

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](http://www.doaks.org/etexts.html)

## 59. *Manuel II: Typikon* of Manuel II Palaiologos for the Monasteries of Mount Athos

*Date:* June 1406

*Translator:* George Dennis

*Edition employed:* Denise Papachryssanthou, *Actes du Prôtaton* (= Archives de l' Athos 7) (Paris, 1975), pp. 254–61, with text at 257–61.

*Manuscript:* Autograph, Monastery of Iveron library (illustrated in Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, album, pls. 36–38)<sup>1</sup>

*Other translations:* Russian, by Porfirii Uspensky, *Vostok kristianskii. Athon. Istoriia Athona*, vol. 3, pt. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 201–9.

### *Analysis*

#### *A. Historical Background*

In this document Manuel II Palaiologos asserts his patronal prerogative to legislate for the monastic communities of Mount Athos, much as his imperial predecessors had done four centuries earlier in (12) *Tzimiskes* and (15) *Constantine IX*. Thessalonike, along with Mount Athos, was returned to Byzantine administration by a treaty in 1403 between this emperor and the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman I (1403–10). This document dates from this last period of Byzantine control over Mount Athos, which according to Oikonomides (“Conquête ottomane,” p. 10) lasted down to 1423/24, at which time the Athonites made their submission to Sultan Murad II (1421–44). In 1403, a delegation of Athonite monks arrived before the emperor in Constantinople to discuss various matters related to their properties and the taxes due on them.<sup>2</sup> According to a surviving *prostagma*, Manuel II sent Demetrios Boulotes on a mission to Athos in September 1404 to investigate disputes over properties in Macedonia between the Athonites and the Turks and between the monks and John VII Palaiologos, who was then administering Thessalonike for the emperor.<sup>3</sup> There is also an allusion in this document to differences among the Athonites themselves on matters of common concern. Boulotes was to investigate, and if these issues could not be resolved, they were to be referred to the emperor for “the necessary correction.” This has been identified by Papachryssanthou (*Prôtaton*, p. 108) as the occasion for the issuance of the *typikon* translated below.

#### *B. Model Typikon*

This document has both an acknowledged and an unacknowledged source. The acknowledged source is the “*Rule of Athanasios*,” which our author refers to primarily on constitutional matters.<sup>4</sup> Despite its title, it seems clear this is not the text of (11) *Ath. Rule* as we know it; though one of the four references may be to that document, the other three apparently are to (14) *Ath. Testament*. The

unacknowledged source, employed for the regulation of disciplinary matters, is (12) *Tzimiskes*, to which the author's own *typikon* has many analogues<sup>5</sup> and from which he quotes (in the typical fashion for our authors, without attribution) in [10]. This shows how one Byzantine patron had the same respect for a prior regulatory *typikon* that patrons typically had for the memory of the "first founder" of a foundation they proposed to restore.<sup>6</sup>

Through the use of these documents, our author was attempting to impose a gradual reform in support of cenobitic monasticism, of which the monks' renunciation of personal property was the key element. Patronal piety aside, (12) *Tzimiskes* was hardly an ideal text on which to base such a reform since—typically for a document originating in the pre-reform tenth century—it is broadly tolerant of monks' ownership of private property. Yet the revolutionary changes in Byzantine monasticism since the tenth century were not without their impact on the present document. Our author's assertion [1], [12] of the inalienability and the sacral character of entrance donations and monastic property in general is an implicit acknowledgement of one of the essential conceptual contributions of the Evergetian reform movement. The administrative council, an institution of consultative government attributed [6] to the "*Rule of Athanasios*," actually represents a considerable expansion of the role designated for the electoral council in the comparable chapters of (14) *Ath. Testament* [12], [13]. Therefore the "*Rule of Athanasios*" as known to our author may have been a later, more ideologically and institutionally developed text than any of the Athanasian documents now preserved. The functions assigned to the "pre-eminent monks" in (22) *Evergetis* [14] may have prepared the way for the expanded role of their Palaiologan counterparts that can also be seen in (58) *Menoikeion* [22]. Yet the notion of collaborative government was never carried to such an extreme (i.e., decision-making by majority vote) in the rest of our documents as it is here. The increasing awareness of and respect for canon law has also had an impact in the sterner attitude shown [8] towards accepting monks from other monasteries.

### C. *Lives of the Monks*

#### 1. Personal Possessions

Among the many aspects of monastic life that our author claims have suffered neglect "because of the anomalies of the times" was the obligation of the Holy Mountain's monks to forswear personal possessions. Since the author considered it impossible to oblige the monks to "observe every one of the original regulations," he prefers to "approach the more important aspects of monastic life" by beginning with "the lesser ones." Here that means allowing [2] those monks who "hold as their own certain possessions which provide them with a modest income" to have a lifetime usufruct but to have these properties revert to their monasteries afterwards. He hoped that later the monks would be able to return to the original practice, referring to (11) *Ath. Rule* [34], of having no personal possessions.

#### 2. Cenobitic Lifestyle

Despite the author's exhortation to the monks to fulfill their cenobitic ideals of renunciation (*apotage*) and obedience (*hypotage*), it seems clear that he also despaired [1] of being able to prevent them from either leaving their monasteries entirely on occasion or else remaining in the cells and "embracing the idiorhythmic life on the pretext of seeking solitude (*hesychia*)."

### 3. Servants Permitted

Those monks with the private means to pay them were allowed to have [2] personal servants, though not eunuchs and beardless youths [13]. Servants were to be [5] subject to the authority of the superior for such matters as permission to enter or leave the monastery.

### 4. Precautions against Sexual Misconduct

Like his distant imperial predecessors and Athanasios the Athonite,<sup>7</sup> the author bans [13] eunuchs and beardless youths. The latter were also not to be allowed to accompany [15] building workers who might be engaged by the monks for particular projects (cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [25]). The prohibition on eunuchs and youths is justified on the peculiar grounds that if it were not in force, a woman might be able to gain access to the Holy Mountain by disguising herself as a man. The author also endorses [14] the traditional Athonite prohibition<sup>8</sup> on the use of female animals, “no matter how much help they provide in meeting needs.”

## D. Constitutional Matters

### 1. Leadership

The author formalizes [6] the governing role of the “preeminent monks” seen in other foundations (especially (22) *Evergetis* [14] and its successors) into an administrative council of fifteen of the leading monks and the superior. He cites the “Rule of Athanasios” for the number of councillors, but neither the number nor indeed even the institution of a governing council is to be found in our present text of (11) *Ath. Rule*, though (58) *Menoikeion* [22] provides for collaborative government between its superior and a panel of four monks. Here, the superior and the councillors were to meet [7] every day or two to review the performance of the various officials of the monastery. They would also be responsible for selecting [3] new officials as well as the administrators of the dependencies of their monastery. The appointments to the dependencies were to be made [11] carefully to avoid the appearance of favoritism. The superior and the council were to resolve disputed issues by majority vote. The members of the council were to have their names inscribed [6] in the register of the monastery; deceased members were to be replaced by co-option.

### 2. Election of the Superior

The councillors were to serve [3], along with certain monks living outside the monastery (perhaps important *kelliotai*), as an electoral college for the selection of the superior. Again, the author cites the “Rule of Athanasios” as his authority. The citation is identifiable in our documents as (14) *Ath. Testament* [13], cf. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [18], in which Emperor Nikephoros Phokas allows the monks at Lavra generally to make their own choice of a new superior. The author provides that the installation ceremony should follow [3] that set down in the “Rule of Athanasios,” cf. (14) *Ath. Testament* [14].

## E. Financial Matters

### 1. Financial Administration

The superior and his councillors were to be responsible [6], cf. [12] for managing the monastery’s financial administration as well as the rest of its affairs. A secretary, functioning like the treasurer

in other monasteries, was to keep [7] a record of income and expenditures, to be countersigned by some of the councillors.

## 2. Treatment of Entrance Offerings

Unlike the contemporary (60) *Charsianeites* [B16], entrance gifts brought to the monastery by postulants were welcomed. There is a special regulation governing their proper allocation. Gifts suitable for use in the church should be placed [12] there as consecrated offerings, while everything else was to be entrusted to the monastery's officials and apportioned out for the needs of the community with the knowledge of the superior and his councillors. As in the Evergetian tradition, taking personal possession of a donation of this sort was condemned as sacrilege. Also, as in (22) *Evergetis* [37], the donor of an entrance gift was not to be accorded [1] any special rights in the monastery because of it but would "receive from the monastery just what each of the brothers receives," i.e., he would not be allowed to retain a private income from his donation for his own use, as was also disallowed in (60) *Charsianeites* [B13]. If the donor decided later to leave the monastery or adopt an idiorhythmic life, he could not take with him any of the foundation's property or demand money from it, once again on the grounds that to do so would be sacrilegious.

## F. Overall Philosophy

### 1. Respect for Canon Law

In a belated demonstration that another of the traditionally ignored principles of canon law was finally taking root,<sup>9</sup> there is a provision that a monk coming to one monastery from another (i.e., a *xenokourites*) should be returned [8] to his home institution. He was to be admitted only if and when his current superior proved unwilling to take him back (cf. the more indulgent (12) *Tzimiskes* [4]). This is a striking contrast to the willingness of many previous foundations illustrated in our collection of documents to accept pious *xenokouritai*, even here on Mount Athos back in the tenth century (see (12) *Tzimiskes* [2]). Indeed these foundations were often dependent on such individuals for institutional reinvigoration and even, on occasion, for their leadership, despite fears that as superiors *xenokouritai* might compromise institutional independence or introduce foreign customs.<sup>10</sup>

## G. External Relations

Just as Athanasios the Athonite had long ago banned adoptions and the formation of spiritual relationships in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [32], so here too our author prohibits [10] them, although he acknowledges that some of these relationships may already be in existence. The fear explicitly acknowledged here is that property-owning monks will bequeath assets to laymen that would otherwise (see [2]) revert to the ownership of their monastery. Our author seems to have been directly acquainted with (12) *Tzimiskes* [14], from which some of the text of [10] is borrowed.

## Notes on the Introduction

1. See Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 254.
2. See Oikonomidès, "Haradj," pp. 681–88.

3. For the *prostagma*, see Arkadios Vatopedinos, “Hagioreitika analekta 15. Basilike diatage pros Demetriton ton Vouloten peri Hagiou Orou,” *Gregorios ho Palamas 2* (1918), 449–52.
4. The citations are: [2] monastic poverty, [3] election of the superior by the councillors, [3] installation of officials, and [6] number of councillors.
5. [8] reception of monks from other monasteries, cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [5]; [10] no spiritual relationships with lay people, cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [14]; [13] no eunuchs or beardless youths, cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [16]; [14] no female animals, cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [22], [23]; [15] building workers’ assistants, cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [25].
6. Cf. (33) *Heliou Bomon* [51], (37) *Kellibara I* [12], and (40) *Anargyroi* [6].
7. (12) *Tzimiskes* [16], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [48], (15) *Constantine IX* [1], cf. [15].
8. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [31], cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [22], [23], (15) *Constantine IX* [3]. For the underlying Studite custom, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [5].
9. See *C. Const. I et II*, c. 4 (R&P 2.658–59).
10. For the acceptability of *xenokouritai* as superiors, see (32) *Mamas* [1], (37) *Auxentios* [3], and (60) *Charsianeites* [B11]; for their career track, see (35) *Skoteine* [5], [8], [17]; for fear of changes introduced by them, see (32) *Mamas* [43], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [1], and (37) *Auxentios* [3].

### Bibliography

- Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 785.
- Dölger, Franz, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, 5 vols. (Munich-Berlin, 1924–65), no. 3312.
- Meyer, Ph., *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 62–64.
- Oikonomidès, Nicolas, “Le ‘haradj’ dans l’Empire byzantin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *Actes du premier Congrès international des Études balkaniques et du sud-est européennes* 3 (Sofia, 1969), pp. 681–88, repr. *Documents et études sur les institutions de Byzance (VII<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> s.)* (London, 1976).
- , “Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane,” *SF* 35 (1976), 1–10.
- Ostrogorsky, George, “Byzance, État tributaire de l’Empire turc,” *ZRVI* 5 (1958), 49–58.
- Papachryssanthou, Denise, *Actes du Prôtaton* (= Archives de l’Athos 7) (Paris, 1975), pp. 107–9.

### Translation

#### [Prologue]

When a disease becomes very oppressive, causing serious harm to our bodies, and the affliction does not yield to treatment, the physicians, nonetheless, by skillfully making use of medicines and dietary improvements bit by bit overcome the illness and restore the patient to his former state of health. In like manner, the physicians of souls must constantly endeavor to see that the monks, who have chosen the narrow and rugged road, should live as God wants. If they should ever happen to turn off the straight way, then they must give sound advice, take them by the hand, and lead them back bit by bit to the life they have turned from. Then too, the instructors of serious students are often able to arouse them to greater effort, making use of speech as a goad to keep laziness from taking over, so their progress in acquiring the skill does not come to a stop. If this is so, how much more is it fitting in the monastic way of life, which is appropriately termed the art of arts,<sup>1</sup> that those who have been negligent in living virtuously and thrown themselves off the steep and narrow road should be carefully guided back to the point at which they turned off.

Now then, since so many aspects of the monastic way of life have suffered neglect in the

## FIFTEENTH CENTURY

revered monasteries on the holy mountain of Athos because of the anomalies of the time and the circumstances, my majesty realizes that some of those matters which have been neglected must be brought back to a better state, as many as the present situation permits. Otherwise, such gradual negligence will make a mockery of the whole monastic way of life. If we do not straightaway arouse the monks to observe every one of the original regulations, it does not mean that these things are being overlooked but that we must take care to correct the [transgressions] which remain [to be corrected] also. After all, wholesome foods are not disregarded because they do not destroy the disease immediately. Rather, we must choose them, for bit by bit they restore complete health. There seems to be no other way to approach the more important aspects of the monastic way of life than to begin somehow with the lesser ones.

1. First of all, to the best of their ability the monks must adhere to their renunciation. What constitutes the monastic way of life is not only whatever leads to the acquisition and practice of virtue and to progress in all other spiritual works which transform the soul into something better and more perfect (the holy scriptures make this clear to anyone interested), but it lies precisely in remembering and fulfilling the ideals of renunciation and obedience. The monks know exactly that just as God holds the recompense ready for those who have chosen to live as monks according to their promise (cf. Heb. 2:2), so there is the threat of judgment if they should be proven false in keeping the agreement they have made with him when they put on the holy habit. To the extent that such monks abandon observing their promises, by so much do they sin against God and transgress their profession to him.

The person entering the monastery and handing himself over completely to be a brother does so without demanding anything back or making any such agreement. He agrees, rather, to observe obedience to the superior and to live in peace with the brothers. Now, if he should wish to present something to the monastery as an offering or dedicatory gift, this may be given by him on the understanding that by making the offering he does not acquire any special right in the monastery because of the gift. The usage followed in the [p. 258] holy and great Lavra<sup>2</sup> is that absolutely no agreement is made between them because of what a man has brought in, but he is to receive from the monastery just what each of the brothers receives. But if he should become restive and move out of the monastery or remain in his cell without the consent of his own superior, embracing the idiorhythmic life on the pretext of seeking solitude, then he ought not take anything from the monastery nor should he demand any *hyperpera* from it. For if they were presented to the monastery as a dedicatory gift, then it is sacrilegious to try to take them back. Neither should he take anything from the monastery, in keeping with another custom in force in the holy Lavra, since he has not observed what he promised, nor is he willing to live as do the rest of the brothers. It is right, therefore, that he be deprived of what the other brothers receive from the monastery because of their perseverance and the peace and obedience which they show towards one another and towards the superior.

2. One who has elected to live as a monk should strive to have nothing as his own. But, mindful of the command and the threat just mentioned above in connection with renunciation, he should turn his back on all things present and, according to his promise, live a crucified life. This is the true

good. “No one who puts his hand to the plow,” it is said, “and turns back is fit to enter the kingdom of heaven” (Luke 9:62). By “back” is meant those things we have tossed aside as though they weighed us down on our journey to God. There are, however, at present instances of monks who hold as their own certain possessions which provide them with a modest income and for that reason cannot easily be taken away. In the case of these monks, then, let them retain the use and enjoy the fruits of these for the rest of their lives. Upon their death, though, these properties should be transmitted to their monasteries, in keeping with the practice observed in the Lavra up to the present. In the future, however, it is fitting that the monks should possess nothing as their own, according to the *Rule* of Saint Athanasios and their own promise.<sup>3</sup> If the current situation presents a problem by not permitting them to make such a change for the better all at once, then let them hold on to those possessions until, with God’s help, the situation is again favorable, as is the custom throughout the holy mountain. From their movable property let them distribute what they wish to the servants subject to them as a recompense for their service, keeping in view what is fitting and blameless.

3. The superior should be appointed not only by the vote and election of the fifteen councillors inside the monastery according to the *Rule* of the Saint,<sup>4</sup> but also by the agreement of preeminent brothers living outside the monastery who are to meet with them. The examination by the internal councillors and their agreement will certainly be sufficient for dealing with the affairs of the monastery. But for the election of the superior the presence of the outside monks is also necessary. For an event which happens only once it is not burdensome for the outside monks to come in once to the monastery. More important, though, it is necessary for everyone to come together and agree upon this man, inasmuch as they are electing a spiritual father whom they are to follow and imitate and to whom they are obliged once and for all to be subject. After the election they shall install him in accordance with the holy *Rule* of Saint Athanasios,<sup>5</sup> who has put order into their way of doing things. It is the duty of the superior, then, in full agreement with the councillors to select the officials of the monastery, those who should be sent out to the dependencies,<sup>6</sup> and those to whom the services of the monastery should be entrusted. In this way no one will gainsay them or suspect that they have appropriated the position themselves, since they were selected by the councillors.

4. All the brothers should have genuine love for the superior and should listen attentively to whatever he may say or propose. “He who hears you,” it is said, “hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me” (Luke 10:16). They should regard him as a father, indeed, as more than a father, for spiritual things are superior to those of the flesh. The superior in turn should look upon all as his brothers and fathers [p. 259] and in every way try to take care of them and guide them along the path of salvation. Our Lord and God was not ashamed to call those who followed him his fathers and brothers. For these, he said, “These are my mother and my brothers” (Matt. 12:49).

5. No one should enter or leave the monastery on his own accord, but only with the permission of the superior and after making their obeisance. Upon their return, they should be closely examined by him about what their soul or body encountered along the way. If necessary, he should give them norms to follow or he should dismiss them with forgiveness. The same will be expected of the

## FIFTEENTH CENTURY

servants of the old monks. If the old monks themselves require the permission of the superior to go out, all the more reason then for the servants to observe this rule. Otherwise, how will they look as disciples and servants of those whose way of life they do not imitate?

6. Everything affecting the monastery should be done with the council of the leading monks and the superior. Those cities which are prosperous are administered by the council of the best citizens, not by that of the majority or of anyone who happens along or even of the ruler alone. For the first is democracy, and the other is tyranny, both of which are quite out of place. It would be right to have nothing affecting the monastery determined without the counsel of the leading monks. Everything, in fact, should be done with the knowledge, intention and approval of them and of the superior. They should number fifteen, according to the *Rule* of the Saint,<sup>7</sup> and their names should be inscribed in the register of the monastery. When one of them is called to perform his final duty, let those who remain deliberate and elect another to take that man's place, so that the number of councillors may be kept the same.

7. These councillors should come together for a meeting each day if possible, and definitely every two days. Together with the superior they should deliberate about what must be done; they should examine the services of the monastery and how they are provided by the appointed officials. The secretary of the monastery should keep a regular account of what goes out and what comes into the monastery, and this should be signed by some of the councillors to keep it above criticism. If there is any disagreement among them concerning what has to be done, the majority of votes should prevail.

8. A monk coming from one monastery to another should not be received immediately by its superior. At the same time, those monks should not be treated with disdain who abandon their own monastery or leave because of some fault, and thus run away from their spiritual enclosure. Every effort, rather, must be made to call them back to their monastery in imitation of our great God and Savior who, according to the parable, left the sheep that had not gone astray to go after the one that had gone astray (Matt. 18:12). A monk leaving one monastery and who wishes to come to this superior's monastery may then be received, according to the holy and divine canons, when the superior whom the monk left has been requested to pardon the brother for his sin, and he does not wish to do so. This is the manner in which they should act. They ought also to fear the penalties which the holy and divine canons<sup>8</sup> of the first and second council [of Constantinople (861)] explicitly establish concerning monks who hop about from one enclosure to another and are received without the process noted above being observed.

9. The dough which is used to prepare the special bread for the divine offering should be more pure and not like that used for the needs of the monks. For if in times past when the sacrifice was being presented to God according to the old rite, the first and choicest fruits were offered to him, now when the bloodless sacrifice is being celebrated by the holy ministers, how much more appropriate is it that the dough from which the divine and spotless bread will be made should be pure and choice? Too much eucharistic bread should not be made from it, but only as much as shall

suffice for the service of the church. To make more than that amount and not to offer it up to God, but to allow the monks to eat the surplus, this is to sin before God. Those who dare to do this call down on themselves the same condemnation to which Eli and his sons were subjected. Before offering sacrifice to God they took the offerings, [p. 260] consumed them, and gave them to others. Eli did not stand up to them and forbid their impetuous act, and because of their sin they perished shamefully along with their father. Then too, the ark of God was handed over to foreigners, almost as if God could not bear having it remain among these lawbreakers (I Kings 2:12–4:18).

10. None of the monks of the Holy Mountain should go out and form spiritual relationships or adopted brotherhoods with lay people. This is quite improper for monks, for they have renounced children and parents and, in a word, all relationship by blood. Even if some have gone ahead and gotten involved in this sort of thing, they should still not go off to their houses, have dinner or supper with them, or do any drinking with them, or leave anything to them as their heirs.<sup>9</sup>

11. The dependencies should be given to those whom the superior and his councillors shall select. This should be a testimony before God, with their own conscience bearing witness, that they were not given these dependencies because of some relationship, close friendship, or in connection with some gift. For if it should not be handled properly, then the monks begin to grumble and whisper, and this will turn the monastery upside down and cause terrible destruction of souls. This leads to the tranquillity of the monks being overturned, as well as the whole monastic establishment and way of life. The Lord laid great stress on this. “Whoever scandalizes one of these little ones, it would be better for him to have a millstone fastened round his neck and to be drowned in the sea” (Matt. 18:6). How severe a judgment, then, will the man suffer who scandalizes so many and such good people? To such a person may be applied the saying: “It would have been better for that man if he had not been born” (Matt. 26:24). By his own actions he dismembers the body of the brotherhood, which is Christ himself, limb by limb with slander and grumbling (cf. I Cor. 12:27). It is clearly time to say: “Drive out such a person from among you,” so that “a little leaven” may not ruin “the whole lump” (I Cor. 5:6).

12. If anything should be brought into the monastery as an entrance gift, whether it be money, sacred vessels, oil, or anything else used for bodily needs, then the sacred things should be placed in the church as dedicated to God, while the other things should be entrusted to the officials, and with the knowledge of the councillors and the superior should be apportioned out for the unquestioned needs of the monastery. No one should take possession of any of them as his own; this would be sacrilegious and quite alien to the monastic way of life.

13. No eunuch or beardless youth should be received by the monks either for some service or to be clothed with the monastic habit.<sup>10</sup> For in that way even a woman might escape notice if she dared to enter into the monastery disguising herself as a man and playing the role of a eunuch or beardless youth.

## FIFTEENTH CENTURY

14. Female animals of any kind whatsoever should never be found within the Holy Mountain, no matter how much help they provide in meeting needs.<sup>11</sup> This has been forbidden once and for all by those holy and virtuous men not out of simplicity or without reason, but to assure that the monks there would be pure in every respect and that not even their eyes would be soiled by the sight of a female.

15. Building workers may enter within the monastery and do work needed by the brothers, but they should not be accompanied by beardless boys on the pretext that they are assisting them.<sup>12</sup> In this case the reason is the same as was given a little bit earlier concerning eunuchs and beardless youths.

We consider it important that all the superiors and monks of the Holy Mountain should carefully observe every one of these regulations published by my majesty. By no means should anyone dare to take steps to overturn any one of the above chapters, being ever mindful, as it is said, of the threat and of the recompense. For at one time God bestows crowns and wreaths on those who carry out these regulations. At another time there is the threat of punishment and fire for those who pay no heed to them. If, therefore, anyone is discovered holding in contempt these regulations which have been issued for the protection and benefit of the monks on the Holy Mountain, let him recall the threats of the divine and holy canons, and let such a person be aware that he will experience no little unpleasantness on the part of my majesty, since he has trampled on his own conscience and been the instigator of scandal for [p. 261] most people.

Since in connection with some other particular topics the monks requested and called upon my majesty to set down regulations on how they should proceed, my majesty has issued a decree about them in a *prostagma*, in which they are all written down.<sup>13</sup> This is also confirmed by the present chrysobull, so that the monks may fulfill everything written down in that *prostagma* just as what is written here. For this reason, now, the present chrysobull has been issued by my majesty to present the honorable monks on the holy Mountain of Athos with a *typikon* and a rule for the way of life they ought to be leading.

Issued in the month of June of the current fourteenth indiction, the year 6914 [= 1406 A.D.], and signed below by our pious and powerful majesty promoted by God.

Manuel [II] Palaiologos, in Christ our God faithful emperor and *autokrator* of the Romans.

### *Notes on the Translation*

1. Cf. Ammonius, In *Porphyrii Isagogen*, ed. A. Busse, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, vol. 4, pt. 3 (Berlin, 1891), p. 6, line 27.
2. Cf. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [49].
3. (11) *Ath. Rule* [34].
4. (14) *Ath. Testament* [13].
5. (14) *Ath. Testament* [14].
6. See also [11] below.
7. (14) *Ath. Testament* [13].

8. *C. Const. I et II*, c. 4 (R&P 2.658–59).
9. Cf. the language of (12) *Tzimiskes* [14]. On *adelphopoiia*, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [8].
10. Cf. the language of (12) *Tzimiskes* [16]. For the so-called transvestite nuns—women who disguised themselves as eunuchs in order to enter a male monastery—and the reasons that prompted them to choose a male disguise, see E. Patlagean, “L’histoire de la femme déguisée en moine et l’évolution de la sainteté féminine à Byzance,” *Studi Medievali*, ser. 3, 17 (1976), fasc. 2, pp. 597–623.
11. Cf. (12) *Tzimiskes* [22], [23].
12. Cf. the language of (12) *Tzimiskes* [25].
13. Papachryssanthou, *Prôtaton*, p. 257, identifies this document as the *prostagma* of September 29, 1404. addressed to Demetrios Boulotes, ed. Arkadios Vatopedinos, “Hagioretika analekta”; see discussion above in Analysis.

### Document Notes

- [1] Irrevocability of entrance gifts. See also [12] below, (22) *Evergetis* [37] and related documents. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [49] takes a different approach to the problem.
- [2] Lifetime rights of usufruct for monks with possessions; private payment for servants. For lifetime usufruct, see also (21) *Roidion* [A2], [B11], cf. [B15], [B17] and (42) *Sabas* [4]. For servants in other Palaiologan monasteries, see (39) *Lips* [40], [41]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [94]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [11].
- [3] Election of and installation of superiors; selection of officials. See also provisions in other Athonite documents in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [16], [17] and (14) *Ath. Testament* [13], [14]. For the regulation of these matters in other Palaiologan monasteries, see (37) *Auxentios* [3], [7]; (38) *Kellibara I* [18]; (39) *Lips* [5], [7], [21]; (48) *Prodromos* [18]; (50) *Gerasimos* [3]; (51) *Koutloumoussi* [A13], [B18], [C8]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [16], [18]; (55) *Athanasios I* [5]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [26], [73], [74]; (58) *Menoikeion* [18], [22]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B11], [C18].
- [4] Proper relations between the superiors and their monks. Cf. the general discussions in (37) *Auxentios* [4], [5] and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [27] ff. and [37] ff.
- [5] The superior to regulate all entrances and departures. For regulation of access in other Palaiologan monasteries, see (39) *Lips* [9], [15], [16]; (40) *Anargyroi* [5]; (52) *Choumnos* [A14]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [16]; and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [55], [72], [75], [76].
- [6] Consultative government by the superior and councillors; deceased councillors to be replaced by co-option. For generally less structured examples of consultative government elsewhere in Palaiologan documents, see (37) *Auxentios* [9], (38) *Kellibara I* [18], (39) *Lips* [27], (48) *Prodromos* [8], (50) *Gerasimos* [3], (52) *Choumnos* [A3], (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [23], [55], [67], (58) *Menoikeion* [22], and (60) *Charsianeites* [B9].
- [7] Regulations for the daily meetings of the councillors. See earlier provisions for financial record-keeping in (27) *Kecharitomene* [24], (32) *Mamas* [10], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [10], (34) *Machairas* [100], and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [55].
- [8] Procedures for admission of monks from other monasteries. See also provisions in other Athonite documents in (12) *Tzimiskes* [4], [5], [8] and (15) *Constantine IX* [7].
- [9] Special dough for the eucharistic bread. See also (34) *Machairas* [40], (36) *Blemmydes* [4]; cf. (29) *Kosmosoteira* [85].
- [10] No spiritual relationships or adopted brotherhoods with lay people. Shared with (12) *Tzimiskes* [14]; cf. (3) *Theodore Studites* [8], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [30].
- [11] Dispassionate choice of administrators for dependencies. For appointments to dependencies, see also (44) *Karyes* [4], [5] and (48) *Prodromos* [4], [6], [12].
- [12] Proper handling of entrance gifts. See also [1] above, with crossreferences. For other contemporary approaches, see (52) *Choumnos* [B11] and (60) *Charsianeites* [B12], [B13], [B16].
- [13] Ban on eunuchs and beardless youths as servants or novices. See similar provisions in other Athonite documents in (12) *Tzimiskes* [16], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [48], and (15) *Constantine IX* [1], cf. [15], in (58)

## FIFTEENTH CENTURY

*Menoikeion* [14], and in the contemporary (60) *Charsianeites* [C2].

[14] Ban on female animals. See similar provisions in other Athonite documents in (12) *Tzimiskes* [22], [23]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [31], [53]; and (15) *Constantine IX* [3], [4]. See also the contemporary (60) *Charsianeites* [C2].

[15] Building workers may enter, but no beardless youths. See similar provision in (12) *Tzimiskes* [25].