conducive to the affairs of God, heed them, you and all persons, just as the Lord says, “Whoever hears you, hears me” (Luke 10:16). All of the above were established with good reason for the glory of God and his blameless mother, the Mother of God, in whom we dwell.

Since, just as it was also written above concerning the office of the superior that it lacks legal authority, as the truth showed, and the cause [for its lack] in the present time was written above, therefore here at the end this is written again for assurance and confirmation as well as for completing everything written above and for our exoneration. Because just as the office of superior is no longer legally valid nor in accord with the order that is grounded in the divine scriptures, for this reason [we declare that] it should not be permitted to exist at all in violation of the divine scripture. But if it should be established in a wholly tyrannical manner by those who do not fear God, just as also was written before, let it not have absolute authority either in the church or in the hospice, just as was also written above,¹⁸ but rather let the person in charge of the church and [the

21. ROIDION

one in charge of] the hospice, [administer them] in accord with the rule of the church and the hospice of the monastery of our holy father Symeon the Wonderworker, except not separate and [not] provided for separately as there. But just as from the beginning it was written and decreed in the rule of the two divine commands,—that is [love for] God and [for] neighbor—so let them be provided for together and just as was written before. Let those serving in the hospice and the person who controls the church—the latter alone because he shares this duty and occupation with the hospice host—be provided with every bodily need. As for their dwelling and eating together, what is acceptable for the salvation of the soul should be done.¹⁹ [p. 80]

[B] 20. It is necessary for the sake of assurance to append such stipulations even a second and a third time²⁰ for refutation and condemnation of those who rule tyrannously, [namely, the stipulation] as was written above, that [the superior] have no authority at all in the church and over the hospice. But if those who seek a pretext [to seize] the surrounding consecrated lands should offer in support of their claim that in earlier times those places were under the authority of the incumbent, let sin not find in this way an occasion for an attack in the person of those who control the church and the hospice. Rather, it is necessary to cede these [lands].

Nevertheless, just as God is pleased, so also let all things now be just as [when] the church and the hospice took their start in such matters from our blameless Mistress for her virtue and glory and that of her Son, and let them abide in this way, and not in sin and blasphemy.

Let the Mother of God herself, if she wishes it, manage in this fashion and without any earthly revenues, just as was written above, according to the rule of our holy father Sabas—when conditions were not those of today, but those when he was still living. For he himself did not receive revenues or donations from the emperor or anywhere else, as his biography records.²¹ But if the hospice building is sought after in the manner of the lands, it is necessary to cede it, too, and establish another. Therefore, let there be nothing in common between the [hospice] building and anything else whatsoever for the sake of freedom from scandal. By the intercession of the supremely glorious Mother of God, and all the saints. Amen.

Notes on the Translation

1. The patriarchate of Antioch; see also [B1] below.
2. *sozei ho sozon ten heautou psychen*. This is a misquotation of Gen. 19:17: *sozon soze ten seautou psychen*: “Save thine own life by all means.”
3. Reference is obscure, but cf. Cyril of Skythopolis, *Vita Sabae*, chap. 32, ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin, 1938), p. 117, and (42) Sabas [8].
4. In [A1] above.
5. In [A3] above.
6. Not extant; see references to it in (20) *Black Mountain* [39R], [84], cf. [18], [38].
7. In [B4] above.
8. John Klimakos, *Scala paradisi*, PG 88, col. 1095.
9. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio in diem natalem Christi*, PG 46, cols. 1127–50 at 1129B.
10. Cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractatae* 19 ([LR 19]), PG 31, col. 969A.
11. Lacuna consists of part of a single word.
12. *Epitome Const. Apost.* 25, ed. F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, vol. 2 (Paderborn, 1905), p. 90.

TWELFTH CENTURY

13. *Epitome Const. Apost.* 26, ed. Funk, *Didascalia*, vol. 2, p. 90.
14. Ioannes Kolobos, *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Ap. 9, PG 65, cols. 205D–208A.
15. Unidentifiable reference.
16. In other words, the only animals allowed are male cats which would protect the monastery from the *miara*; for the use of *miaros* (“loathsome,” “unclean”) in reference to mice, see Kriaras, *Lexiko*, s.v.
17. In [B15] above.
18. In [A4] above.
19. *Hos kai paradechetai pros soterian psyches*.
20. Cf. [A1], [A4] above.
21. Cyril of Skythopolis, *Vita Sabae* chap. 73, ed. Schwartz, p. 177, indicates the opposite.

Document Notes

- [A1] Description of new administrative arrangements. The circumlocution here and in the preface for the secular ruler suggests some awkwardness. Perhaps he was some local Armenian feudal lord. The declaration of the superfluity of the superiorship is repeated below in [A4] and [B20]; yet as [A4] indicates, he was evidently irremovable. The monastic officials mentioned here are probably the hospice host (*xenodochos*, for whom see [A3], [B2], [B4], [B5], [B8], [B9] and [B19] below) and the ecclesiarch (but not the steward; see [A3], [A4] below).
- [A2] Description of the existing kelliotic constitution. For earlier testimony to the kelliotic lifestyle, see (12) *Tzimiskes* [10], [18], [19], [20] and (13) *Ath. Typikon* [37], [41], [43] ff. Kelliotic monks were generally looked upon with indifference or hostility by monastic reformers; see (28) *Pantokrator* [28], (32) *Mamas* [26], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [26].
- [A3] Restriction of the steward’s authority; entitlements to financial support. Cross-referenced in [A4] below. For the support of attendants in a philanthropic foundation, see (16) *Mount Tmolos* [2], (28) *Pantokrator* [38], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [70], and (39) *Lips* [51].
- [A4] Restriction of the superior’s authority. Cross-references [A1] above; see also [B20] below. The restriction is unique in the monastic foundation documents. Nikon cites the lost regulation (*typos*) of the monastery of Symeon the Wonderworker here and in [B19] below for the independent administration of a hospice by a hospice host (*xenodochos*).
- [A5] Responsibilities of the lay protector. See (14) *Ath. Testament* [6], [7], (17) *Nikon Metanoieite* [12], [14], and (18) *Nea Gephyra* [2], [3] for analogous provisions.
- [A6] Acceptability of alternative arrangements. For Nikon’s characteristic willingness to stand correction, see (20) *Black Mountain* [88], [92].
- [B1] Source of Nikon’s authority. Nikon refers to his patriarchal commission; cf. [A1] above and [B18] below.
- [B2] Limitations on hospitality to guests. See (42) *Sabas* [8], perhaps an influence on Nikon here; cf. (34) *Machairas* [117].
- [B3] Lesser hospitality to Franks. Catholic Franks are treated with some prejudice here and in [B4] below; so also in (42) *Sabas* [2].
- [B4] Host of the hospice to eat with his guests. See exceptions noted in [B8] below.
- [B5] Monks to entertain guests in their own cells. This, of course, is the converse of the usual cenobitic legislation forbidding “secret eating” in cells, for which see (20) *Black Mountain* [24], [69], [70], and [72] along with (22) *Evergetis* [9], [22] and related documents. (60) *Charsianeites* [C4] is also opposed to entertainment of visitors in cells.
- [B6] Separate financing of the hospice and individual cells. Depending on the circumstances of their foundation, dependencies might have their own endowments, as in (28) *Pantokrator* [27], (31) *Areia* [M10]; but they could also be supported by the principal foundation, as in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [37], (24) *Christodoulos* [A24], (48) *Prodromos* [11].

21. ROIDION

- [B7] Special hospitality for dignitaries. This is an implicit rejection of (3) *Theodore Studites* [23]. See also (26) *Luke of Messina* [3], [8]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [17]; (34) *Machairas* [117]; and (54) *Neilos Damilas* [20].
- [B8] Permission for the hospice host to practice fasting and abstinence. This is in spite of his general obligation to eat with his guests as described in [B4] above; see also the treatment of this issue in (44) *Karyes* [12].
- [B9] Regulation of the feast of the Dormition. See also [B10] below, (22) *Evergetis* [11], which instructs its monks to celebrate this feast in a “splendid and sumptuous manner,” and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [10].
- [B10] Specific provisions for the festal diet. Cf. the dietary prescriptions for feasts in (28) *Pantokrator* [12].
- [B11] Foundation to inherit property of deceased monks. Nikon indicates that this and the following chapters are later additions to [B]. (59) *Manuel II* [2] makes the same provision. (14) *Ath. Typikon* [44] and (42) *Sabas* [4] both reject any notion of their monks having proprietary rights over cells, but (12) *Tzimiskes* [18] provides for compensation to monks for their improvements upon changing superiors.
- [B12] Obligation to perform commemorative liturgies for the departed. Cf. provisions for these observances in (22) *Evergetis* [36], (23) *Pakourianos* [30], (27) *Kecharitomene* [70], (30) *Phoberos* [50], (32) *Mamas* [39], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [39], and (34) *Machairas* [157].
- [B13] Canonical support for charitable donations to the poor. For charitable donations in conjunction with commemorative services for the dead, see (22) *Evergetis* [36], (23) *Pakourianos* [21], [30], (27) *Kecharitomene* [70], (28) *Pantokrator* [8], (32) *Mamas* [39], and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [39].
- [B14] Patristic testimony for charitable donations to the poor. Here Nikon insists on an authoritative precedent for each contemporary observance; cf. (20) *Black Mountain*, Analysis.
- [B15] Benefits of making charitable donations to the hospice. Nikon is making a convoluted argument here for the advantages of donations to the hospice rather than directly to the poor; see also [B17] below.
- [B16] Ban on animals, male or female. Cf. Nikon’s ban on female animals in (20) *Black Mountain* [86]; see also (3) *Theodore Studites* [5], (12) *Tzimiskes* [22], [23], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [31], [53], (15) *Constantine IX* [3], (45) *Neophytos* [19], (59) *Manuel II* [14], and (60) *Charsianeites* [C2].
- [B17] Exhortation to renunciation of property in favor of the hospice. Nikon returns here to the theme of [B15] above; for the sentiment against additional acquisitions of property, see also (13) *Ath. Typikon* [34], [45], [53].
- [B18] Nikon’s service as spiritual teacher. See also [A1], [B1], and [B14] for the nature of his responsibilities towards the foundation.
- [B19] Recapitulation of administrative arrangements. The administrative provisions of the *typikon*, [A1], [A3], [A4], are incorporated into the *Treatise* here.
- [B20] Contingent provisions. Like the author of (1) *Apa Abraham* [5], Nikon anticipates lawsuits from the lay relatives of the residents of this foundation; see also the treatment of this problem in (19) *Attaleiates* [34], [43] and (23) *Pakourianos* [18].