

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

Preface

I

Among the many types of sources for the history of Byzantine monasticism, none are more important than the *typika*, or foundation documents, collected and translated in these volumes, which will make possible for the first time a comprehensive study of religious life and institutions in the Greek East and a comparison between Greek and Latin monasticism.¹ Together, the *typika* throw light on almost every aspect of Byzantine monastic life and its development from the eighth to the fifteenth century. Their nature is discussed by John Thomas in the introduction. They were flexible and personal documents, which differed considerably in form, length, and content. Not all of them were foundation documents in the strict sense, since they could be issued at any time in the history of an institution. Some were wills; others were reform decrees and rules; yet others were primarily liturgical in character.

Each *typikon* was normally written for a specific monastery and its dependencies and reflected the ideas and wishes of the writer. A few were designed for several monasteries, such as the houses on Mt. Athos or in Sicily. The *typikon* issued by Patriarch Athanasios I in 1303–5, (55) *Athanasios I*, was exceptional, since it applied in theory to all the monasteries in the empire and calls to mind the claims of papal monarchy in the West. There are many resemblances among the *typika*, and large parts of some were virtually copied from others. The *typikon* of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople, (4) *Stoudios*, influenced the *typika* of many other houses, including (22) *Evergetis*, which in turn formed the basis of (29) *Kosmosoteira*, (32) *Mamas*, (33) *Heliou Bomon*, and others. The differences between these successive variations show not only the individuality of each monastery but also the changes in Byzantine monasticism over the centuries. Each *typikon* needs to be studied in terms of the history and circumstances of the monastery for which it was written.²

A *typikon* thus combined the features that in the West were found on the one hand in foundation charters, which established the legal and economic status of a monastery and were often

Note: The *typika* are cited by the number, in parentheses, and section, in brackets, of the translations in this edition.

¹ When this project was first conceived, in 1980, I planned to contribute a running commentary from the point of view of a historian of western monasticism, but this proved impossible owing to the size of the undertaking and the inevitable repetitions, given the number of topics that are treated in more than one *typikon*. I therefore decided to write a preface comparing some of the more salient characteristics of eastern monasticism as reflected in the *typika* with monasticism in the West, leaving the examination of more detailed questions for further study.

² According to Alice-Mary Talbot and Mark Johnson, “Monastery,” *ODB*, p. 1391, “The organization of each monastery varied and was prescribed by its *typikon*.”

PREFACE

formulaic in character,³ and on the other hand in the rules, customs, and statutes that applied to several houses and from which the personal elements found in the *typika* were excluded.⁴ There were no general monastic rules in the East, and no monastic orders in the western sense of the term.⁵ Honor was paid to the early monastic legislators, especially to Basil, but his so-called rules were not normative, and they differed from the *typika* in many respects, which are described in John Thomas's introduction, such as with regard to manual labor, intermonastic relations, and attitudes toward women. The *Apophthegmata patrum*, *Precepts* of Pachomios, and *Book of Horsesios* were also known in the Middle Ages, but they never exercised the influence of the western rules and customs. There was also considerable variety in the West, particularly during the so-called period of the Mixed Rule, from the sixth to the eighth century, when no single rule predominated and some monasteries had their own rules, but the Carolingian reform in the early ninth century in principle imposed the *Rule of Benedict* on all monasteries. Many houses had their own customaries, which have been collected in the *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*,⁶ but they were within the framework of the *Rule of Benedict*, and most customaries were designed to promote a uniform liturgy and observance in groups of monastic houses, which were later referred to as orders. The customs of independent religious houses, including some of the greatest, such as Monte Cassino, were primarily enshrined in the memories and practices of their members. The customaries were supplemented in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as the orders developed, by the statutes issued by the superiors of the mother house, as at Cluny, or by the decrees of general chapters, which included representatives from all the member houses, as in the orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré.⁷

It is possible that most Byzantine monasteries originally had their own *typika*, of which the surviving examples (except for a few liturgical *typika*) are collected here. They were sometimes confirmed by a public authority, preferably the emperor, and served as the legal basis and protection for the communities to which they were granted. In this they resembled foundation charters in the West but were more comprehensive in their scope and content. The *typikon* of the monastery of the archangel Michael, (37) *Auxentios*, was called a constitution [1], and that of the monastery of St. John the Forerunner, (58) *Menoikeion*, "this very monastic constitution" [22]. Previously, it

³ On the contrast between Byzantine *typika* and western monastic foundation charters, see the comments of Georg Schreiber, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche," *ZKG* 60 (1941), 384–410, esp. 387–90, and "Byzantinisches und abendländisches Hospital," in his *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* (Münster, 1948), p. 9.

⁴ Adalbert de Vogüé, *Les règles monastiques anciennes (400–700)* (= Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 46) (Turnhout, 1985), pp. 22–23, stressed the parallel between eastern *typika* and early Latin, Irish, and Syrian monastic rules.

⁵ See Schreiber, "Anselm," pp. 397 and 403–4, who also stressed (pp. 394–95 and 407) that there was no Cluny and no St. Bernard nor St. Norbert in the East, and Alice-Mary Talbot, "Monasticism," *ODB*, p. 1393.

⁶ *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, ed. Kassius Hallinger (Siegburg, 1963–), 12 vols. in 16 to date.

⁷ Jacques Hourlier, *Le chapitre général jusqu'au moment du Grande Schisme* (Paris, 1936). Collections of the statutes and decrees of the general chapters of the orders of Cluny and Cîteaux have been published, respectively, by Georges Charvin and Joseph-Marie Canivez.

PREFACE

appears, this latter house had neither “a *typikon* which could be produced at any time before an official or magistrate or in any kind of court where legal arguments regarding matters of the law and lawsuits take place” nor “an authoritative document in which all sorts of sacred matters are written down as well as other things such as the immovable property belonging to the monastery and the rights pertaining to these properties so that these remain stable and safeguarded against seizures” [2]. Some monasteries also had other types of governing documents. There is a reference in (54) *Neilos Damilas* for the convent of the Mother of God *Pantanassa* in Crete, which dates from about 1400, to a *tabularion* written not in Greek, the language of the nuns, but in Latin so that it could be understood by the Venetians who controlled Crete at that time [18].

Owing to their legal and practical importance, the *typika* were preserved with special care, to which there are many references. This unique character may also explain the prescriptions requiring that they be read aloud, sometimes as often as three, seven, or twelve times a year. Given the length and complexity of some of the *typika*, this must have been a time-consuming business, and if the members of the community paid attention, they would have known their *typikon* almost by heart. There are comparable provisions in the West for reading the *Rule of the Master*, *Rule of Benedict*, the *Regula IV Patrum*, and other early monastic rules.⁸ Writing was also of importance as the monastic orders spread in the high Middle Ages.⁹ Their rules and customs had a common character and were designed for many houses, however, in spite of particular observances, whereas monks and nuns in the East had a sense of their *typikon* as the embodiment and protection of their own special rights and way of life.

The difference between the *typika* in the East and the rules in the West affected the nature of the movements of monastic reform in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Both reforms were directed against the abuses of the previous period, especially lay control over monasteries, and were designed to restrict the powers of founders and patrons and to assert institutional independence. Reformers in both the East and West, in spite of their admiration for individual hermits, preferred community life and cenobitical forms of monasticism to solitude or eremitism, which they associated with self-will, disobedience, and private property. The so-called eremitical movement was less concerned with promoting solitary forms of religious life than with founding monastic communities in isolated places, cut off from secular society. The western reformers often worked through public authorities, such as popes, kings, and bishops, and through councils that sought to establish the literal observance of the *Rule of Benedict* or the life of the primitive church.

The reform movement in Byzantium was primarily the work of individuals concerned with specific monasteries. Their *typika* frequently include details of their own lives both in the world and in religious institutions. The concepts of reform, renewal, and rebirth figured less prominently than in the western reform documents, and it may be significant that the term *reformation* (*diorthosis*) was used only in a *typikon* from Sicily, (26) *Luke of Messina* [5], where western influence was stronger than in the East. There was a great stress on tradition, and any innovation or change in a *typikon* was regarded with suspicion. The modalities of reform therefore differed

⁸ *Regula Magistri*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé ao, *SC* 105–7, vol. 2 (1964), p. 126, n. 15.

⁹ On the importance of writing for religious groups, see Gert Melville, “Zur Funktion der Schriftlichkeit im institutionellen Gefüge mittelalterlicher Orden,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 25 (1991), 392–93.

PREFACE

from house to house, and there was no movement of reform that applied to all monasteries. The *typika* differ widely, for instance, in their provisions concerning the selection and installation of the superior and the admission and treatment of members of the community. From a modern point of view, they often seem to be repetitive, confused, and occasionally self-contradictory. Yet many of them were written by men and women of affairs and by experienced administrators, who were ready to make accommodations for the times and the circumstances of the institutions for which they were legislating rather than to lay down abstract principles that in practice they knew would be disregarded.¹⁰

Behind these differences lay important common principles, however, and the parallels and resemblances among monastic institutions all over the Christian world were the result less of specific influences or traditions than of the distinctive way of life led by men and women who had left secular society to serve God and were dedicated to prayer, virginity, and unworldliness. Since at least the time of Cassian and Basil, the religious life was compared to that of angels. The monks of Mt. Athos were described in (44) *Karyes* as “angels here on earth” [2], and in (57) *Bebaia Elpis* the nuns in Constantinople followed an “ascetic or angelic way of life” [37] and imitated Christ, the apostles, and the martyrs [41–42]. In (24) *Christodoulos*, the monks of Patmos, like the angels, were occupied in praising God [A17], and Isaac Komnenos established the monastery at Bera, according to (29) *Kosmosoteira*, “for the propitiation of God and of his mother” [70]. Similar sentiments were expressed in the West, as by Alcuin in a letter to the abbot and monks of an unknown monastery in which he said that the life of the saints consisted in praising and loving the goodness of Christ and that the followers of this life in the present world resembled the angels who eternally praised God: “He who strives to be watchful for the prayers of God leads the angelic life on earth.”¹¹

These quotations emphasize the positive aspects of the monastic ideal, but there was also a strong negative element of self-abnegation and of practical, if not theoretical, dualism. (55) *Athanasios I* took from John Klimakos’s *Ladder of Heaven* the definition of a monk as

the order and rule of the incorporeal carried out in the filthy and material body. A monk is one who is attached only to the things of God every day, everywhere, and in everything. A monk is a continual forcing of nature and a constant guarding of the senses. A monk is a sanctified body, a purified mouth, and an enlightened mind. A monk is a grieving soul, meditating in the continual awareness of death, meditating both while asleep and while awake and all the rest. [3]

According to the *typikon* of Nikon, (20) *Black Mountain*, which dates from 1055–60, “the monastic life professes to a greater degree what the world professes. The worldly life professes the commands of the Lord, but the monastic life both professes death from the world and pledges to God life crucified in its submission and tonsuring. This is the comprehensive command and tradition of the monks” [84].

¹⁰ Schreiber, “Anselm,” p. 401, stressed the personal role of the emperor in establishing the Pantokrator in Constantinople, whether or not he himself wrote the *typikon*.

¹¹ Alcuin, ep. 278, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Epistolae*, vol. 4, p. 435.

PREFACE

Entry into monastic life was a second baptism, which involved at the same time death to life in this world and rebirth into a life cleansed of sin.¹² In (22) *Evergetis*, which was written in the eleventh century and influenced many later *typika*, monks and nuns were committed to a life of effort, endurance, and perseverance [42].¹³ They should grieve for their sins rather than teach, contemplate, or perform miracles, according to (54) *Neilos Damilas*, citing the *Ladder of Heaven* of John Klimakos and echoing the dictum of St. Jerome that “A monk has the office not of a teacher but of a mourner” [12].¹⁴ They were required to confess their sins regularly and frequently, sometimes as often as once a day. This stress on conscience (*syneidesis*) in the sense of self-examination and self-awareness is found in many of the *typika*, especially in the twelfth century and later, when there was a growing concern with conscience in western monastic and theological writings.

Monastic communities were often called living organisms, as in (29) *Kosmosoteira*, where the monastery had “one body and one breath” [57], (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, where the nuns were said to have “many separate bodies, but . . . one, indivisible soul” [46], and (58) *Menoikeion*, in which the body was “governed by the five senses” [22] and needed the care of a doctor to remain in good health. Members who were ill had to be either cured or cut off and expelled, like a diseased limb or cancer of the body. In (32) *Mamas*, concealed faults were described as wounds that harmed the whole body [29]. In (33) *Heliou Bomon* [prol.] and (37) *Auxentios* [1], the monasteries when they were in difficulties were compared to fallen runners. Similar terms were applied to monasteries in the West, and the number of medical images in the *Rule of Benedict* has led some scholars to conjecture that the author may have had medical training.¹⁵

The *typika* are filled with agricultural, military, architectural, and naval metaphors. Some monasteries were compared to gardens, as in (26) *Luke of Messina* [7] and (31) *Areia* [M2], to houses, with walls and gates, and to vineyards, beehives, and flocks of sheep in a sheepfold. In (30) *Phoberos*, the monks were urged to “resist and wage the war” [53], like soldiers in an army; the hermitage at Ktima in Cyprus, in (45) *Neophytos*, was called “a godly watchtower” [pref.] by its founder; and other houses were safe harbors or ships steered by a helmsman, as in (58) *Menoikeion* [22]. The members of religious communities were like the members of a family living in a single house or the inhabitants of a town or like fish swimming in a river or pond. The descriptions of the physical beauty of their locations and the wildness and isolation of their surroundings derived from the Bible and served, like similar *topoi* in the foundation documents and

¹² See, on baptism, Peter Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200–c. 1150* (Cambridge, 1993), and, on entry into monastic life as a second baptism, the references in my article, “The Ceremonies and Symbolism of Entering Religious Life and Taking the Monastic Habit, From the Fourth to the Twelfth Century,” in *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale, 11–17 aprile 1985* (= *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo* 33) (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 799–802.

¹³ See Appendix C on the reform elements in (22) *Evergetis* and its influence on other *typika*.

¹⁴ Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium* 15, in *Patrologia latina* 23, col. 367A, and the references in Pierre Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1937), p. 25.

¹⁵ Einar Molland, “*Ut sapiens medicus*: Medical Vocabulary in St. Benedict’s *Regula monachorum*,” *Studia monastica* 6 (1964), 293–98, and *The Rule of St. Benedict*, ed. Timothy Fry (Collegeville, 1981), pp. 222–23, 352, and 430, n. 57 (hereafter *Regula Benedicti*).

PREFACE

histories of western monasteries,¹⁶ to underline the paradisiacal character of religious houses and their contrast with the world of secular society.

In spite of this rich figurative language, the *typika* were not spiritual treatises, and they touch only incidentally on the inner lives of the men and women who left their homes in order to serve God in monasteries. They lend little support to the view favored by some scholars that religious life in the East, unlike the West, was aimed primarily at deification and that monks and nuns, like the saints, were more inspired by the divine and impassible Christ than by the human Jesus and that they sought to rise above the body and earthly things to disincarnated incorruptibility.¹⁷ This view stresses the difference between the image of the austere *Pantokrator* who looked down from the apses and domes of so many monastic churches in the East and the tender and suffering Man who, from at least the eleventh century, was seen on the altars of western churches. Other scholars have argued that devotion to the humanity of Jesus and imitation of Christ the man were not unknown in medieval Greek spirituality.¹⁸

Though the *typika* contribute little to this dispute, they do not entirely neglect the human side of religious life in their emphasis on asceticism, self-denial, and service to God. Love was greater than prayer, in (22) *Evergetis* [33], which was copied in (27) *Kecharitomene* [25], (32) *Mamas* [23], and elsewhere, and the author of (30) *Phoberos* spoke of the personal sadness and discouragement associated with the term *akedia* [6], which was often used in the West. “[C]ontemplation profits by works rather than by words,” according to (42) *Sabas* [7], of which the author was presumably opposed to the chattering of the *hesychastai*. For (45) *Neophytos*, however, “Talk is better than silence. For silence only benefits its own laborer, while the word also benefits many others” [14]. These are surprising words for an austere hermit, and they show that at least some writers of *typika* were aware of the needs of others as well as of the requirements of personal salvation.

II

The communities for which these *typika* were written ranged in size from three or four monks—as at the *kellion* of St. Sabbas on Mt. Athos ((44) *Karyes*) and the dependency of St. Euthymios at Jerusalem ((50) *Gerasimos*)—up to eighty—as at the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos in the tenth century (and later a hundred twenty) ((13) *Ath. Typikon* [36]) and at the *Pantokrator* in Constantinople ((28) *Pantokrator* [19]). (15) *Constantine IX* said in 1045 that the total number of monks at Lavra had grown from one hundred to seven hundred [4], which by the end of the fifteenth century

¹⁶ Dieter von der Nahmer, “Die Klostergründung ‘in solitudine’—ein unbrauchbarer hagiographischer Topos?” *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 22 (1972), 90–111.

¹⁷ Myrrha Lot-Borodine, “La doctrine de la ‘déification’ dans l’Eglise grecque jusqu’au XI^e siècle,” *RHR* 105–6 (1932), 5–43 and 525–74, and 107 (1933), 8–55.

¹⁸ Sévérin Salaville, “Christus in orientalium pietate: De pietate erga Christi humanitatem apud orientales liturgias et liturgicos commentatores,” *EL* 53 (1939), 13–59 and 350–85, and “Un office grec du ‘Très doux Jésus’ antérieur au ‘Jubilus’ dit de saint Bernard,” *RAM* 25.2–4 (1949 = *Mélanges Marcel Viller*), 246–59, and Irénée Hausherr, “L’imitation de Jésus-Christ dans la spiritualité byzantine,” *Mélanges offerts au R. P. Ferdinand Cavallera* (Toulouse, 1948), pp. 231–59.

PREFACE

had increased to more than two thousand.¹⁹ Most of the *typika* written in the twelfth century and later were for communities of between twenty and fifty members, but some authors expressed a preference for relatively small houses and were concerned that the size of the community should not outstrip its resources. The number of monks was limited to seven in (19) *Attaleiates* [27] and to twelve in (16) *Mt. Tmolos* [1] and in (30) *Phoberos* [42], where the community was allowed to increase if resources permitted. (45) *Neophytos*, which dates from 1214, set the number of monks at between fifteen and eighteen, saying that “God does not want a multitude of monks, crawling in sin” [C16].

These figures agree approximately with those proposed by Charanis, who said that the majority of Byzantine monasteries had between ten and twenty members, though some had as many as eighty.²⁰ Mango and Ševčenko, in their study of monasteries on the southern shore of the Sea of Marmara, found two houses of roughly one hundred and another of more than seventy in about 800, and others of eighty, sixty-four, and forty-two members.²¹ Monasteries tended to be smaller in the central and late Middle Ages than they were earlier, in both East and West, where Lérins, St. Riquier, Jumièges, and Fulda all had several hundred monks in the eighth and ninth centuries. The average Benedictine monastery in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had between twelve and twenty members. Communities of more than sixty were exceptional, and only a few, such as Cluny, had more than a hundred.²²

Very little is known about who entered monasteries, aside from the fact that they included highly placed and wealthy people. The abolition of the payment for entry, which is mentioned in several *typika* and was considered a reform measure, may have made it easier for poor people to enter religious life, but it is hard to be sure on this point. It is clear that a number of both monks and nuns received their monastic formation in one house and later transferred to another, in spite of ecclesiastical legislation requiring them to stay in their monastery unless the bishop or the superior gave them permission to leave. In his study of *stabilitas loci* in Byzantine monasticism, Emil Herman concluded, largely on the basis of hagiographical sources, that transfers were not unusual,²³ and there are a few references in the *typika* to monks who left their monasteries on

¹⁹ Heath Lowry, Jr., “A Note on the Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries under Ottoman Rule (ca. 1520),” in his *Studies in “Defterology”: Ottoman Society in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (= *Analecta Isisiana* 4) (Istanbul, 1992), p. 238.

²⁰ Peter Charanis, “The Monk as an Element in Byzantine Society,” *DOP* 25 (1971), 69–72. Raymond Janin, “Le monachisme byzantin au moyen âge: Commende et typica (X^e– XIV^e siècle),” *REB* 22 (1964), 29–31, cited fourteen communities ranging in size between five to seven and eighty to one hundred twenty, and Anthony Bryer, “The Late Byzantine Monastery in Town and Countryside,” in *The Church in Town and Countryside*, ed. Derek Baker (= *Studies in Church History* 16) (Oxford, 1979), p. 225, accepted Charanis’s estimate.

²¹ Cyril Mango and Ihor Ševčenko, “Some Churches and Monasteries on the Southern Shore of the Sea of Marmara,” *DOP* 27 (1973), 270.

²² See Ursmer Berlière, “Le nombre des moines dans les anciens monastères,” *Revue bénédictine* 41 (1929), 231–61, and 42 (1930), 19–42, and Jacques Dubois, “Du nombre des moines dans les monastères,” *Lettre de Ligugé* 134 (1969.2), 24–36.

²³ Emile Herman, “La ‘stabilitas loci’ nel monachesimo bizantino,” *OCP* 21 (1955), 115–42.

PREFACE

pilgrimages or special missions or, most frequently, in search of a more austere life. Monks were allowed to leave the monastery voluntarily at Bera, according to (29) *Kosmosoteira* [55], and in some houses members who misbehaved or did not fit into the community were expelled. Whether such former monks and nuns reentered secular society, transferred to other monasteries, or became vagrants and beggars is not known. Although in some houses the reception of monks from other houses (*xenokouritai*) was prohibited, in others they were admitted but not allowed to become superior.

The issue of *transitus*, or transfer from one monastery to another, was much discussed in the West.²⁴ The *Rule of Benedict* laid great emphasis on *stabilitas loci*, which was (together with obedience and *conversatio morum*) one of the three promises made by a new monk, but the possibility of movement was foreseen. In chapter 61 the abbot was warned not to receive a monk “from another known monastery . . . without the consent of his abbot or commendatory letters,” and in the final chapter, monks who wanted to achieve perfection were advised to follow the teachings of the holy fathers, which were interpreted as living in solitude. During the monastic reforms of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when many monks sought a more austere life, stability was increasingly seen in terms of profession rather than of place, and transfers were not only permitted but in some cases encouraged, especially from a lower to a higher, or stricter, monastery.

Six out of the sixty-one *typika* translated here were written for houses of women, who played an important part in Byzantine monasticism. None of them were written for double houses, where men and women lived in a single community under one superior, occasionally a woman,²⁵ but several of them envisaged a close relationship between male and female houses, as in (34) *Machairas* [169], (47) *Philanthropos* [intro.], and (54) *Neilos Damilas* [8], [14], which cited the decree of the Second Council of Nicaea forbidding double monasteries and established that work both within and outside the nunnery should be done by pious laymen rather than monks, who were forbidden even to conduct services for the nuns. (31) *Areia* [M5–6] shows that some relationship existed between the two houses near Nauplia after the nuns moved and their former house was occupied by monks. Close relations between male and female monasteries were also found in the West, where many of the communities established by the reformers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries welcomed both men and women. As time passed, the women lived an increasingly segregated life but were still associated with houses of monks.

Both monks and nuns were deeply concerned with sexual purity. The monks’ fear of sexuality extended to contacts not only with women, boys, and beardless youths, but also with female animals. (30) *Phoberos*, which dates from 1113/40, includes a striking passage on the fears of homosexuality and bestiality written by Paul Helladikos in the sixth century [58]. In (53) *Meteora*, the monks were forbidden to give food to women even if they were dying of hunger [7]. On a visit to Mt. Athos in the 1930s, Kurt Weitzmann met a hermit who, having come there as a child, had

²⁴ Philipp Hofmeister, “Der Übertritt in eine andere religiöse Genossenschaft,” *AKKR* 108 (1928), 419–81.

²⁵ On double monasteries in the East, see Jules Pargoire, “Les monastères doubles chez les Byzantins,” *EO* 9 (1906), 21–25; Janin, “Monachisme,” pp. 42–44; and Georges-Joseph Mahfoud, *L’organisation monastique dans l’Eglise maronite* (= Bibliothèque de l’Université Saint-Esprit, Kaslik-Jounieh-Liban 1) (Beirut, 1967), pp. 289–315.

PREFACE

never seen a woman, and whose opinion that “the woman is a devil” was derived, he said, from reading Klimakos’s *Ladder of Heaven*.²⁶ These regulations were not inspired by misogyny or dislike of women as such, according to Nikon’s (20) *Black Mountain* [86] and (22) *Evergetis* [39], which was copied in (29) *Kosmosoteira* and other *typika*. Nuns inevitably had some contact with men, since they were dependent upon priests to celebrate the sacraments and upon male laborers to perform hard physical work, but it was kept to a minimum in order to avoid temptation, and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* specified that the priest who served in the church should be married [79]. In (28) *Pantokrator*, provision for women was made in the hospital associated with the monastery, though the male doctors were paid more than the female doctors [38], [52].²⁷

A special problem was posed in eastern monasteries by eunuchs, who were almost unknown in the West, but who played a prominent role in Byzantine society and with regard to whom policy seems to have varied. They were forbidden in some monasteries, including nunneries. The reference to the admission of a wealthy eunuch in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [55] suggests that it was regarded as exceptional. In (19) *Attaleiates*, on the other hand, the monks had to be eunuchs and “men free from passions,” and bearded monks were forbidden [30]. In (27) *Kecharitomene*, the priests, the spiritual father of the nuns, the steward, and the attendant physician were all required to be eunuchs [14–16], [57]. The fact that one of the three monasteries at Mt. Galesios was reserved for twelve eunuchs shows that there was no objection in principle to eunuch monks.²⁸

The communities therefore differed in character, and some were less cut off from the outside world than others. There were important distinctions even among the regular members of the community, in spite of the emphasis found in several of the *typika* on equal treatment of all members. It was in practice impossible to exclude entirely the social distinctions and attitudes that permeated secular society, in which most monks and nuns had been raised, and in almost all religious houses special privileges were given to members of rich and powerful families, especially if they were related to the emperor or to the founder. There are countless references to travelers, pilgrims, beggars, strangers, servants, laymen, and all sorts of hangers-on, and, in spite of efforts to exclude them, to women and boys in male houses and to men and girls in female houses. In (34) *Machairas*, pilgrims going to Jerusalem stopped at the monastery in Cyprus [116]; a “sister Melanie” is mentioned in the *typikon* of *Nea Mone* at Thessalonike, (52) *Choumnos*, which was otherwise strict on the subject of women [A18]; and (55) *Athanasios I* apparently indicates the acceptance of the presence of laymen in monasteries in the reform program for Mt. Athos [4]. Monks from distant places—“beyond Cadiz,” as they were called in (13) *Ath. Typikon* [27]—were welcomed at the Great Lavra, and were not called foreigners. Begging monks appear in (32) *Mamas* [13] of 1158. More obscure are the frequent prohibitions against imposed guests and against internal and external monks, which suggests that monks sometimes lived outside the community at the expense of the monastery.

²⁶ Kurt Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium from Europe to America: The Memoirs of an Art Historian* (Munich, 1994), p. 135.

²⁷ On the parallel expressions of brotherly love in the *Pantokrator typikon* and western monastic sources, see Schreiber, “Hospital,” p. 30.

²⁸ See Alexander Kazhdan, “Eunuchs,” *ODB*, pp. 746–47, and Alice-Mary Talbot, “Galesios, Mount,” *ODB*, p. 817.

PREFACE

Prohibitions of this type show something about the nature of monastic communities and the indifferent success of reformers, in both East and West, in fully cutting off monks and nuns from secular society, even when they were surrounded by walls and guarded by watchful doorkeepers. In (60) *Charsianeites*, for instance, the monks, like the Grandmontines in the West, were forbidden to engage in lawsuits, even in a just cause, and were required simply to state their case in court and leave [C7]. The nuns in (57) *Bebaia Elpis* were not allowed to educate lay children [148], as were some western nuns in the twelfth century. The prohibitions against the use of professional singers, which are found in several *typika*, were more distinctively eastern, as were the efforts to prevent the types of personal links that appear to have been a feature of Mediterranean society.²⁹ Spiritual and adoptive brotherhoods, familiarity, associations, and unions between monks of religious houses and outside laypeople were forbidden in (3) *Theodore Studites* [8], in (12) *Tzimiskes* [14], (22) *Evergetis* [46], (26) *Luke of Messina* [3], (42) *Sabas* [6], and others, including the general *typikon* for Mt. Athos, (59) *Manuel II*, which prohibited spiritual relationships and adoptive brotherhoods between a monk and a layperson [10]. The precise nature of these associations is uncertain, but they included serving as godparents and sponsors at baptisms. Though they were regarded as improper for monks and nuns, the number of prohibitions suggests that they were not uncommon.

The *typika* throw considerable light on the age of entry, which tended to be higher in eastern than in western monasteries, where the system of oblation, by which children were given to monasteries by their parents, was common until at least the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the age of entry was raised in many houses.³⁰ Although eastern church law set the age of entry at ten and of tonsure at sixteen or seventeen,³¹ there are no references to child members in the *typika* except in (36) *Blemmydes*, which, written in 1267, allowed ten-year-old boys to be admitted on condition that they could not become monks before they were twenty and might leave if they proved unsuited to monastic life [9]. The minimum age of entry was sixteen in (60) *Charsianeites* [C2], eighteen in (10) *Eleousa* [17], and ranged in other places from twenty up to thirty, as in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3]. These figures were considerably higher than for any known monastery in the West, where the average age of profession was between fifteen and twenty, and where the imposition of higher age limits was regarded as a reform measure designed to insure a higher level of commitment and maturity than could be found in children.³² This, perhaps in addition to a desire to avoid the sexual temptation presented by boys, may also have inspired the authors of the *typika*. The result was that most monks and nuns in the East had considerable experience in the secular world, and many had been married. According to (35) *Skoteine*, Maximos, the founder of the monastery of the Mother of God, was the son and grandson of monks but was himself tonsured before the age of marriage and perhaps below the established age of entry [2–4], [7]. In (54)

²⁹ John Boswell, *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe* (New York, 1994), pp. 240–42, and Claudia Rapp, “Ritual Brotherhood in Byzantium,” *Traditio* 58 (1997), 285–326.

³⁰ See *Regula Benedicti*, 59, ed. Fry, pp. 270–72, and the references in my *Medieval Monasticism: A Select Bibliography* (= Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 6) (Toronto-Buffalo, 1976), pp. 123–24.

³¹ Janin, “Monachisme,” pp. 21–22.

³² See Peter the Venerable, *Stat.* 36, in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, vol. 6, p. 70.

PREFACE

Pantanassa, a married woman could not be admitted without her husband's permission and with a girl who was more than ten years old [5]. These girls, like the boys of the monastery of the Lord Christ-Who-Is at Ematha, were presumably educated in the monastery, as were many children in the West. They may have resembled the "insiders" who were admitted at the age of sixteen to the nunnery of Lips, where, according to (39) *Lips* [17–18], twenty was the age of entry for outsiders.

The length of the novitiate varied with the age and experience of the candidate but tended to be longer in the East than in the West, where it was set at two months in the *Rule of the Master* and at a year in the *Rule of Benedict*, which prescribed three successive probationary periods of two, six, and four months, each concluding with a reading of the rule.³³ In (22) *Evergetis*, the novitiate lasted six months [37], which was increased to two years in (32) *Mamas*, though known people were admitted after six months and monks from other monasteries after eight days [22]; in (34) *Machairas* from Cyprus, the novitiate was three years but was reduced to six months for known people and transfers [55], [60]; and in (39) *Lips* the novitiate at the nunnery was three years for outsiders, a year for unspecified others (perhaps nuns from other houses), and six months for mature women [17–18]. In (13) *Ath. Typikon*, an abbreviated novitiate was allowed in the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos for "some who are pious and well known and whose religious way of life is well attested" [50], in (24) *Christodoulos* at Patmos for "a pious man who led a monastic life in the world" [A26], and in (27) *Kecharitomene* in Constantinople for devout women "practicing the monastic life in secular clothing" [30].³⁴ Provisions were made for shortened periods of probation, and even for immediate tonsure, especially for candidates who were sick or dying, as in (12) *Tzimiskes* [3], in (36) *Blemmydes* [9], and probably also in other monasteries. The practice of speedily admitting the elderly and ailing, to enable them to enter the next world clad in the monastic habit, was common in western monasteries, where it was known as *ad succurrendum*.³⁵ Exceptions were also made in the West for important people and monks from other houses, and the reformers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries tried to establish the regular novitiate, as it was called, of a year. The longer novitiate in the *typika* may have been associated with the higher ages of admission and with the perceived need to test thoroughly the vocations of men and women who had lived in the world and had to learn the ways of monastic life, unlike monks and nuns who had been raised in monasteries or came from other houses.

The *typika* say comparatively little about the formal ceremonies of admission, which were spelled out in detail in the *Rule of Benedict* and many western customaries, and they do not support the view that entering religious life in the East was a consecration rather than a personal promise or commitment.³⁶ The blessing of monks is occasionally mentioned, mostly in connec-

³³ *Regula Magistri*, 88.3, vol. 2, p. 369, and *Regula Benedicti*, 58, ed. Fry, pp. 266–68.

³⁴ These passages are interesting evidence of the existence in secular society of men and women who lived a quasi-monastic life. See John Nesbitt and J. Wiito, "A Confraternity of the Comnenian Era," *BZ* 68 (1975), 300–384.

³⁵ Nikephoros Chartophylax was the first Byzantine layman known to Karl Holl to take the monastic habit on his deathbed. See his *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum: Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 321.

³⁶ See, for instance, Olivier Rousseau, "Le rôle important du monachisme dans l'Eglise d'Orient," *Il monachesimo orientale* (= *OCA* 153) (Rome, 1958), pp. 38–40.

PREFACE

tion with the authority of the bishop, but the primary emphasis was on the promise, tonsure, and habit. According to (10) *Eleousa*, which dates from 1085–1106, the monks made “our promise on the things that we were proclaiming, frequently repeating our consent with both a subdued posture and a calm voice” [9], and in (30) *Phoberos* new monks read and promised to obey “this rule” [51]. There are many references, in part owing to the influence of (22) *Evergetis*, to “the hair of this world” and to “worldly locks,” which were cut when someone entered religious life. Facial hair was a mark of maturity in men, and of suitability to be a monk or priest, since clerics in the East, unlike the West, were bearded. The beardlessness of eunuchs showed their anomalous status, even if it did not exclude them from becoming monks or priests.

The monastic habit was of symbolic as well as practical significance in distinguishing men and women in religion from those living in the world. (55) *Athanasios I* called it “the robe of unchanging glory” [1], and in (45) *Neophytos*, the founder of the hermitage at Ktima in Cyprus kissed the cuffs of his habit [4]. The scapular was compared to the cross in (10) *Eleousa* [9], as in many western monastic texts, and Nikon in (20) *Black Mountain* stressed the importance of the distinctive cap worn by eastern monks [75]. In (45) *Neophytos* [15] and (34) *Machairas*, different ranks of monks apparently wore different habits, and according to the latter the great habit was apparently worn by the monks known as *apostolikai* but not by others [102], [148]. (45) *Neophytos* expressed a preference for inexpensive grey rather than black cloaks [C15]. The western reformers in the twelfth century, and later the mendicants, also favored undyed and cheap materials for their habits. It was a mark of visible humility and unworldliness, like the use of a donkey rather than a horse when traveling, to which there are references in both eastern and western saints’ lives and, among others, in (48) *Prodromos* [7], whose monastery was a dependency of Docheiariou on Mt. Athos.

Great importance was attached in the *typika* to the behavior of monks and nuns and their proper deportment toward each other and, especially, toward the superior and monastic officials. There are references in several *typika* to disciplinary officers, as in (11) *Ath. Rule* [17] of the Great Lavra, but comparatively few to punishments, aside from the long list, which derived from the pseudo-Basilian *Poenae* and resembled a western penitential, incorporated into (34) *Machairas* [121–34]. (4) *Stoudios* [25] and (11) *Ath. Rule* [19] for the Great Lavra noted the presence of prisons for recalcitrant monks at their respective monasteries, and some, such as (28) *Pantokrator* and (29) *Kosmosoteira*, said theirs were used for political prisoners, who may have been the imposed guests mentioned above. Whipping was explicitly forbidden in (4) *Stoudios*, and the most serious punishment for monks who refused to obey the rule or to fit into the community seems to have been expulsion.

All distinctions within monastic communities were potential sources of disputes and tension, and the authors of many *typika* attempted to head off the problems created by differences in rank, social status, wealth, and culture. Among the most interesting of these was the presence in a single community of various linguistic and ethnic groups. In (23) *Pakourianos*, only Georgians, for instance, were admitted to the monastery at Bačkovovo in Bulgaria [prol.], [24]. The community of St. Sabas near Jerusalem included both Greeks (or Romans, as they are called) and Syrians, and the *typikon*, (42) *Sabas*, specified that the superior should be Greek but that the steward and treasurer should be Syrians, who were “more efficient and practical in their native country” [9].

PREFACE

There is an interesting account of the difficulty of introducing Vlachs into a Greek house in (51) *Koutloumousi* [B6] of Mt. Athos. Similar problems must have arisen in western monasteries, especially with the decline of Latin and the spread of vernacular languages, but they are not discussed with equal frankness in any known rule or customary.

III

Members of religious communities, both monks and nuns, divided their time between religious services, private devotions, and various types of work, of which the proportions varied from monastery to monastery. Their activities were regulated, in Byzantine monasteries, by the sound of the *semantron*—"the holy bell," as it was called in (46) *Akropolites* [6]—which was a flat piece of wood or metal and performed the same function as the bell in western monasteries. Some monasteries had several *semantrons*, as in (22) *Evergetis* [6] and (32) *Mamas* [47], where there were small, great, and bronze *semantrons*, and in (34) *Machairas* [45], [47], [61], where there was a refectory *semantron* and at least one large *semantron*. According to their differing sounds, the monks and nuns knew what they should do. Less is said in the *typika* about the system of keeping time, but there are a few references to clocks, which were presumably water clocks, or *clepsydra*, which were also known in western monasteries. The primary indicators of time, in both East and West, were the sun and stars and, in the morning, the cock.

The most important occupation of monks and nuns was the celebration of the liturgy, with which a few *typika* (which are not translated here) were exclusively concerned.³⁷ In (32) *Mamas*, the members were required to attend the services [21], but in other communities a distinction was drawn between the members who primarily served in church and those who performed other functions, who would today be called the support staff and usually included the monastic officials, as in (38) *Kellibara I* [17] and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [23], [146–47]. (23) *Pakourianos*, for instance, shows that of the fifty monks at the monastery in Bačkovo in 1083 ten were in holy orders and twenty-six were officials, including the superior, who was not required to be a priest, leaving four unaccounted for. The *typikon* also distinguished three types of monks who received different stipends [6], [9], [22]. In (28) *Pantokrator*, there were four servants and eighty monks, of whom thirty were occupied in what were called menial duties and fifty with the praise of God, and they received, respectively, the biblical rewards of thirty-, sixty-, and a hundred-fold [19]. In (37) *Auxentios*, of the forty monks in the monastery of the archangel Michael, sixteen served in the church and twenty-four in the monastery and fields [6–7]; of the fifty nuns in (39) *Lips* [4] and thirty in (40) *Anargyroi* [6] at Sts. Kosmas and Damian, thirty and eighteen, respectively, performed liturgical duties, and twenty and twelve were occupied with housekeeping; and so on in other monasteries, though the division may have been less strict in smaller houses. The two categories were called fathers and brothers, *ekklestastikoi* and *diakonetai*, and (in other sources) psalmodists and attendants, and they were described as literate and illiterate, though it is not

³⁷ There is no evidence in these *typika* of the type of continuous prayer by shifts of monks that was found in early monasteries in the East but more or less died out by the twelfth century. See Michael Marx, *Incessant Prayer in Ancient Monastic Literature* (Rome, 1946).

PREFACE

certain that those who served in the church were all literate and the others, especially the officials, were illiterate.

The *typika* throw comparatively little light on the number of monks who were in holy orders or on whether the proportion increased, as it did in the West, where by the thirteenth century almost all monks were ordained. Likewise, there is little said on the related question of the performance of pastoral work by monks, both within their communities and in parish churches.³⁸ What evidence there is suggests that the proportion of ordained monks was lower in Byzantine monasteries than in the West and that they did not regularly serve as parish priests, though other sources might lead to a different conclusion.³⁹ (23) *Pakourianos* shows that at Bačkovo in the late eleventh century ten monks, or a fifth of the community, were ordained, of whom six were priests and two each were deacons and subdeacons [6]. In (32) *Mamas*, which dates from 1158, there were twenty monks, of whom two or three were priests and two were deacons [5].

At first sight, the distinction between the liturgical and non-liturgical members seems to resemble that in western monasteries between western monks who were raised in a monastery (*oblati* or *nutriti*) and those who entered as adults (*conversi*) and, even more, that between the so-called choir monks and lay brothers (*fratres laici* or *conversi*), who were found in many reformed houses in the West, especially those affiliated with Hirsau, Cîteaux, and Prémontré, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁴⁰ The comparisons do not hold up on close inspection, however. The *conversi* of the old type were characteristically illiterate at their time of entry and able to participate in the services only in limited ways, but they often learned to read and write, were ordained, and served as priors and abbots. The lay brothers and sisters, or *conversi* of the new type, on the other hand, constituted a closed category, from which there was no promotion, and they were mostly occupied with agricultural labor. The *typika* show that, in Byzantine monasteries, unordained, non-liturgical monks were not a closed group and frequently occupied responsible positions, and that unlettered monks sometimes participated in the offices, as seen in (22) *Evergetis* [33] and (33) *Heliou Bomon* [23]. (39) *Lips* suggests that the contemplative nuns were subordinate to the preeminent active nuns [27], and Neophytos, the founder of the hermitage at Ktima, worked in the vineyards for five years before he learned to read and write and became assistant ecclesiarch, a position he later gave up in order to devote himself to the contemplative life ((45) *Neophytos* [4]).

The welfare of specific individuals as well of society in general was thought to depend upon the prayers of monks,⁴¹ the “faithful *oratores*” as Charlemagne called them in his capitulary *De*

³⁸ A related issue, which requires further study, is the number of churches within monastic enclosures in both East and West and their use. See Schreiber, “Anselm,” p. 385.

³⁹ See Irénée-Henri Dalmais, “Sacerdoce et monachisme dans l’Orient chrétien,” *La vie spirituelle* 80 (1949), 37–49, and the references in my *Medieval Monasticism*, pp. 135–37. Clément Lialine, “Monachisme oriental et monachisme occidental,” *Irénikon* 33 (1960), 444–45, argued that the “pneumatico-psychological preference” of Byzantine monks led to a distrust of clericalization, institutionalization, and the ministry.

⁴⁰ On conversion and lay brothers see the references in my *Medieval Monasticism*, pp. 124–25.

⁴¹ On intercessory prayer in the East, see Schreiber, “Anselm,” pp. 408–9, and Paul Lemerle “Un aspect du rôle des monastères à Byzance: les monastères donnés à des laïcs, les charistocaires,” *CRAI* (1967), 13.

PREFACE

litteris colendis.⁴² There are innumerable references in the *typika* to liturgical commemoration for founders, protectors, and benefactors, especially the emperor and members of the ruling family, both male and female,⁴³ for members of the community and, more rarely, for all Christians, as in (48) *Prodromos* [5], or for specific groups in society, as in (33) *Heliou Bomon* [47] and (34) *Machairas* [44]. The steadily growing number of commemorations created a problem at *Evergetis*, as it did at Cluny and other western monasteries, where efforts were made to limit the amount of time spent in commemorations.⁴⁴ The manner of chanting was also mentioned in several *typika*, of which the authors stressed the need for moderation, slowness, clarity, and attention to the words of the texts ((20) *Black Mountain* [16], (23) *Pakourianos* [12], (36) *Blemmydes* [13], and (37) *Auxentios* [7]). (54) *Neilos Damilas* mentioned the “excessive variety of hymns” and warned against “undignified tunes” [12].⁴⁵

Policy with regard to celebration of the Eucharist varied from monastery to monastery, but frequent communion, especially for monks, was common in Byzantium in the early Middle Ages.⁴⁶ At *Evergetis*, mass was celebrated every day, though not all the monks communicated; at *Machairas*, a liturgy was daily and communion weekly, or at least twice a month; and in other monasteries a liturgy was celebrated between once and five times a week, and the frequency of communion was not always specified. “Daily communion was a rarity in Byzantine monasteries,” according to Robert Taft, “but weekly communion, though not universal, remained common.”⁴⁷

The importance of confession has already been mentioned in connection with the emphasis on conscience.⁴⁸ In some monasteries, daily confession was required, and a parallel between confession and bodily health was drawn in (22) *Evergetis* and the *typika* that derive from it. It was considered as important as the Eucharist at *Nea Mone* in Thessalonike, of which the *typikon*, (52) *Choumnos*, dates from before 1374 [B10]. The reformers preferred that confession be made to the superior or spiritual father rather than to other monks or to outsiders, presumably in order to ensure a consistent spiritual direction, but (22) *Evergetis* [7] and (30) *Phoberos* [14] allowed confession to be made to priests, deacons, or “more reverent brothers,” probably owing to the

⁴² *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Capitularia*, vol. 1, p. 79.

⁴³ (27) *Kecharitomene* specified that male and female members of the ruling family should be commemorated equally [79].

⁴⁴ See Peter the Venerable, *Stat. 32*, in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, vol. 6, pp. 66–67, and note there.

⁴⁵ See Margot Fassler, *Gothic Song: Victorine Sequences and Augustinian Reform in Twelfth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 39–40, on “conventional nonsense syllables” in eastern liturgies and parallel phenomena in the West.

⁴⁶ Sévérin Salaville, “Messe et communion d’après les *typika* monastiques byzantins du X^e au XIV^e siècle,” *OCP* 13 (1947), 283–98, and Emil Herman, “Die häufige und tägliche Kommunion in den byzantinischen Klöstern,” *Mémorial Louis Petit* (= Archives de l’Orient chrétien 1) (Bucharest, 1948), pp. 203–17.

⁴⁷ “Communion,” *ODB*, p. 491.

⁴⁸ On confession in the West, where it was more frequent among monks than the laity and was prescribed in the *Rule of Benedict*, see Alexander Murray, “Confession before 1215,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. 6, 3 (1993), 70–72.

PREFACE

difficulty in finding time and opportunity for each member of the community to confess to a single person every day.

Allowance was also made for private prayers and devotions, though they do not figure prominently in the *typika*. Private psalmody was indeed prohibited in some of the early *typika*, but Athanasios the Athonite in his rule for the Great Lavra in 963, (11) *Ath. Rule*, modified the *typikon* of St. John Stoudios and recognized that absolute uniformity was not required and that a monk might have reason not to attend choir service [17]; the provisions of (22) *Evergetis* were altered in (30) *Phoberos* specifically to allow the midnight office to be sung by monks in their cells [12]. There are several references to penitential devotions, such as weeping, foot washing, and, especially, genuflections, which were defined as fifteen prostrations in (27) *Kecharitomene* [32]. In (54) *Neilos Damilas* the nuns were expected to perform two hundred prostrations every twenty-four hours, but those who were unable to do that many were permitted to reduce the number [10].

All members of the community, including those whose primary duties were in the church, were expected to work,⁴⁹ not only as a way to avoid idleness, according to (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, but also as a mortification of the flesh and a means to provide the wherewithal for alms [95]. The monks were allowed to work in their cells, according to (31) *Areia* [T3], and in (34) *Machairas* helped to harvest the grain and grapes [83]. In (54) *Neilos Damilas*, the nuns of the *Pantanassa* nunnery worked to produce goods both for their own use and for sale [6]. (52) *Choumnos* set no fixed amount of work for the monks of *Nea Mone*, because people differed in their capacity for physical labor, and elsewhere in the *typikon* it is said that those who wanted should spend ten years working and then devote themselves to spiritual labor [B18], [B21]. A similar attitude is found in the book of proverbs by the twelfth-century Cistercian Galland of Rigny, who wrote that monks who were unable to work in the sun should choose an occupation in the shade and that those who could not observe all the feast days at least should celebrate All Saints, which covers the other feasts in the same way that charity includes the other virtues.⁵⁰ Passages like these suggest that there was a growing recognition in both East and West of the physical needs and capacities of monks and nuns, in spite of the general emphasis on asceticism and self-denial.⁵¹ The spiritual well-being of monks was associated with their physical health in a remarkable chapter in (60) *Charsianeites*, which dates from 1407:

When everyone is healthy, you should be grateful to the Provider of health, each one on behalf of the others rather than on his own behalf, but if one of you is ill, then you should all be sympathetically disposed to his illness and share in his suffering, just as the other

⁴⁹ Tudor Teoteoi, "Le travail manuel dans les *typika* des XI^e-XIII^e siècles," *RESE* 17 (1979), 455–62, and in *Actes du XV^e Congrès international d'études byzantines. Athènes-Septembre 1976*, vol. 4 (Athens, 1980), 340–49, and Maria Dembinska, "Diet: A Comparison of Food Consumption between Some Eastern and Western Monasteries in the 4th–12th Centuries," *Byzantion* 55 (1985), 44–45. According to Schreiber, "Anselm," pp. 404–6, there was a greater emphasis on manual labor in the West, especially among reformers, than in the East.

⁵⁰ Galland of Rigny, "Libellus proverbiorum," *Revue du moyen âge latin* 9 (1953), 47 and 105, no. 13.

⁵¹ Gerd Zimmermann, *Ordensleben und Lebensstandard: Die Cura Corporis in den Ordensvorschriften des abendländischen Hochmittelalters* (= Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 32) (Münster, 1971).

PREFACE

limbs of the body suffer, if one is in pain. You should do everything and exert yourselves to see the brother cured of illness. [B4]

The most remarkable evidence of concern for physical health is in the *typikon* of the *Pantokrator* monastery in Constantinople, which made elaborate provision for five wards (*ordinoi*), each with appropriate staff and equipment, to care for various diseases, wounds, and disorders of both men and women.⁵² Several *typika* mention springs and aqueducts, and the provision of an adequate supply of water was considered a notable benefaction to a monastery. Water was needed not only for drinking and cooking but also for bathing, which is the subject of various provisions in the *typika*.⁵³ In (30) *Phoberos*, for instance, bathing was allowed only for the sick [46], and in (45) *Neophytos* for the sick and aged [C9], whereas in (31) *Areia* it was allowed once a week [T3], and in other monasteries between three and twelve times a year, sometimes in bathing establishments outside the monastery, for which the monks were given special allowances. Careful control was exercised over other aspects of bodily care, such as bleeding and hair cutting, which in (34) *Machairas* could be done only with permission and a blessing [133]. Shaving, on the other hand, was of less concern to the bearded monks in the East than to western monks, who were expected to cut their beards, though not too closely or too often, and whose shaving was the subject of legislation in many monasteries.⁵⁴

Greater attention was paid to diet in the *typika* than in comparable western documents, and especially to the precise amounts and types of food to be eaten at different times during the liturgical year.⁵⁵ Some of the dietary restrictions were very strict and included prohibitions against eating even eggs and cheese, but small additional allowances, resembling pittance in western monasteries, were often given in memory of a benefactor. Dembinska in her article on food consumption in eastern and western monasteries concluded, “The basic foodstuffs mentioned in the rules of the period under research were almost identical in Byzantium and in Western Europe,” but the daily per capita ration was at least a third greater in caloric weight and value in western monasteries in the ninth century than in eastern monasteries in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This was the result not only of the more severe regime in the East but also, she proposed, of climatic differences and perhaps of a decrease in agricultural production in Byzantium.⁵⁶ In (32) *Mamas*, dietary concessions were made for those who participated in the liturgy [18], and a concern for physical health was shown in (22) *Evergetis*, which remarked on the ill-effects of drinking [App.], and (30) *Phoberos*, which said that moderate eating showed a care for bodily health [5].

⁵² See Schreiber, “Hospital,” pp. 3–80; Timothy Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire* (Baltimore, 1985); and Peregrine Horden, “Text and Context: The Pantokrator Hospital in Its Middle Byzantine Setting” (paper presented at the Nineteenth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, Princeton, 5 November 1993).

⁵³ Apostolos Karpozilos, “Bath,” *ODB*, pp. 271–72. On monastic bathing in the West and the number of baths taken by monks, see Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, esp. pp. 117–33.

⁵⁴ See the introduction to Burchard of Bellevaux, *Apologia de barbīs*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (= *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* 62) (Turnhout, 1985), pp. 114–30.

⁵⁵ See Appendix B on the dietary prescriptions of the *typika*.

⁵⁶ Dembinska, “Diet,” p. 453.

PREFACE

The *typika* were generally less concerned with the intellectual than with the material aspects of monastic life, though there are some interesting lists of books in the inventories of individual houses.⁵⁷ Relatively little is said about literacy or reading, in contrast to the *Rule of Benedict*, in which monks were told to read on Sundays and to take a book from the library at the beginning of Lent and to read it through “in order in its entirety.”⁵⁸ Houses that followed the *Rule of Benedict* consequently had at least a few books, if not a library, and the monks were expected to be able to read, even though many of the *conversi*, who entered as adults, were in fact illiterate. The author of (30) *Phoberos*, which was based on (22) *Evergetis*, added that new monks should read and promise to obey “this rule” [51], but they may not all have been literate. The most interesting reference to literacy is in (54) *Neilos Damilas* of Crete, where reading aloud was said to be more important than psalmody [13], [20], but it is unknown how this was interpreted in practice.

IV

The *typika* include much material on the organization and administration of religious communities and reflect the writers’ desire for the independence of monasteries and fear of outside interference in monastic affairs. These concerns need to be seen against the background of the system of *charistike*, which was widespread in Byzantium in the tenth and eleventh centuries and by which monasteries were held in quasi-possession by institutions and private individuals, who often exploited them for their own advantage.⁵⁹ In theory, the grants were conditional, limited in time, and designed to benefit not only the *charistikarios* but also the monastery, and to keep its members from secular involvements. In practice, however, they opened the way to abuses, including lay control and loss of revenues. In some respects the *charistike* resembled the so-called proprietary churches and monasteries in the West, where both churchmen and secular rulers and nobles controlled religious institutions over which they had no legal rights and, as advocates, exercised jurisdiction over monastic lands, in principle in the name of the abbot but in fact in their own name and as a hereditary right.⁶⁰ The movements of monastic reform in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were directed against these types of control over monasteries and tried to define and limit the powers, respectively, of lay proprietors and advocates in the West and of *charistikarioi* in the East.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Nicolas Oikonomides, “Mount Athos: Levels of Literacy,” *DOP* 42 (1988), 167–78, estimated the levels of literacy among monks on Mt. Athos on the basis of subscriptions to documents.

⁵⁸ *Regula Benedicti*, 48, ed. Fry, p. 251. On this chapter, see Anscari Mundó, “‘Bibliotheca’: Bible et lecture du Carême d’après saint Benoît,” *Revue bénédictine* 60 (1950), 65–92.

⁵⁹ See Peter Charanis, “The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire,” *DOP* 4 (1948), 72–81; Lemerle, “Aspect,” who stressed as a general feature of Byzantine monasticism that monasteries were viewed as a source of private profit; and Hélène Ahrweiler, “Charisticariat et autres formes d’attribution de fondations pieuses aux X^e–XI^e siècles,” *Receuil des travaux de l’Institut d’études byzantines* 10 (1967), 1–27, and generally Mark Bartusis, “Charistikion,” *ODB*, p. 412.

⁶⁰ See the work of Felix Senn, *L’institution des avoueries ecclésiastiques en France* (Paris, 1903), and other references in my *Medieval Monasticism*, pp. 105–6.

⁶¹ John Thomas, “The Rise of the Independent and Self-Governing Monasteries as Reflected in the Monastic *Typika*,” *GOTR* 30 (1985), 21–30.

PREFACE

The reformers in the East, some of whom were themselves *charistikarioi*, sought to promote, in place of the *charistike*, the more limited system of *ephoreia*, which emphasized the protection and supervision of monasteries rather than their possession. According to (32) *Mamas*, the patriarchs had controlled the monastery in the past and had granted it “to various *charistikarioi*, the greatest number of whom used to abuse the monastery as landed property and to seek nothing else but what they were going to gain from it, and there was no concern for the monastery and its affairs.” When the *mystikos* George the Cappadocian held St. Mamas, however, he realized that it might again come under the control of a bad *charistikarios*, and therefore “sought to have the monastery made independent and released from the patriarchal rights” [First *Semeioma*]. In 1261–80 the emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos wrote in (37) *Auxentios*,

one must hold tightly to freedom for the stability of the monastery and for its continued progress. Monasteries that are self-governing are more flourishing and self-sufficient than those that are subject to various individuals. For these enjoy what they possess without any diminution, whereas the others receive little or nothing of their revenues. All or most of their possessions are appropriated [by their lords] as if they were their own and they distribute them as their own property. [2]

It was not easy even for an emperor, however, to safeguard a monastery from outside interference, especially when it took the form of protection. After the flurry of reform in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the real independence of monasteries tended to diminish, and the *ephoroi*, like the advocates in the West, increasingly exercised a variety of powers in their own names.

One of the most important ways to secure the independence of a monastery was to free it from obligations and payments to external authorities.⁶² These were known as *exkousseia*; in the West they were called immunities when they involved the exclusion of royal officials from monastic lands and called exemptions when they applied to episcopal authority. (19) *Attaleiates* for the almshouse at Rhaidestos and the monastery of *Panoiktirmon* in Constantinople, which dates from 1077, included a privilege of emperor Michael VII Doukas exempting the monks from an elaborate list of obligations, including the billeting of officers and soldiers, various types of provisioning, forced sales and purchases, compulsory services, and any number of payments, levies, and taxes of which the precise nature is uncertain [INV10]. It is interesting to compare this list with that in the privilege granted the following year, in 1078, to the monastery of Leno in Lombardy by pope Gregory VII, who forbade any layperson to control the monastery or to hold a court without the abbot’s permission and who freed the monks from having to provide food, housing, or fodder for animals, pay moorage dues, or render any “other public obligation.”⁶³

The reformers in both the East and the West particularly wanted to prevent any outside control over the selection of monastic superiors, especially by a lay *charistikarios*, and advocated some type of internal selection. The authors of a few *typika* allowed the founder to appoint the superior, occasionally without the participation of the community, as in (60) *Charsianeites* [A5],

⁶² Charanis, “Monastic Properties,” pp. 64–65.

⁶³ Leo Santifaller, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen Papst Gregors VII.: Quellen—Urkunden, Regesta, Facsimilia* (= ST 190) (Vatican City, 1957), pp. 167–70, no. 150.

PREFACE

[C18], but they mostly favored election either by lot or by the community. In some houses, the principal role was played by the elder or more preeminent monks, as on Mt. Athos, where Manuel II Palaiologos, in (59) *Manuel II*, established in 1406 that superiors should be chosen by fifteen councillors and some monks who lived outside the monastery [3]. In most houses the superiors were elected either by all or a majority of the members of the community. In the case of disagreement, in (32) *Mamas* [1], the superior was chosen by lot, and in (37) *Auxentios*, the superior of the monastery of the archangel Michael was appointed by the emperor [3].

How a new superior took office was apparently of less concern to the writers of the *typika* than to western monastic reformers, for whom the question of investiture was at the heart of the eleventh-century reform movement. In the East, practice varied from house to house, and the terms *cheirotonia* (ordination), *sphragis* (blessing), and *procheirisis* (appointment) were used interchangeably in the *typika* to describe the installation of the superior and other monastic officials.⁶⁴ According to (27) *Kecharitomene*, the new superior took her pastoral staff from the altar [11], which corresponded to the procedure known in the West as auto- or self-investiture,⁶⁵ and in (58) *Menoikeion*, the bishop was explicitly forbidden to install the superior [3]. In (28) *Pantokrator* [25] and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [33], the superiors were installed by the bishop or metropolitan, but took their staffs respectively from the icon of the *Pantokrator* and from the altar. In (31) *Areia*, though the *typikon* is not entirely clear, the bishop invested the first superior but was not involved in the election or investiture of subsequent superiors, who received the staff from the priest [M4], [M7], [M15], [T10].

The role of the bishop in the installation of the superior does not figure prominently in most of the *typika*. The patriarch or bishop was often simply said to bless the superior, and occasionally to grant the authority to hear confession, though a closer study of the precise wording in these and other sources might throw further light on the question. A provision for blessing by the patriarch was added to the section dealing with the selection of the superior in (30) *Phoberos* [35], which otherwise derived from (22) *Evergetis* [35], and the bishop was said to install and bless the superior after he was chosen by the monks in (34) *Machairas* [17], [140]. In (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, the patriarch both blessed and gave the staff to the superior [26], but there is no reference to either blessing or investiture in the *typikon* of a nearby monastery, (60) *Charsianeites*, though the superior visited the patriarch twice a year to show his orthodoxy [C12].

The authors of some *typika* even allowed lay investiture, which was anathema to reformers in the West. In (37) *Auxentios*, the superior was invested with rod and staff by the emperor (who also appointed him if there was disagreement within the community) and was blessed by the bishop, who was otherwise entitled only to liturgical commemoration and three small honoraria [2–3].

⁶⁴ See J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὁφίκια de l'église byzantine* (Paris, 1970), p. 612, s.v. *sphragis*. *Cheirotonia* is used for the self-investiture of the superior in (22) *Evergetis* [13] and is translated as “installation” here and as “nomination” by P. Gautier, “Le typikon de la Théotokos Evergétis,” *REB* 40 (1982), 46. *Procheirisis* is used for the lay investiture in (19) *Panoiktirmon* [26] and for the installation of the superior by the bishop in (34) *Machairas* [17], where it is later described as *sphragis* [140].

⁶⁵ On auto-investiture at Cluny, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, “Coutumes et statuts clunisiens comme sources historiques (ca. 990–ca. 1200),” *Revue Mabillon*, n.s., 3 (1992), 39–43.

PREFACE

The superior of the nunnery of Lips received the staff from the emperor and a box containing the *typikon*, (39) *Lips* [7], from the priest. According to (51) *Koutloumoussi*, the *voivode* of Wallachia confirmed the superior of the monastery on Mt. Athos [A13], and in (58) *Menoikeion* the superior of the monastery of St. John the Forerunner received the staff from the emperor himself “if the chance arises” or by order of the emperor [22].

The superior, once installed, exercised a wide range of responsibilities. According to (37) *Auxentios*,

Governance is in fact a single thing but becomes many-sided because of the diversity among those governed. The person who assumes such office may have to take various titles to fit each situation. Sometimes he is addressed as father, at other times as superior, at times of course as shepherd, helmsman, guide, guardian, teacher, salt, lamp, and light. As a father he ought to suffer along with those who are weak. As a person in authority he ought to be a shield to those who are under attack. As a helmsman he ought to sail over the dangerous waves. As a shepherd he ought to settle his flock in verdant pastures and provide them with the waters of spiritual repose. As a guardian he ought to give timely warning to those he guards of the approach of something harmful. As a teacher he trains those whose understanding is like that of children. As salt he seasons what is lacking in spiritual flavor with virtues, or he causes what is frivolous and starting to decay to tighten up. As a lamp and a light he shows his flock the unencumbered path of virtue. [4]

This passage deals primarily with the internal, pastoral duties of superiors, but they also exercised authority over people and lands outside the monastery. Isaac Komnenos, in (29) *Kosmosoteira*, referred to the superior’s jurisdiction over arsonists and to his responsibility for the behavior of the peasants, who were not allowed to eat eggs, cheese, or meat on Wednesdays or Fridays [98], [104].

The superiors were expected to rule in consultation with the members of the community, as in the *Rule of Benedict*, or at least with the officials and *seniores*, but in practice they often behaved autocratically. In (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, the superior of the nunnery was to rule in a manly way [27], according to the *typikon* written by Theodora Synadene in 1327–35. As time went on, monastic administration tended to concentrate increasingly in the hands of the superior, over whom the only real control seems to have been the threat of deposition, to which there are many references in the *typika*.

The superior was assisted in administering the monastery by a variety of officials and by a group of preeminent, leading, or senior members of the community, who are described in (24) *Christodoulos* as “more prominent” [A20] and in (55) *Athanasios I* as “more pious” [5] and who presumably corresponded to the somewhat shadowy category of *seniores* found in western monastic sources.⁶⁶ The officials were sometimes themselves the preeminent members, but the exact relation between the two groups, and how they were chosen, is unclear. In (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, the officials were elected by the nuns, not appointed by the superior, but the *ecclesiarchissa* was

⁶⁶ See my “*Seniores et pueri à Cluny aux X^e, XI^e siècles*,” in *Histoire et société: Mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*, vol. 3 (Aix-en-Provence, 1992), pp. 17–24.

PREFACE

chosen by the superior and nuns [50], [73–74]. (13) *Ath. Typikon* [52] for the Great Lavra and (28) *Pantokrator* [9] specified that the steward might not be a priest, perhaps because the secular responsibilities of the steward were considered incompatible with the sacerdotal dignity.

The basic unit of administration was the monastic community, of which the members lived a common life together, and the authors of the *typika* for the most part favored cenobitical over eremitical forms of life. In (32) *Mamas*, cenobitism was equated with solitude in the sense that it was cut off from the world, and all forms of non-cenobital monasticism were forbidden [25–26].⁶⁷ Solitude led to disobedience, according to (13) *Ath. Typikon* [40]; the superiority of common life to solitude was stressed in (35) *Skoteine* [13]; and the general *typikon* for the monasteries on Mt. Athos, (59) *Manuel II*, said that monks who wanted to have their own property sometimes used the desire for solitude as a pretext [1]. Hermits were also accused of disobedience, willfulness, and acquisitiveness in many western monastic texts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and most of the contemporary reformers in the West favored community life for monks and nuns.

The clear preference for cenobitism expressed in the *typika* is important in view of the emphasis put by some scholars on eremitism, and its combination with cenobitism, in Byzantine monasticism. The opinion of Delehaye that “the mixture of the cenobitic and eremitic lives was one of the most characteristic particularities of eastern monasteries” was cited with approval by Papachryssanthou, who argued, largely on the basis of hagiographical sources, that the interpenetration of cenobitism and anchoritism was peculiar to Byzantine monasticism and left little room for the traditional type of lavra, which usually referred in Byzantine texts to a *koinobium* that had either anchoritic cells within the community or associated anchorites living in detached cells.⁶⁸ These practices were not distinctively eastern, however, and recent research has shown that hermits were often associated with cenobitic monasteries in the West.⁶⁹ At Cluny, for instance, some four hundred monks were said to live in the surrounding woods during the first half of the twelfth century, and they were occasionally joined for temporary retreats not only by members of the community but also by the abbot himself.⁷⁰ Prieories often served as permanent or temporary eremitical retreats for monks who needed a period of solitude and private devotions.⁷¹

⁶⁷ See also (58) *Menoikeion* [11].

⁶⁸ Hippolyte Delehaye, “La vie de saint Paul le Jeune († 955) et la chronologie de Métaphraste” (1893), in his *Mélanges d’hagiographie grecque et latine* (= Subsidia Hagiographica 42) (Brussels, 1966), p. 97, and Denise Papachryssanthou, “La vie monastique dans les campagnes byzantines du VIII^e au XI^e siècle: Ermitages, groupes, communautés,” *Byzantion* 43 (1973), 169–75; cf. Mahfoud, *Organisation*, pp. 53–54 and 126 on monasticism in Egypt, Syria, and the Holy Land.

⁶⁹ See my “Eremitical Forms of Monastic Life,” in *Istituzioni monastiche e istituzioni canonicali in Occidente (1123–1215). Atti della settima Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 28 agosto–3 settembre 1977* (= Pubblicazioni dell’Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Miscellanea del Centro di studi medioevali 9) (Milan, 1980), pp. 239–64.

⁷⁰ See the chronicle of Cluny in *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, ed. Martin Marrier and André Duchesne (Paris, 1614), col. 600BC, and Jean Leclercq, “Pierre le Vénérable et l’érémisme clunisien,” in *Petrus Venerabilis, 1156–1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Death*, ed. Giles Constable and James Kritzeck (= Studia Anselmiana 40) (Rome, 1956), pp. 99–120.

⁷¹ Jacques Dubois, “La vie des moines dans les prieurés du moyen âge,” *Lettre de Ligugé* 133 (1969.1), 10–33.

PREFACE

Not all the monks were cenobites, however, either in practice or in principle, and there are many references in the *typika* to solitaries, who were called *kelliotai* or *hesychastai*—which derived from the term for prayer or contemplation—and who lived in cells or caves outside a monastery but remained members of the community and also to monks who owned property and lived by themselves within a community and whose way of life was known as idiorhythmic, or self-regulating. The solitaries mentioned in the *typikon* of Christodoulos of Patmos in 1091–3, (24) *Christodoulos* [A24], and in (34) *Machairas* [152] in 1210 returned to the monastery on Saturdays and Sundays and were given provisions there, and in (42) *Sabas* [3], [7] the community in the early twelfth century included both monks who lived together in the *lavra* and *hesychastai*, who apparently participated in the vigils but not in the liturgical commemoration.

In the late Middle Ages the opposition to non-cenobitic forms of life seems to have weakened, and there was a growing acceptance of the coexistence of community and solitary life, as seen in (37) *Auxentios*, where cells were set aside for solitaries [11], and in (45) *Neophytos* for Ktima, which started as a hermitage and where the superior was known as “the recluse [*enkleistos*]” [14].⁷² In (60) *Charsianeites* the different forms of monasticism are compared to the many mansions in the house of God and it is said that the life of monks who lived with others but by themselves was between the cenobitic and communal life, on one hand, and the solitary and reclusive life, which is called angelic, on the other [B2]. A *kelliotas*, it said, was “a monk in his habit, but has chosen an idiorhythmic regime and to live by himself as he wishes” [B18]. The solitary and idiorhythmic forms of life overlapped, as the passage cited above from the general *typikon* of Mt. Athos shows.

Although Byzantine monasteries remained in principle opposed to private property, personal poverty was not a rule, and exceptions were regularly made, especially for monks and nuns who came from powerful and wealthy families and who, by the standards of the time, could not be expected to live a common life with other members of a community.⁷³ The superiors of monasteries were allowed to have private property by John Tzimiskes in his *typikon* for Mt. Athos in 971–2, (12) *Tzimiskes* [6–7]; in (19) *Attaleiates*, the eunuch monks at the *Panoiktirmon* monastery in Constantinople had servants to whom pensions were given after their masters died [42]; and in (23) *Pakourianos* [4], for the monastery at Bačkovo, and in (28) *Pantokrator* [17], concessions were made for monks who were accustomed to luxurious ways. In (24) *Christodoulos*, personal servants at Patmos were required to be bearded before they could sit at table or drink wine [C4]. In some houses the members received cash allowances to cover such expenses as clothes, which might otherwise be a source of dispute, and bathing in establishments located outside the monastery, as in (19) *Attaleiates* [33], [35] and (32) *Mamas* [28]. In other houses, however, such as the monastery of the archangel Michael, (37) *Auxentios* [7], all food and clothing was distributed by

⁷² A. P. Kazhdan and Ann Wharton Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1985), p. 87, commented on the growing individualism in late Byzantine monasticism, which they contrasted with the “coherent communities bound by the strict discipline of the monastic orders” in the West.

⁷³ Emil Herman, “Die Regelung der Armut in den byzantinischen Klöstern,” *OCP* 7 (1941), esp. 419–21.

PREFACE

the monastic officials. The *typikon* of Koutloumoussi on Mt. Athos, which dates from 1370–78, illustrates the problems that were created by the presence in a monastery of powerful men who expected special treatment. (59) *Manuel II* allowed the Athonite monks to keep a life interest in personal property [2], and a few monasteries on Mt. Athos have remained idiorhythmic down to the present time. Such arrangements were never sanctioned in the West, where personal poverty was always the rule, in spite of abuses, and where the lay servants, or *famuli*, customarily lived outside the monastic enclosure and worked for the community, not for individual members.⁷⁴

Mention has already been made of the internal and external monks and imposed guests who appear in the *typika* and who were clearly regarded as an abuse, though their precise status is unclear. Internal and external monks were distinguished in (28) *Pantokrator* [28], and Isaac Komnenos specified that his secretary should be treated as an internal monk in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [107]. *Kelliotai* and external monks were forbidden in (32) *Mamas* [26], of which the provisions, with the addition of imposed guests, were repeated in (58) *Menoikeion* [11]. These sources suggest that internal monks, who may have been monks assigned from other houses, lived in the monastery but did not participate in the common life, and that external monks lived outside at the expense of the monastery. Imposed guests were apparently appointed by the patron, but they may have included the political prisoners who were sometimes incarcerated in monasteries.

Some monks in the West also lived outside monasteries, either when they served parishes or administered monastic estates or as independent hermits or wandering monks, who were called *sarabaitae* and *gyrovagi* in the *Rule of Benedict*. They had no special name or status, however, when they belonged to a community and obeyed its superior. From the twelfth century on, there were also lay pensioners or corrodians who received material support from monasteries, and sometimes lived in them, usually in return for some sort of payment. Though disapproved of by reformers, corrodies were a recognized way for poor monasteries to acquire property and to use their underoccupied facilities.⁷⁵

The authors of the *typika* frequently refer to monastic possessions and finances, which were a subject of concern in both the East and the West.⁷⁶ Neophytos, in the early thirteenth century, was opposed to the acquisition of property by his hermitage in Cyprus, (45) *Neophytos* [10], and in 1261–80/81 Michael VIII Palaiologos mentioned the resentment at the wealth of monasteries in (37) *Auxentios* [9]. The security of monastic institutions was more often threatened by poverty than by wealth, however, and the authors of most *typika* sought to secure both an adequate endowment for their monasteries and, when possible, exemptions from taxes and other fiscal obligations. (60) *Charsianeites*, which dates from the early fifteenth century, was exceptional in its requirement that the monks “must pay the fisc its due . . . from the income of the monastic estates” [C8].

⁷⁴ Ursmer Berlière, *La familia dans les monastères bénédictins du moyen âge* (= Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, Mémoires in-8° [ser. 2] 29.2) (Brussels, 1931).

⁷⁵ See Howard M. Stuchert, *Corrodies in the English Monasteries: A Study in English Social History of the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1923).

⁷⁶ Charanis, “Monastic Properties,” esp. pp. 56–59 and 82–87.

PREFACE

There are some interesting references elsewhere in this *typikon* to taxes and tithes [A11] and in (34) *Machairas* to the tithing of male but not of female animals, “because of the wool and the cheese” [170]. Monastic estates were mostly run by dependencies and cultivated by dependent workers, for whose treatment Isaac Komnenos expressed a concern in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [71], [76]. Two other important sources of revenue for monasteries were gifts made at the time of entry, which were prohibited in some houses but welcomed by others, and grants in return for liturgical commemoration and burial. A few houses required rich candidates to dispose of their property before joining the community. Practice with regard to payment for entry into monasteries also varied in the West, where compulsory payments were considered simoniacal, but voluntary offerings were commonly accepted.⁷⁷

After the expenses of the community itself, philanthropic and eleemosynary activities were the most important drain on monastic revenues, though the *typika* give no indication of the proportion of monastic income they absorbed. Almost all houses distributed alms to the poor and to travelers at the gate (*pyle* or *porta*) and provided food and lodging in the *xenodocheion*, or guesthouse, and many of them assisted orphans, prisoners, and women who lacked the wherewithal for dowries. The hospital associated with the *Pantokrator* in Constantinople was unique, but many houses supported hospices, old age homes, and hospitals, and also bridges, which were considered a worthy object of charity and were mentioned in several *typika*, including (29) *Kosmosoteira* [67]. In (23) *Pakourianos* [29], the monastic hostel at Bačkovo was cared for by peasants who held responsible positions and who in some respects resembled the officeholders or *ministeriales* who performed comparable duties for monasteries in the West.

The protection of monastic property often presented a greater problem than its acquisition, and the rising concern in the eleventh and twelfth centuries over the alienation of consecrated property paralleled the efforts of the reformers in the West to recover ecclesiastical revenues and possessions from lay owners and to prevent further alienation to either secular or ecclesiastical authorities. Even the greatest houses, and those with the most comprehensive privileges, were liable to oppression and invasion by nobles and churchmen, including the emperor and the patriarch, and their founders tried to find the proper balance between protection and control. The ideal was a powerful but distant protector—strong enough to repel invaders but sufficiently removed not to be an oppressor himself—like the so-called umbrella-advocacy exercised by the western emperor over Cistercian abbeys in the Holy Roman Empire or the regional protectorates established by great prelates such as the archbishops of Mainz and Cologne.

The bishops were more often presented in the *typika* as a source of difficulty than of protection. Very few mentioned decrees such as the fourth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which granted the bishops authority over the monks in every town and region, and many of them either failed to refer to the bishop at all or asserted that their monasteries were independent and exempt from the bishop. In (23) *Pakourianos* he was excluded from the liturgical services at Bačkovo [3], and at the monastery of St. Demetrios-Kellibara at Constantinople, according to the *typikon* is-

⁷⁷ Joseph H. Lynch, *Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260: A Social, Economic, and Legal Study* (Columbus, Ohio, 1976).

PREFACE

sued by Michael Palaiologos in 1282, (38) *Kellibara I*, the patriarch himself was entitled only to liturgical commemoration [15]. Episcopal rights were explicitly rejected at the monastery at Ematha, (36) *Blemmydes*, where no outsider was allowed to investigate or correct any spiritual failings [1]. This is not to say that bishops were systematically excluded from all monasteries. Their role in confirming and blessing and occasionally in choosing new monastic superiors and in granting the power to hear confessions has already been discussed, and their supervisory powers were recognized in a few houses, as in (29) *Kosmosoteira* [41]. In (31) *Areia*, which bishop Leo of Nauplia wrote in 1143–49, the bishop had no authority over the monastery but could investigate spiritual faults [M11], and in (35) *Skoteine* any misunderstandings were laid first before outside spiritual fathers, perhaps local superiors, and then before the bishop [16]. The patriarch of Constantinople was recognized as the protector of the monastery in (37) *Auxentios* [16] and had the power of spiritual correction over the nuns in (39) *Lips* [1].

The authors of the *typika* were more likely to look for protection to secular than to ecclesiastical authorities. Mindful of the dangers of *charistikarioi*, they turned to the more restricted type of protector known as an *ephoros* or *prostates*, who was often a ruler, a member of the founding family, or a great noble, as in (49) *Geromeri* [15]. Local magnates were also sometimes used, and Isaac Komnenos, in (29) *Kosmosoteira*, expected the military men in nearby villages and the *vestiaritai*, or imperial bodyguards, to defend the monastery [110], [112]. Some *ephoroi* acted not only as protectors in external affairs, but also as internal administrators, like commendatory abbots in the West. At the monastery of St. John the Forerunner, (58) *Menoikeion* stated that the *ephoros* worked with the superior and monastic officials on both the spiritual and the material affairs of the community [21–22]. Such a position resembled that of the western advocates, who exercised jurisdiction in the name of the monastery and were often chosen from within the family of the founder. The rewards of the *ephoros* were in principle spiritual. They were defined in (50) *Gerasimos* as the remission of sins, the health of the soul and body, and a good reputation [A4], [B5]. In practice, however, they often took a more concrete form. There was a balance in medieval monasteries between the need for protection and the desire for independence. Just as the advocates in the West inherited some aspects of lay proprietorship, the *ephoroi* exercised some of the same powers as the *charistikarioi*, but as time went on, their authority was effectively limited.

When all forms of human protection failed, religious communities sought supernatural assistance, both from God and from the saints, whose role as protectors was less prominent in the *typika* than in hagiographical texts, but who are mentioned several times, as in (38) *Kellibara I*, where the emperor is called upon to guard the monastery in such a way as to have “the great athlete of Christ, Demetrios, as his legate and intermediary” [16]. Even when they were not specifically invoked, the saints were ever present in the monasteries. The images of saints appeared to be alive at Bera, according to (29) *Kosmosoteira* [9]; the patron saint—“our fervent patron and helper”—was personally present in (32) *Mamas* [4], [9], [22], [46]; and in (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, the saints were “living images” and “efficacious and inspiring figures” whose lives were models for the nuns to follow [30]. The close relation between nature and supernature was characteristic of religious life in both the East and the West and is a reminder that the monks and nuns lived in the company of supernatural powers and the expectation of eternal salvation. Although the *typika*

PREFACE

published in these volumes are primarily concerned with the outer forms of monastic life, they were written not only for institutions but also for the men and women who sought to lead a Christian life in religious communities, and they reflect the changing aspirations and objectives of monks and nuns and of their patrons throughout the course of the Middle Ages.

Giles Constable