

This is an extract from:

*Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents:*

*A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*

*edited by John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero*

*with the assistance of Giles Constable*

Published by

*Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection*

*Washington, D.C.*

in five volumes as number 35 in the series Dumbarton Oaks Studies

© 2000 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

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

## Early Monastic Rules

The earliest of the documents in our collection, (1) *Apa Abraham*, dates from the first quarter of the seventh century, at which time Christian monasticism had already existed in the Eastern Mediterranean world for well over three hundred years. By the time the first surviving monastic *typika*, (2) *Pantelleria* and (4) *Stoudios*, made their appearance towards the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth centuries, respectively, approximately a half-millennium of monastic history had already taken place. Even if, as many contemporary experts suspect, a profound cultural and institutional break occurred between the end of late antiquity and the beginning of the medieval period during this interval,<sup>1</sup> our medieval Byzantine monastic foundation documents confirm that there was some continuity of monastic institutions and customs from the ancient world. The surviving monastic rules of late antiquity, considered together with our monastic foundation documents, enable us to form some estimation of the nature and extent of medieval Byzantium's inheritance from the monastic traditions of the ancient world.

### A. *The Ascetic Treatises of Basil of Caesarea*

Basil, archbishop of Caesarea (370–379), was the author of the earliest surviving monastic rules composed in the Greek language. These are the so-called *Longer Rules* [LR] and *Shorter Rules* [SR].<sup>2</sup> As documents of late antiquity that are already readily available in English translations as well as in some other languages, these rules have not been retranslated for our collection of medieval Byzantine monastic foundation documents.<sup>3</sup> Basil was also the author of some but by no means all of the other documents that circulated along with the rules as his *Ascetic Treatises* in many medieval Byzantine manuscripts.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Alexander Kazhdan and Anthony Cutler, "Continuity and Discontinuity in Byzantine History," *Byzantion* 52 (1982), 429–78, and Warren Treadgold, "The Break in Byzantium and the Gap in Byzantine Studies," *BF* 15 (1990), 289–316 with references therein for a discussion of the problem.

<sup>2</sup> *Regulae fusius tractatae*, PG 31, cols. 889–1053 and *Regulae brevius tractatae*, cols. 1080–1306; valuable studies include: Emanuel Amand de Mendieta, "Le système cénobitique basilien comparé au système cénobitique pachômien," *RHR* 152 (1957), 31–80; Gustave Bardy, "Basile (Règle de saint)," *DDC* 2 (1937), cols. 218–24; Ferdinand Laun, "Die beiden Regeln des Basilius, ihre Echtheit und Entstehung," *ZKG* 44 (1925), 1–61; Adalbert de Vogüé, "The Greater Rules of Saint Basil—A Survey," *Word and Spirit: A Monastic Review* 1 (1979), 49–85.

<sup>3</sup> English translations by W. K. L. Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil* (London, 1925), *Longer Rules*, pp. 145–228, *Shorter Rules*, pp. 229–351; Sister M. Monica Wagner, *Saint Basil, Ascetical Works* (New York, 1950), *Longer Rules*, pp. 223–337.

<sup>4</sup> For a proposed list of the authentic ascetical works, see E. Amand de Mendieta, *L'ascèse monastique de saint Basile. Essai historique* (Paris, 1949), p. xxvi; Jean Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des Ascétiques de saint Basile* (Louvain, 1953), provides a description and classification of the manuscripts.

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

Unlike the later monastic *typika*, both of the Basilian rules are simply a series of responses to questions posed to Basil by his disciples. No certain evidence exists to fix a date for the *Longer Rules*, though they likely are from after Basil's return to Caesarea in 358 following his tour of monastic foundations throughout the eastern Roman Empire. They may have been intended to guide Basil's first monastic settlement near Annesi in Pontos in the 360s, but could also date from some time in the 370s during his episcopacy. Since the *Shorter Rules* reference the *Longer Rules*, they clearly were written somewhat later.

Although it seems to us that to label the entire Byzantine monastic tradition as "Basilian,"<sup>5</sup> as is frequently done by non-specialist commentators, is mistaken, the Basilian tradition (including the *Rules*) certainly did serve as an enduring—if also inconsistent—influence on the later documents included in our collection. Therefore, without presuming to offer an authoritative summary of this tradition, it does not seem out of place to examine here briefly how Basilian monasticism related to its medieval Byzantine successors.

### 1. The *Longer Rules*

#### a. Regulation of Admissions and Departures

Significant differences with the later Byzantine monastic traditions appear in the *Longer Rules'* discussion of admissions to the Basilian monastery. Applicants were to be tested through hard labor [LR 10], an idea employed in those Byzantine monasteries in which manual labor remained an important part of daily life for at least some of the monks.<sup>6</sup> Slaves [LR 11] could not be accepted, nor a married man [LR 12] without his spouse's consent. Medieval Byzantine founders, generally less respectful of public authority, were less scrupulous.<sup>7</sup>

In his day, Basil welcomed young orphans [LR 15], [LR 53] to the monastery, though they were to be housed, fed and educated apart from the adult monks. Many—but not all—medieval Byzantine founders, fearing the potential for sexual misconduct, came to disagree; the author of (36) *Blemmydes* [9] in the thirteenth century is a conspicuous exception.

Once accepted, monks could not leave the monastery [LR 14]—unless they had suffered injury, on pain of sacrilege. Medieval Byzantine attitudes varied.<sup>8</sup> After attempting to enforce

<sup>5</sup> For the traditional view, see Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 3 (Westminster, Md., 1960), p. 213: "The Basilians are the one great order of the Orient," rightly rejected by Cyril Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome* (New York, 1980), p. 110: "As has often been observed, there never existed in the Greek Church a 'Basilian Order' or, for that matter, any other monastic 'order' . . ."

<sup>6</sup> For testing of novices through manual labor in Byzantine times, see (22) *Evergetis* [37], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [53], (30) *Phoberos* [51], (32) *Mamas* [22], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [22], and (34) *Machairas* [56].

<sup>7</sup> In the fifteenth century, however, (54) *Neilos Damilas* [5] provides that women should not be admitted to the convent on Crete for which that document was written without the consent of their husbands.

<sup>8</sup> For monastic stability in Byzantine times, often discussed in terms of the acceptability of an outside monk (a *xenokourites*) for tonsure, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [14], (4) *Stoudios* [24], (11) *Ath. Rule* [18], [34], (12) *Tzimiskes* [2], [4], [5], [8], (13) *Ath. Typikon* [22], (15) *Constantine IX* [7], (19) *Attaleiates* [30], (22) *Evergetis* [37], (23) *Christodoulos* [B12], (27) *Kecharitomene* [54], (30) *Phoberos* [52], (32) *Mamas* [22], [43], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [22], (34) *Machairas* [60], [148], (35) *Skoteine* [17], (37) *Auxentios* [3], and

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

monastic stability in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, Byzantine founders of the reform era were more concerned that monks who wished to depart not be permitted to reclaim their entrance gifts; from the early thirteenth century some founders sought to enforce stability once again, but probably without a great deal of success.

### b. Prohibition of Private Property

Like later monastic founders in the reform tradition, Basil was very much concerned with issues of property renunciation [LR 8] by postulants, and laid down specific rules [LR 9] for how this was to be distributed. However, some medieval Byzantine founders would not insist on a complete surrender of all personal property.<sup>9</sup>

### c. Cenobitical Bias

Like most of the later monastic *typika*, the *Longer Rules* are forthrightly partial to cenobitical life and hostile to solitaries [LR 7], cf. [LR 24]. Coming from an era when the public authorities of the church (perhaps including Basil himself at this point) were still strong, it is not surprising that the multiplication of monasteries in one place is condemned [LR 35]. By medieval Byzantine times (indeed as early as the sixth century) the overwhelming reliance on private initiative for founding monasteries would have made any attempt to promote a diocesan centralization futile.<sup>10</sup>

### d. The Superior's Style of Rule

The superior appears to have been a much less autocratic ruler than many of his early medieval Byzantine successors. "Aged and wise" monks were charged with admonishing [LR 27] an errant superior, a precaution revived periodically in later Byzantine times along with the provision that the superior should take counsel [LR 48] with them on important issues.<sup>11</sup> He should also meet

---

(39) *Lips* [20]; for bans on reclamation of entrance gifts, see (22) *Evergetis* [37], (27) *Kecharitomene* [7], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [55], (30) *Phoberos* [53A], (32) *Mamas* [5], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [5], and (34) *Machairas* [59]; for the revival of strictness, see (45) *Neophytos* [C5], [CB1] ff, cf. [4], (55) *Athanasios I* [7], and (59) *Manuel II* [8]. For a general discussion of the problem, see Emil Herman, "La 'stabilitas loci' nel monachismo bizantino," *OCP* 21 (1955), 115–42, and Donald M. Nicol, "Instabilitas Loci: The Wanderlust of Late Byzantine Monks," *SCH* 22 (1985), 193–202.

<sup>9</sup> For the problem of whether to insist on a complete property renunciation or permit its partial retention, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [2], [7]; (9) *Galesios* [191]; (10) *Eleousa* [5]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [34]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [30], [32]; (19) *Attaleiates* [33], [35]; (20) *Black Mountain* [84]; (21) *Roidion* [A3]; (22) *Evergetis* [22]; (23) *Pakourianos* [5]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A22]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [50]; (28) *Pantokrator* [32]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [47]; (30) *Phoberos* [41]; (32) *Mamas* [26], [35]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [34]; (34) *Machairas* [87]; (35) *Skoteine* [13]; (37) *Auxentios* [5]; (45) *Neophytos* [C10]; (52) *Choumnos* [B11], [B19]; (53) *Meteora* [8]; (55) *Athanasios I* [5]; (56) *Kellibara II* [9]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [46]; (58) *Menoikeion* [12]; (59) *Manuel II* [2], [12]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B5].

<sup>10</sup> See my *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, D.C., 1987), pp. 46–47, 115–17, 123–33.

<sup>11</sup> For similar schemes of consultative governance in Byzantine times, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [22]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [32]; (22) *Evergetis* [13], [14], [17], [19]; (23) *Pakourianos* [5], [19]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [34], [41], [45], [78]; (30) *Phoberos* [35], [38]; (31) *Areia* [M9], [T10]; (38) *Kellibara I* [15]; (39) *Lips* [10], [27], [32], [38], [39]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [18]; (55) *Athanasios I* [5]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [67]; (58) *Menoikeion* [22]; and (59) *Manuel II* [3], [6], [7].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

periodically [LR 54] with the heads of other monastic communities on matters of common interest, advice that was rarely practical for medieval Byzantine monastic communities or desired by their jealous founders. Like the superiors of later Byzantine monasteries, the Basilian superior was told [LR 30] not to be proud of his rank, nor to rebuke [LR 50] his monks when angry.<sup>12</sup> The superior was further instructed [LR 31] to render personal service to the monks of his community, a precept evidently too radical even for reform-minded founders of medieval monasteries.

### e. Daily Life of the Monks

The regulation of daily life bears a fair correspondence to many later Byzantine practices. Silence [LR 13] was recommended for novices; as in certain later medieval documents, other monks were to speak sparingly and laughter [LR 17] was proscribed.<sup>13</sup> As in many but not all medieval Byzantine monasteries, confession was a superior's duty to offer [LR 25] and mandatory for monks [LR 26] who were told [LR 46] not to conceal sins from their superior.<sup>14</sup>

### f. Importance of Manual Labor

In terms of the economic regime portrayed, there is a strong endorsement [LR 37] of manual labor. Monks were to pursue their appropriate trades [LR 38] as assigned by the superiors, with tools that were the common property [LR 41] of the community. Yet there were restrictions on commerce [LR 39], [LR 40], which was to have a strictly utilitarian focus. The advocacy of manual labor as a salutary discipline for all monks gradually died out in medieval Byzantine monasticism, to be replaced by an increasing emphasis on the performance of the monastic hours, psalmody, and other aspects of liturgical life.<sup>15</sup> Ideology aside, however, some medieval monastic communi-

<sup>12</sup> For echoes of these injunctions in later Byzantine exhortations to the superior, see (10) *Eleousa* [12]; (22) *Evergetis* [17]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [12]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [44]; (30) *Phoberos* [36]; (32) *Mamas* [42], [48]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [41], [47]; (34) *Machairas* [144]; (58) *Menoikeion* [19]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B9].

<sup>13</sup> For restriction of conversation and proscription of laughter in later Byzantine documents, see (2) *Pantelleria* [7], [18]; (7) *Latros* [11]; (22) *Evergetis* [9], [21]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [41], [47]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [21]; (30) *Phoberos* [21], [25], [39], [40]; (32) *Mamas* [17], [35]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [17], [34]; (34) *Machairas* [63], [113]; (55) *Athanasios I* [4]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [8], [17].

<sup>14</sup> For the requirement of confession to the superior and authorized alternatives in Byzantine times see (22) *Evergetis* [7], [15], (23) *Pakourianos* [13], (28) *Pantokrator* [20], (27) *Kecharitomene* [16], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [16], [17], (30) *Phoberos* [14], [35], (31) *Areia* [T2], (32) *Mamas* [29], [30], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [29], [30], (34) *Machairas* [50], [51], [53], [141], (39) *Lips* [11], (52) *Choumnos* [A17], (54) *Neilos Damilas* [9], (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [105], [109], [111], (58) *Menoikeion* [13], and (60) *Charsianeites* [B4].

<sup>15</sup> For the practice of manual labor in Byzantine times, see (2) *Pantelleria* [14], [16]; (4) *Stoudios* [26], [33]; (6) *Rila* [17], (7) *Latros* [4]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [20]; (15) *Constantine IX* [4], [10]; (20) *Black Mountain* [78], [79], [80], [82], [83]; (22) *Evergetis* [4], [21], [33]; (23) *Pakourianos* [14]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A22], [A23]; (26) *Luke of Messina* [6]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [6], [25], [27], [75]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [39]; (30) *Phoberos* [48]; (32) *Mamas* [19], [23], [35], [47]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [19], [23], [46]; (34) *Machairas* [32], [33], [86], [113], [115], [120]; (35) *Skoteine* [23], [41]; (37) *Mount Auxentios* [6], [7]; (45) *Neophytos* [15], [18], [20], [C6], [C13]; (52) *Choumnos* [B8], [B17], [B18]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [6], [7], [8], [10], [16]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [66], [95], [96], [97]; (58) *Menoikeion* [10], [12], [17]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B20]. For the generally greater importance of liturgical functions, see (4) *Stoudios*; (10) *Eleousa* [6] ff.; (11) *Ath. Rule*; (19) *Attaleiates* [32]; (20) *Black Mountain*; (22) *Evergetis* [4], [7], [33]; (23) *Pakourianos* [6]; (24)

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

ties became even more entrepreneurial than Basil could have foreseen, despite similar anti-commercial regulation by the founders of their own era.<sup>16</sup>

### g. Food, Clothing, and Medical Care

General guidelines on suitable food and on procedures for the refectory were influential in medieval times. Seating at meals was to be determined by the appropriate official [LR 21]. Monks were to taste all food put before them [LR 18]; simple, easily procured food was to be preferred [LR 19]; and no special food served for guests [20]. The superior was allowed a wide latitude in setting diets for individual monks that eventually becomes a part of medieval Byzantine monasticism as well. There was much subsequent elaboration on particulars of the monastic diet, however, for this was one of the favorite concerns of patrons in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>17</sup> The regulation of clothing endorsed [LR 22] a single multi-purpose garment, especially one that was easy to obtain and maintain. Though more practical-minded in allowing additional garments, later Byzantine monasteries in the reform tradition endorsed the principles of ready access and easy maintenance.<sup>18</sup> Basil guardedly endorsed [LR 55] the use of medical science, but also equated illness with punishment for sin. The authors of medieval Byzantine monastic documents did not share this belief, and were on the whole more sanguine about the value of medicine for their monks.<sup>19</sup>

### h. External Relations

The extent to which monks should be allowed to maintain relations with their relatives was a

---

*Christodoulos* [A15]; (28) *Pantokrator* [32]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3]; (31) *Areia* [M8], [T1]; (32) *Mamas* [21], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [21]; (34) *Machairas* [31], [35], [42] ff.; (35) *Skoteine* [14]; (39) *Lips* [4]; (44) *Karyes* [12]; (45) *Neophytos* [C3]; (46) *Akropolites* [7]; (48) *Prodromos* [9]; (52) *Choumnos* [A16], [B14]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [10]; (55) *Athanasios I* [4]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [56]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [16].

<sup>16</sup> For the views of medieval Byzantine founders on entrepreneurial activities, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [21]; (7) *Latros* [12]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [13], [15], [22], [24]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [44], [53]; (15) *Constantine IX* [3], [4], [6], [9], [10], [12]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A22]; (26) *Luke of Messina* [8], [9]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [66], [69], [86], [97]; (34) *Machairas* [110], [111]; (35) *Skoteine* [23]; (37) *Auxentios* [9]; (45) *Neophytos* [10], [C13]; (47) *Philanthropos* [2]; (53) *Meteora* [4]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [7], [8]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [66]; (59) *Manuel II* [2]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C8].

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of the monastic diet in Byzantine times, see Appendix B: The Regulation of Diet in the Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents, along with the discussion in (43) *Kasoulon* Analysis, and the works cited in the General Bibliography, XXVII. Daily Life, B. Diet.

<sup>18</sup> For monastic clothing in Byzantine times, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [12]; (4) *Stoudios* [38]; (9) *Galesios* [130], [187]; (10) *Eleousa* [9]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [35]; (22) *Evergetis* [25], [26]; (23) *Pakourianos* [9]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [52]; (28) *Pantokrator* [22]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [52]; (30) *Phoberos* [44]; (31) *Areia* [T4]; (32) *Mamas* [28]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [28]; (34) *Machairas* [102], [103]; (35) *Skoteine* [23]; (37) *Auxentios* [7]; (39) *Lips* [36]; (45) *Neophytos* [15], [C15]; (53) *Meteora* [8]; (56) *Kellibara II* [7], [8]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [68], [97] ff.; (58) *Menoikeion* [12]; (60) *Charsianeites* [B20]; and the works cited in the General Bibliography, XXVII. Daily Life, C. Dress.

<sup>19</sup> For the care of sick monks in Byzantine times, see (10) *Eleousa* [13]; (22) *Evergetis* [26], [41]; (23) *Pakourianos* [28]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [56], [57]; (28) *Pantokrator* [10]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [47], [53], [61]; (30) *Phoberos* [45], [55], [56]; (32) *Mamas* [33], [34]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [33]; (34) *Machairas* [107], [108]; (39) *Lips* [33], [35]; (55) *Athanasios I* [4]; (56) *Kellibara II* [5]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [90], [91], [92]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C3].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

difficult question, and would remain so in later times.<sup>20</sup> The *Longer Rules* provide that a monk's (needy) pious relatives be cared for by the community as a whole [LR 32], but not even visits were to be permitted from those who were irreligious. Monks returning from a journey were to be interrogated on their return [LR 44], a practice revived by some monasteries in medieval Byzantium.<sup>21</sup>

Basil's foundation was a double monastery, paired with a nunnery [LR 33], an arrangement that was much rarer in medieval Byzantine times when founders generally insisted on a much stricter sexual segregation, though in the fifteenth century the author of (54) *Neilos Damilas* [8] would justify his own similar foundation by appealing to the Basilian precedent.

### 2. The *Shorter Rules*

The structure and content of the *Shorter Rules* differ considerably from those of the *Longer Rules*. The number of questions (313) is much greater than for the *Longer Rules* (55). Basil's replies are also very much briefer. Many have no regulatory content at all, but belong in the category of scriptural exegesis (e.g., [SR 282]). There is also a great deal of discussion of disciplinary and attitudinal problems, much of it repetitious. These *Rules* also lack any evident pattern of organization, leading one to suppose that they may have been compiled incrementally as questions arose and Basil replied to them. Nevertheless, there is some material (about one-third of the whole) which can be said to have a bearing on the regulation of monastic life as in the *Longer Rules*.

#### a. Regulation of Admissions

The regulation of admissions was another subject of common interest to both the Basilian and later Byzantine traditions.<sup>22</sup> The *Shorter Rules* permit admissions for short stays [SR 97] that are usually not foreseen by the authors of the later Byzantine documents. Applicants enmeshed in worldly affairs were discouraged [SR 107]; the later Byzantine tradition agreed but in practice was more tolerant. Here, new admissions require the consent of the brotherhood [SR 112]; in the Byzantine tradition this was left to the discretion of the superior. Like later monastic reformers (if not the overall Byzantine tradition), the *Shorter Rules* are wary of accepting gifts from outside

<sup>20</sup> For monks' relations with their families in Byzantine times, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [3], [8], [9]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [14]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [30], [32]; (22) *Evergetis* [14], [18], [22]; (23) *Pakourianos* [8]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [12], [17]; (30) *Phoberos* [37]; (31) *Areia* [T10]; (32) *Mamas* [44]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [45]; (34) *Machairas* [136], [146]; (39) *Lips* [15]; (41) *Docheiariou* [5]; (45) *Neophytos* [C14]; (52) *Choumnos* [A4]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [7]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [75], [76]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B13], [B14], [C9].

<sup>21</sup> For similar interrogations in Byzantine times, see (57) *Bebaia Elpis* and (59) *Manuel II* [5].

<sup>22</sup> For qualifications for admission to monasteries in Byzantine times, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [18]; (4) *Stoudios* [24]; (7) *Latros* [9]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [18]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [4], [5], [16]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [22], [34], [50]; (15) *Constantine IX* [1], [7]; (19) *Attaleiates* [30]; (22) *Evergetis* [37]; (23) *Pakourianos* [6], [7], [24], [25]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A26]; (25) *Fragala* [A8], [B8]; (26) *Luke of Messina* [5]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [4], [5], [30]; (28) *Pantokrator* [16]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3], [48], [49], [55]; (30) *Phoberos* [42], [51]; (32) *Mamas* [5], [22]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [5], [22]; (34) *Machairas* [55], [56], [60]; (36) *Blemmydes* [9]; (37) *Auxentios* [12]; (38) *Kellibara I* [17]; (39) *Lips* [4], [17], [18], [20]; (42) *Sabas* [1]; (45) *Neophytos* [9], [C17]; (52) *Choumnos* [B17]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [5]; (55) *Athanasios I* [7]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [22], [23], [146]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B12], [C2].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

ers.<sup>23</sup> The superior was to decide on gifts from postulants' relatives [SR 304] and others [SR 305]; the steward was responsible for providing any favor in return to benefactors [SR 308].

### b. Prohibition of Private Property

The discussion of private property in the *Shorter Rules* foreshadows some major problems to come in this area later in Byzantine monasticism. These include the prohibition of private property in the brotherhood [SR 85], cf. [SR 92]—not excluding “personal effects” [SR 86]—and a discussion of whether admission to the community requires the payment of a gift [SR 89]. The Basilian tradition on these issues, ignored for a time in early medieval Byzantium, would be influential again during the late eleventh century with the advent of the monastic reform movement.<sup>24</sup>

### c. Food, Clothing, and Medical Care

The *Shorter Rules* also show that problems of diet were particularly troublesome, e.g., how to deal with demands of special diets [SR 71], self-imposed abstinences [SR 137] and private fasts [SR 138], claims that certain foods were harmful [SR 132], etc. These are either absent or not so prominent in the medieval Byzantine monastic foundation documents.<sup>25</sup> Yet the provisions for readings at mealtimes [SR 180] and for the punishment of monks late or absent for meals [SR 136] anticipate typical Byzantine monastic practices.<sup>26</sup>

The *Shorter Rules* moderate the harsh (and no doubt untenable) position of the *Longer Rules* [LR 22] against more than one set of clothing and announce the principle that clothing should be appropriate to task and season [SR 210], cf. [SR 90], thereby bringing the Basilian tradition closer to the common-sense conventions of medieval Byzantine monasticism. Some harsh attitudes on the subject persist in the *Shorter Rules*, however, such as the declarations that while monks should

<sup>23</sup> For the views of medieval Byzantine founders on the acceptability of outside gifts and general discussions of patronage, see (6) *Rila* [7], [8]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [36]; (19) *Attaleiates* [30]; (22) *Evergetis*, Appendix; (23) *Pakourianos* [20]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A6], [A9]; (25) *Fragala* [B11], [C1], [C3]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [8], [71], [76]; (28) *Pantokrator* [8]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [86]; (31) *Areia* [M10], [T6]; (32) *Mamas* [5], [27], [37], [40]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [5], [27], [37]; (34) *Machairas* [7], [9], [15], [22], [23], [153]; (35) *Skoteine* [9], [10], [11]; (37) *Auxentios* [15]; (39) *Lips* [19]; (45) *Neophytos* [20], (46) *Akropolites* [8], (49) *Geromeri* [15], (50) *Gerasimos* [2]; (51) *Koutloumoussi* [A8], [B12]; (52) *Choumnos* [A18], [A20], [A26], [B7], [B22]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [143], [156], [157], [158], [159]; (58) *Menoikeion* [1], [2], [21]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [A6], [A7], [A8], [A9], [A11], [A12].

<sup>24</sup> See discussion below in Chapter Four.

<sup>25</sup> For subsequent treatment of self-imposed dietary austerities, see (11) *Ath. Rule* [28], (20) *Black Mountain* [72], (22) *Evergetis* [9], (23) *Pakourianos* [15], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [24], (30) *Phoberos* [19], [24], (34) *Machairas* [66], (35) *Blemmydes* [11], and (45) *Neophytos* [C4]; for complaints about food, see (22) *Evergetis* [41], (27) *Kecharitomene* [57], (30) *Phoberos* [56], (32) *Mamas* [34], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [33], (34) *Machairas* [108], (45) *Neophytos* [C12].

<sup>26</sup> For similar refectory procedures in Byzantine times, see (4) *Stoudios* [8], [28]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [21]; (20) *Black Mountain* [33]; (22) *Evergetis* [9]; (23) *Pakourianos* [8]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [40]; (28) *Pantokrator* [9]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [21], [24]; (30) *Phoberos* [21], [26]; (31) *Areia* [T3]; (32) *Mamas* [17]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [17]; (34) *Machairas* [62]; (37) *Auxentios* [10]; (39) *Lips* [29]; (56) *Kellibara II* [4]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [85]; (58) *Menoikeion* [8]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C10].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

endure poor quality or even ill-fitting garments or shoes [SR 168]; it is also a sin for a monk to insist on cheap clothes or shoes [SR 50].

Treatment of the sick [SR 155] moderates the rather hostile tone of the *Long Rules* [LR 55]. The instruction to take sick monks to a hospital for treatment [SR 286] anticipates the usual medieval Byzantine practice.

### d. Importance of Manual Labor

Like the latter, the *Shorter Rules* place a major emphasis on manual labor that is not generally to be found in later medieval documents. The treatment of how to deal with those who would not work [SR 61], [SR 119], those who refused [SR 121] or could not endure [SR 69] especially heavy labors, and of care for [SR 143] and loss of [SR 144] tools shows a level of detailed regulation indicative of the importance of manual labor in a late antique foundation. Not surprisingly, this detailed regulation is absent in the later Byzantine monastic tradition, which generally placed a considerably lesser value on manual labor itself, and often restricted the performance of necessary duties to a separate—and less prestigious—class of monks.

### e. Importance of Reading and Literacy

Although the *Shorter Rules* endorse the reading of scripture for all [SR 95], the superior was to determine who was to be taught the arts [SR 105] and letters [SR 96]. Like the *Longer Rules*, the *Shorter Rules* endorse [SR 292] the religious education of lay children. Overall, a commitment to literacy and a sense of educational mission would be less prominent in medieval Byzantine monasticism.<sup>27</sup>

### f. External Relations

The *Shorter Rules*' regulation of the external relations of the monks demonstrates that the community was an integral part of the public world of late antiquity, with concerns like paying for the tax arrears of monks [SR 94]; the sharing of goods [SR 181], provision of mutual assistance [SR 284] and conduct of commercial transactions [SR 285] with neighboring monasteries; and a hostility to liturgies [SR 310] held in private dwellings. This was very different environment from the more insular, private world in which later Byzantine monasteries would find themselves.

Similarly, the close relations portrayed here with the neighboring nunnery [SR 108], [SR 109] would not find many parallels in later Byzantine monasticism. However, certain precautions (e.g., having a witness present) taken in this connection would be adopted in regulating other necessary contacts between the sexes in medieval times.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> For the educational functions of monasteries in Byzantine times and the rationale for not providing such services, see (10) *Eleousa* [17]; (23) *Pakourianos* [31]; (28) *Pantokrator* [55]; (36) *Blemmydes* [9]; (53) *Meteora* [6]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [5]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [148]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [14].

<sup>28</sup> For medieval Byzantine precautions in connection with relations between the sexes, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [9], [15], [16], [17]; (9) *Galesios* [129]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [34]; (22) *Evergetis* [38], [39]; (23) *Pakourianos* [23]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A10], [A13]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [17], [80]; (28) *Pantokrator* [18]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [56], [84]; (30) *Phoberos* [55]; (31) *Areia* [M6]; (32) *Mamas* [27]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [27]; (34) *Machairas* [115], [118], [119]; (37) *Auxentios* [12], [13]; (57) *Lips* [16], [26]; (42) *Sabas* [1]; (45) *Neophytos* [19]; (53) *Meteora* [7]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [7]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [76]; (58) *Menoikeion* [14]; (59) *Manuel II* [13]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C2].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

### g. Policies on Visits

Despite a critical tone, the *Shorter Rules* adopt what is in effect a relatively liberal regulation of visits and travel. As in the medieval Byzantine tradition, monks were not to travel without the superior's permission [SR 120], visits by friends and relatives were discouraged [SR 188] (but not forbidden), and only the steadfast were allowed home visitations [SR 189].<sup>29</sup> Reflecting a more open society than in medieval times, visits from the laity for prayer [SR 312] were encouraged, though these visitors were not to interrupt work [SR 313]. In the monasteries of medieval Byzantium, lay visitors (aside from patrons and their families) seem to have been less common.

### h. Institutional Philanthropy

On some other matters, the *Shorter Rules* endorse charitable distributions [SR 100], to take place at the discretion of the steward [SR 302], but, significantly, not without limits [SR 101]. Still, charity had not yet become formulized and essentially ritualistic as it was in many monasteries in medieval times.<sup>30</sup> The reception of communion required a proper attitude [SR 172] and was not for the "unclean" [SR 309], anticipating the ever more cautious attitudes of the founders of Byzantine reform monasteries on the subject of frequent reception of the Eucharist.<sup>31</sup> Confession was also recommended [SR 229], but only to priests [SR 288]; founders of Byzantine reform monasteries would attempt to restrict this further to an obligation to confess only to one's superior.

## 3. Other Testimonies to the Basilian Tradition

There are other ascetic works attributed to Basil but several may actually be the work of later authors writing for foundations loosely modeled on his. These documents provide further testimony on the Basilian monastic tradition. They include the *Introduction to the Ascetic Life*,<sup>32</sup> which affirms the place of women within the monastic movement; the *Discourse on Ascetic Dis-*

<sup>29</sup> For travel and visitation policies for monks in Byzantine times, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [10]; (7) *Latros* [6], [12]; (9) *Galesios* [150]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [8]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [33], [35]; (21) *Roidion* [B5]; (23) *Pakourianos* [8], [15]; (25) *Fragala* [B10]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [17], [29], [80]; (28) *Pantokrator* [13], [21]; (32) *Mamas* [12]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [12]; (34) *Machairas* [118], [136]; (39) *Lips* [15], [16]; (42) *Sabas* [8], (44) *Karyes* [12]; (45) *Neophytos* [10], [C5], [C17]; (52) *Choumnos* [A21]; (55) *Athanasios I* [6]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [55], [72], [75], [76]; (59) *Manuel II* [5]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [B19], [C4], [C9], [C10].

<sup>30</sup> For charitable distributions to the poor in Byzantine monasteries, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [21]; (9) *Galesios* [192]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [49]; (19) *Attaleiates* [2], [20]; (21) *Roidion* [B7], [B13], [B15]; (22) *Evergetis* [38]; (23) *Pakourianos* [10], [21], [26], [29]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A25]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [59], [61], [63], [64]; (28) *Pantokrator* [8], [11], [45]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [6], [9], [10], [56]; (30) *Phoberos* [24], [54]; (32) *Mamas* [13], [39]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [13]; (34) *Machairas* [29], [118]; (37) *Auxentios* [7], [9], [13], [14]; (45) *Neophytos* [C18]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [115], [149], [150]; (58) *Menoikeion* [7], [22]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [A9], [C14], [C15].

<sup>31</sup> For discussions of the appropriate frequency of reception of the Eucharist in Byzantine times, see (22) *Evergetis* [5], (27) *Kecharitomene* [33], (30) *Phoberos* [11], (32) *Mamas* [32], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [32], (34) *Machairas* [37], and (58) *Menoikeion* [16].

<sup>32</sup> *Praevia instituto ascetica*, PG 31, cols. 619–26, trans. Clarke, *Works*, pp. 55–59, and Wagner, *Saint Basil*, pp. 9–13.

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

*cipline*,<sup>33</sup> a succinct code of conduct for the pious monk also known in a Latin version of the fifth century; and two *Ascetic Discourses*,<sup>34</sup> the first, notable for its moderation, suggesting how a regulatory text like the later monastic *typika* could have developed out of a work of this genre, and another, quoted by some later Byzantine foundation documents for its analogy of the superior to an artist's model and its identification of inequality as the root cause of envy and hatred.<sup>35</sup>

More influential than these texts was the *Discourse on Renunciation of the World*,<sup>36</sup> frequently quoted or endorsed by the *typika* of later reform monasteries for its condemnation of secret eating, its instruction to avoid quarrels over seating at meals, and its scriptural quotation that "the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence, and men of violence take it by force" (Matt. 11:12). The warning against homoerotic associations, not a concern of the *Rules*, suggests that this text is post-Basilian.

The *Ascetic Constitutions*, which is certainly not a genuine work of Basil of Caesarea, nevertheless was thought to be one by several of the authors of later Byzantine *typika*.<sup>37</sup> Another work from the *Ascetic Treatises* that was popular despite its illegitimate claim to genuine Basilian authorship was the *Penitential*, which was brought back into use by Theodore the Studite in the early ninth century and is quoted in two thirteenth-century *typika*.<sup>38</sup>

The concerns and disciplinary provisions of these subsidiary works in the *Ascetic Treatises* are frequently quite different from those of the undoubted Basilian rules, raising some concern as to whether they can be used to establish a tradition dating back to the life of Basil himself. Perhaps these works are best seen as representatives of unidentified intermediary traditions between the Basilian *Rules* and the later monastic foundation documents included here in this collection that further study may elucidate.

<sup>33</sup> *Sermo de ascetica disciplina*, PG 31, cols. 647–52, trans. Clarke, *Works*, pp. 73–75, and Wagner, *Saint Basil*, pp. 33–36.

<sup>34</sup> *Sermones ascetici I et II*, PG 31, cols. 869–82 and 881–88, esp. 884B and 885A, trans. Clarke, *Works*, pp. 133–39, 141–44, and Wagner, *Saint Basil*, pp. 207–15, 217–22.

<sup>35</sup> For comparison of the superior to an artist's model, see (9) *Galesios* [180] and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [30], cf. (30) *Phoberos* [3] and (29) *Kosmosoteira* [9]; for inequality as the source of envy and hatred, see (9) *Galesios* [187], (56) *Kellibara II* [3], and (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [83]; for a contrary view, see (37) *Auxentios* [4] and (52) *Choumnos* [B20].

<sup>36</sup> *Sermo de renunciatione saeculi*, PG 31, cols. 625–48, trans. Clarke, *Works*, pp. 60–71, and Wagner, *Saint Basil*, pp. 15–31. For possible use of this work in later Byzantine documents, see (7) *Latros* [10]; (22) *Evergetis* [9], [42]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [42], [45], [49], [78]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [22], [23], [57]; (30) *Phoberos* [22], [23], [59]; (32) *Mamas* [20], [36], [46]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [20], [36], [45]; (34) *Machairas* [20], [64], [166]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [20].

<sup>37</sup> *Constitutiones asceticae*, PG 31, cols. 1321–1428; no English translation; cited by (20) *Black Mountain* [42R], [75]; (22) *Evergetis* [17]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A15], [A26]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [12]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [44]; (30) *Phoberos* [36] and [53B], a quotation in extenso; (32) *Mamas* [42]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [41]; (34) *Machairas* [144]; (39) *Lips* [30]; (58) *Menoikeion* [19]. Many of these are indirect citations, however, through the medium of (22) *Evergetis* [17]. This list is most likely not exhaustive.

<sup>38</sup> *Poenae in monachos delinquentes*, PG 31, cols. 1305–20; no English translation; endorsed by (3) *Theodore Studites* and quoted (generally very loosely) by (34) *Machairas* [122] ff. and by (45) *Neophytos* [CB1] through [CB12].

4. Utilization by Later Authors of Monastic *Typika*

A close study not only of the acknowledged citations but also of the unacknowledged borrowings of the authors in our collection from the Basilian *Ascetic Treatises* will some day reveal the true extent to which medieval Byzantine monasticism was “Basilian” in its inspiration. Certainly Basil was a popular saint in many Byzantine monasteries. In our collection of documents alone, there are provisions for the observance of his feast day in the late eleventh century in (20) *Black Mountain* [22] and in (28) *Pantokrator* [7] and (31) *Areia* [B13] in the twelfth century. Also in the twelfth century, Appendix B of (27) *Kecharitomene* records the presence of an icon of the saint in that foundation’s collection of consecrated objects. In the early ninth century, (3) *Theodore Studites* [13] orders that Basil’s “laws and canons,” presumably including the pseudo-Basilian *Penitential*, were to be considered as authoritative. In the tenth century, Athanasios the Athonite, in (11) *Ath. Rule* [19], [34], is anxious to attribute a Basilian origin ([SR 44] and [SR 85]) to several regulations that likely came to him more directly from Studite rules. In the mid-eleventh century, an imperial injunction to monastic stability found in (15) *Constantine IX* [7] is justified by appeal to Basil too.

Various works of Basil were to be found in the monastic libraries of the foundations for which (19) *Attaleiates* [INV 7] and (23) *Pakourianos* [33] were written in the late eleventh century, (35) *Skoteine* [24], [42] in the thirteenth century, and the *Inventory* associated with (54) *Neilos Damilas* in the fifteenth century.

Only a few of our authors may have been able to use the *Ascetic Treatises* directly. One of them, the eleventh-century author of (19) *Attaleiates*, had the work in his library, but, judging from his *typikon*, made little use of it. His contemporary, Nikon, the author of (20) *Black Mountain*, shows such a wide acquaintance with the *Ascetic Treatises* that he may be reasonably presumed to have had a copy.<sup>39</sup> Another contemporary, the author of (24) *Christodoulos*, shows a direct acquaintance with both the *Shorter Rules* as well as the pseudo-Basilian *Ascetic Constitutions*.<sup>40</sup>

The author (or authors) of (22) *Evergetis*, written for the great Constantinopolitan reform monastery of the late eleventh century, apparently had access to a fine library and used a small selection of patristic works, including the *Ascetic Treatises*, in the *typikon*.<sup>41</sup> The authors of the subsequent *typika* in the Evergetian tradition generally use the *Ascetic Treatises* indirectly, through the medium of (22) *Evergetis* or some other Evergetian text,<sup>42</sup> though there are some indications

<sup>39</sup> See the citations from the *Asketika* in (20) *Black Mountain* [9], [20], [22], [29], [37], [42R] (twice), [44], [45], [69], [70], [72], [74], [75], [78], and in (21) *Roidion* [B10], [B15].

<sup>40</sup> See (24) *Christodoulos* [A17], [A15] and [A26]; cf. language similar to *Constitutiones asceticae* in [A4], [A17], and [A18].

<sup>41</sup> See (22) *Evergetis* [4], attributed to Basil but unidentifiable; [7], a quotation from Basil’s [LR 26]; and [17], a quotation from the pseudo-Basilian *Constitutiones asceticae* 28.

<sup>42</sup> See (27) *Kecharitomene* [12], (29) *Kosmosoteira* [44], (30) *Phoberos* [36], (32) *Mamas* [42], (33) *Heliou Bomon* [41], and (58) *Menoikeion* [19], all citing *Constitutiones asceticae* 28 through the filter of (22) *Evergetis* [17]; also (29) *Kosmosoteira* [17], (30) *Phoberos* [14], (52) *Machairas* [52], all citing Basil, [LR 26] through (22) *Evergetis* [7], and again (29) *Kosmosoteira* [13], (30) *Phoberos* [9], (34) *Machairas* [31] citing an unidentified Basilian source through the intermediary of (22) *Evergetis* [4].

of independent access as well.<sup>43</sup> The late eleventh and early twelfth century seem to have been a high point of Basil's prestige, coinciding with the strongly pro-cenobitic monastic reform movement, since the author of (26) *Luke of Messina* [6] speaks of having collected Basil's works and Gregory, author of (25) *Fragala* [B4], claims to have given the saint's laws to his monks.

Actual quotations in extenso from the *Ascetic Treatises* are relatively rare. Those that do occur are invariably taken from works we now recognize as not being genuinely Basilian. In (30) *Phoberos* [53B] there is a very lengthy verbatim citation from *Ascetic Constitutions* [21] that disturbs the numeration of the *typikon's* chapters. In the early thirteenth century, the authors of two Cypriot *typika*, (34) *Machairas* [121] ff., and (45) *Neophytos* [CB1] ff. cite very loosely from what may have been contaminated texts of the pseudo-Basilian *Penitential*.

There are few explicit Basilian citations of any kind from the last centuries of Byzantine history (13th–15th c.) during the Palaiologan dynasty, though there is unacknowledged use of a fairly broad group of tracts in the *Ascetic Treatises* in documents like Theodora Synadene's (57) *Bebaia Elpis*, written for a fourteenth-century Constantinopolitan convent.<sup>44</sup> The impression of a broadening acquaintance with Basilian ascetic literature independent of citation is confirmed by Patriarch Matthew I in (60) *Charsianeites* [C10] in which he provides for regular readings from the *Ascetic Treatises* to his monks.

## 5. Legacy of the Basilian Tradition

The customs of the Basilian *Ascetic Treatises* and those found in subsequent medieval Byzantine monastic foundation documents (especially those in the Evergetian reform tradition) were similar in many ways, especially in the regulation of daily life. Yet the Basilian *Rules* were very different from what followed in such features as the acceptance of a nearby community of nuns, the maintenance of close relations with other monasteries and a companion nunnery, the heavy emphasis on manual labor, and the willingness to take in orphans of both sexes. Perhaps the most significant differences stem from the very different public world of late antiquity and the more private world of the middle ages. The foundation regulated in the Basilian *Rules* needed to take cognizance of and establish proper relations with groups and institutions external to it, both secular and ecclesiastical. The Basilian monastery then was necessarily less isolated from the external world of its day than its distant successors would become in medieval times.

### B. The Pachomian Tradition

The Pachomian tradition embodies the oldest form of cenobitic monasticism in Christianity as developed by the fourth-century Egyptian monk Pachomios († 346).<sup>45</sup> It is represented in the first

<sup>43</sup> See (27) *Kecharitomene* [51], from [LR 18]; (30) *Phoberos* [24], [25], [53B].

<sup>44</sup> Late citations include (54) *Neilos Damilas* [8], [10]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [96], but see also unacknowledged use in [30], [79], [126]; and (58) *Menoikeion* [19].

<sup>45</sup> For Pachomios, see Heinrich Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs: Studien zum frühen Mönchtum*, vol. 2: *Pachomios—Der Mann und sein Werk* (Würzburg, 1983); James Goehring, "New Frontiers in Pachomian Studies," in *Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. Birger Pearson and James Goehring (Philadelphia, 1986), pp. 236–57, and "Pachomios' Vision of Heresy: The Development of a Pachomian Tradition," *Le Muséon*

instance by a small collection of rules, best known in a translation made indirectly by the church father Jerome into Latin in 404 from Coptic texts then in use at the Pachomian monastery of Metanoia near Alexandria in Egypt, to which he added his own *Preface*.<sup>46</sup> The translation was made more than a half century after the death of Pachomios himself. The *Precepts*, which are very similar in content to the *typika* of the medieval Byzantine monastic tradition, are the most important of the Pachomian documents. Jerome also translated the *Precepts and Institutions* and the *Precepts and Penal Statutes*, both primarily penitential texts, and the *Precepts and Laws*, which serve as a supplement to the *Precepts*. Long known only in Jerome's translation, extensive Coptic fragments of the documents are now available as a control.<sup>47</sup> The documents are readily available in modern English translation.<sup>48</sup>

Although Jerome used a Greek translation of the Coptic originals for his Latin version, this has not survived. The *Excerpts*, a collection of quotations from the *Rules*, is preserved separately in Greek, and may indicate some continuing influence by the Pachomian tradition during the first few centuries of medieval Byzantium before most of the monastic *typika* were composed.<sup>49</sup> Unlike the Basilian *Ascetic Treatises*, which were known and used by some of the authors of the medieval foundation documents in our collection, it is unlikely that any of the authors of these documents—with the possible exception of the author of (2) *Pantelleria*—had access to the Pachomian *Rules*. On the other hand, certain fundamentals of cenobitic monasticism established by the Pachomians in Upper Egypt in the first half of the fourth century were the enduring legacy

---

95 (1982), 241–62; Philip Rousseau, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt* (Berkeley, 1985); Fidelis Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge klösterlichen Gehorsams* (Münsterschwarzach, 1971). For the relationship with the earlier anchoritic tradition, see Heinrich Bacht, “Antonius und Pachomius. Von der Anachorese zum Cönobitentum,” in Basilius Steidle, *Antonius Magnus Eremita* (Rome, 1956), pp. 66–107.

<sup>46</sup> Amand Boon, *Pachomiana Latina* (Louvain, 1932). *Praefatio Hieronymi*, pp. 3–9, *Praecepta*, pp. 13–52, *Praecepta et Instituta*, pp. 53–62, *Praecepta atque Iudicia*, pp. 63–70, *Praecepta ac Leges*, pp. 71–74.

<sup>47</sup> Ed. L. Th. Lefort, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples* (Louvain, 1956) = *CSCO*, vol. 159, *Scriptores Coptici*, vol. 23, pp. 30–36. See also the editor's earlier studies, “La Règle de S. Pachôme (Etude d'approche),” *Le Muséon* 34 (1921), 61–70, and “La Règle de S. Pachôme (2<sup>e</sup> étude d'approche),” *Le Muséon* 37 (1924), 1–28. Studies of particular interest include Heinrich Bacht, “Ein Wort zur Ehrenrettung der ältesten Mönchsregeln,” *ZKT* 72 (1950), 350–59, and Peter Nagel, “Diktion der römischen Kommandosprache in den Praecepta des Pachomius,” *ZĀS* 101 (1974), 114–20.

<sup>48</sup> Armand Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 2: *Pachomian Chronicles and Rules* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1981). Translations of Jerome's Preface, pp. 141–44, Precepts, 145–67, Precepts and Institutes, 169–74, Precepts and Judgments, 175–79, and Precepts and Laws, 181–83. Bacht, *Pachomios*, has German translations of the Pachomian rules with extensive notes.

<sup>49</sup> *Excerpta*, ed. Amand Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, pp. 169–82. Latin translation in *PG* 40, cols. 947–52. There is no English translation. For the subsequent history of Pachomian monasticism in Egypt, see Heinrich Bacht, “Pachome et ses disciples (IV<sup>e</sup> siècle),” in *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris, 1961), pp. 39–71; Jean Gascou, “P. Fouad 87: Les monastères pachômiens et l'état byzantin,” *BIFAO* 76 (1976), 157–84; James Goehring, *Chalcedonian Power Politics and the Demise of Pachomian Monasticism* (Claremont, Ca., 1989); Ewa Wipszycka, “Les terres de la congrégation pachômienne dans une liste de paiements pour les apora,” in *Le monde grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), pp. 625–36.

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

of all later cenobitic traditions in the Eastern Mediterranean down to medieval times.<sup>50</sup>

### 1. The Pachomian *Rule*

Of the constituent parts of the Pachomian *Rule*, the *Precepts* are the most comprehensive and offer the greatest number of parallels and contrasts to the later Byzantine monastic tradition. The extent to which the *Precepts* reflect the thought of Pachomios himself and the conditions of Egyptian monasticism in the mid-fourth century as opposed to the developed Pachomian monasticism of the end of the fourth century must be left to specialists to determine.<sup>51</sup> The *Precepts* certainly form an incrementally developed text, with definite stages of composition like some later documents included in our collection (e.g., (22) *Evergetis*, (29) *Kosmosoteira*, and (30) *Phoberos*). Even though the *Precepts* form an early document, the similarity in structure to later Byzantine monastic *typika* is striking, except that there is little said about the liturgy and the monks' life of prayer. Also, this is in no way a personalized text (as many *typika* were) in which the author's imprint is readily evident.

#### a. Similarities with Medieval Byzantine Monasticism

Many of the conventions of Byzantine monasticism are already present in the *Precepts*. Officials rule in authoritarian fashion [47], [53], [55], [81], [84], [143], often in order to curb the assertion by monks that their personal relationships were more important than their communal obligations. The regulation of meals in the *Precepts* left a recognizable imprint (directly or indirectly) on medieval Byzantine monasticism with respect to such matters as proper deportment at mealtime [8], [29], [30], [31], [32], [90], the principle of equal portions of food for all [35], [41], and a prohibition on secret eating [78], [80], [114], though there is a provision for those abstaining from the common table to consume bread and water in their cells [79]. The *Precepts* stress punctuality, and those who were late for prayers and meals were to be punished [9], [32], though there was a concession for latecomers to night prayers [10]. Monks were not allowed to retain personal effects, which were subject to confiscation [81], [98]. Excuses for not participating in the common life of work, prayer, and eating were not to be tolerated [141], [142]. Hospitality [50], [51] was an important obligation incumbent on the community. Burial was also a common responsibility [127]. Certain auxiliary institutions of later monasteries such as the infirmary [42], [43], [93], [129] and the bakery [116], [117] are present already in the *Precepts* and taken for granted.

#### b. Differences with Medieval Byzantine Monasticism

The Pachomian tradition had some major differences with the monasteries portrayed later in the medieval Byzantine monastic foundation documents. First of all, the Pachomian foundation was large and structurally complex,<sup>52</sup> unlike the mostly much smaller medieval foundations which followed. Manual labor was very important in the Pachomian tradition, and required a lot of special legislation (see [5], [58], [60], and [61] among many others). Like its Basilian counter-

<sup>50</sup> See Heinrich Bacht, "L'importance de l'idéal monastique de s. Pachôme pour l'histoire du monachisme chrétien," *RAM* 26 (1950), 308–26.

<sup>51</sup> For a discussion of the problem, see Goehring, "New Frontiers," pp. 236–46.

<sup>52</sup> See *Praefatio Hieronymi* [2].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

parts, the Pachomian foundation was not an institution cut off from the outside world. Travel, while perhaps not encouraged, was seen as both necessary and inevitable. Characteristically for late antique monasticism then, the Pachomian tradition regulates travel and visitation for its monks [50], [51], [52], [53], [54], [55], [56], [57], [63], [64], [118], [142] leniently.

The Pachomians took self-reliance more seriously than in medieval times, so personal care and housekeeping [67], [68], [70], [97] required regulation too. Perhaps this self-sustaining ethic made the Pachomian tradition willing to accept postulants on easier terms [49] than would be the case later on in the Byzantine Middle Ages. In some respects Pachomian monks adopted a stricter lifestyle than many later medieval institutions, for there was no consumption of wine [45], [54]; and (apparently) no bathing [92], [93]. Also, odd and presumably uncomfortable chairs served as beds [86] for the monks.

Unlike many later medieval foundations, particularly those under the influence of the monastic reform movement,<sup>53</sup> those of the Pachomian tradition were not misogynist institutions; women were welcome as guests, even at night [52], cf. [143]. Yet there is a notable amount of discreet anti-homoerotic legislation [95], [97], [107], [109], [118] which seems to have been directly related to the presence of boys in the foundations (for which see the *Precepts and Penal Statutes* [7], [13]) as in Basilian foundations of the fourth century. By the early ninth century, “beardless youths” had been formally excluded from many Byzantine monasteries, though frequently they were still present in practice.<sup>54</sup> The tradition also routinely stressed the importance of catechetical instruction for all the monks [19], [20], [138] (cf. *Precepts and Institutions* [15]). Along with the regime of manual labor, perhaps the biggest difference between the Pachomian and later medieval traditions is the stress the former tradition put on literacy and reading [25], [100], [139], [140] (cf. *Precepts and Laws* [7]).<sup>55</sup> The *Precepts* flatly declare [139] “even if he does not want to he shall be compelled to (learn how to) read.”

<sup>53</sup> For the misogynist tendency of later Byzantine monasticism, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [9], [15], [16], [17]; (7) *Latros* [9]; (10) *Eleousa* [17]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [34]; (22) *Evergetis* [38], [39]; (23) *Pakourianos* [23]; (24) *Christodoulos* [A10], [A13]; (28) *Pantokrator* [18]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [56], [84], [86]; (30) *Phoberos* [55]; (32) *Mamas* [27]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [27]; (34) *Machairas* [115], [118], [119]; (37) *Auxentios* [12], [13]; (42) *Sabas* [1]; (45) *Neophytos* [19]; (53) *Meteora* [7]; (58) *Menoikeion* [14]; (59) *Manuel II* [13]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C2].

<sup>54</sup> For the subject of “beardless youths” in Byzantine monasteries, see (3) *Theodore Studites* [18]; (7) *Latros* [9]; (9) *Galesios* [196]; (10) *Eleousa* [17]; (12) *Tzimiskes* [16], [25]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [34], [48]; (15) *Constantine IX* [1], [15]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [3], [49]; (42) *Sabas* [1]; (58) *Menoikeion* [14]; (59) *Manuel II* [13], [14]; (60) *Charsianeites* [C2]; cf. (2) *Pantelleria* [5], [6], [7], [12], [20] and (45) *Neophytos* [C6], [C7], [C17], [CB6].

<sup>55</sup> For evidence of literacy in Byzantine monasteries, see (2) *Pantelleria* [9]; (3) *Theodore Studites*, Preface; *Stoudios* [A2], [A8–9], [AB12], [AB13], [B14], [B16], [AB26], [AB33], [AB36]; (6) *Rila* [16]; (9) *Galesios* [138], [182], [191], [246]; (10) *Eleousa* [13]; (11) *Ath. Rule* [1], [21], [37]; (13) *Ath. Typikon* [23]; (15) *Constantine IX*, Introduction; (17) *Nikon Metanoieite*, Foundation History; (19) *Attaleiates* [33], [40]; (20) *Black Mountain* [4], [17], [18], [21], [24], [33], [42], [56], [81], [89]; (22) *Evergetis* [4], [43]; (23) *Christodoulos* [A26], [B15]; (27) *Kecharitomene* [7], [15], [26], [32], [65]; (30) *Phoberos* [9], [15], [59]; (31) *Areia* [M4]; (28) *Pantokrator* [9], [24], [68]; (29) *Kosmosoteira* [13], [59], [106]; (32) *Mamas* [5], [10], [16], [32], [47]; (33) *Heliou Bomon* [5], [10], [16], [32], [46]; (34) *Machairas* [39], [60], [101], [167]; (35) *Skoteine* [12], (37) *Auxentios* [13]; (38) *Kellibara I* [17], cf. [3]; (39) *Lips* [8], [20], [28], [29]; (42) *Sabas*

## 2. Other Testimonies to the Pachomian Tradition

Jerome's Latin translations of documents from the Pachomian tradition also include the *Book of Horsiesios*, professedly the *Testament* of Horsiesios († ca. 380), Pachomios' second successor.<sup>56</sup> This document, of which there is no surviving Coptic or Greek text, demonstrates a very early stage in the evolution of the monastic testament as a regulatory text that would become one of the two principal formats of Byzantine monastic foundation documents in the medieval period. As such it deserves comparison with (1) *Apa Abraham*, the first document in our collection, which is more than two hundred years later in date, yet more primitive in construction and content.

Horsiesios' *Testament* marks a critical, defining turning point for the ideological development of the Byzantine monastic tradition. It condemns privatization of monastic property [22], denies monks the right to dispose of their personal effects [26], advocates equality as a principle of the monastic lifestyle [23], and is generally hostile to the outside world [39], [42]. These principles would eventually be taken up again by the Byzantine monastic reform movement in the eleventh century.<sup>57</sup> In his own day, Horsiesios had evidently come to realize the dangers close intercourse with the secular world posed for monastic communities. Specifically, Horsiesios astutely recognized the connection between the monks' maintenance of their personal possessions and ties to their lay relatives on the one hand and a corresponding threat to institutional well-being through privatization and secularization on the other. The peril was less well perceived in the early Pachomian tradition (see the *Precepts*) or in the early Basilian tradition (as exemplified by the *Longer* and *Shorter Rules*).

Just as the *Book of Horsiesios* anticipates the testamentary format of subsequent Byzantine monastic foundation documents, so the *Regulations of Horsiesios* look forward to the format of the monastic *typikon*.<sup>58</sup> If the *Regulations* are in fact correctly attributed to Horsiesios, then taken together with his *Testament*, they provide the first example of the coupling of a testament with a more formal regulatory document known from several examples in the Byzantine era.<sup>59</sup> The *Regulations*, preserved only in Coptic, provide a considerable amount of practical regulation on matters of everyday life, including cleanliness of kitchen vessels [25], kneading bread [47], irrigation

---

[2]; (43) *Kasoulon* [20]; (44) *Karyes* [8], [10]; (45) *Neophytos* [11], [13], [14], [22], [C18]; (51) *Koutlounmoussi* [A10]; (52) *Choumnos* [A3]; (54) *Neilos Damilas* [2], [5], [13], [20], cf. [18]; (55) *Athanasios I* [8], [9]; (56) *Kellibara II* [1]; (57) *Bebaia Elpis* [62], [66], [85], [120]; (58) *Menoikeion* [8], [9]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [C] Preamble, [C10]. Also, the literacy of at least the choir monks in those Byzantine monasteries in which the performance of liturgical services was a prominent part of the activities in those institutions may be presupposed.

<sup>56</sup> *Liber Orsiesii*, ed. Amand Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, pp. 109–47; English translation by Armand Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 3: *Instructions, Letters, and Other Writings of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1982), pp. 171–215, with notes 215–24; see also Heinrich Bacht, "Studien zum 'Liber Orsiesii,'" *HJ* 77 (1958), 98–124.

<sup>57</sup> For the monastic reform, see below, Chapter Four.

<sup>58</sup> *Orsiesii Regula*, Coptic text ed. L. Th. Lefort, *Oeuvres*, pp. 82–99; English translation by Armand Veilleux, *Pachomian Chronicles*, pp. 197–223.

<sup>59</sup> Compare to these later couplings: (3) *Theodore Studites* and (4) *Stoudios*; (13) *Ath. Typikon* and (11) *Ath. Rule*; (24) *Christodoulos* [A] and [B]; and (60) *Charsianeites* [A] and [C].

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

of fields [57] and care of livestock [59]. These concerns all followed naturally from the author's insistence on manual labor [18], and not surprisingly lack ready parallels in the Byzantine medieval tradition in which manual labor was less important.

Then there is the so-called *Rule of the Angel*,<sup>60</sup> preserved in Palladius' *Lausiatic History*. Specialists now seem convinced that it is not, as was once thought by some, a primitive rule anterior to the other documents in the Pachomian tradition.<sup>61</sup> The treatment of diet [2], manual labor [12], and dress [3] seems vaguely Pachomian, but it is hard to recognize other features of the cenobitic life in this picture of a monastic community so large that it was obliged to perform prayers [6] and to eat meals [11] in rotating shifts. This was the one monastic rule in the Pachomian tradition preserved in a Greek edition that was potentially available to the later Byzantine tradition.

Finally, the hagiographic tradition preserves much valuable information about Pachomian monastic institutions although it needs to be interpreted very carefully to distinguish the customs of Pachomios' own times from those of his successors.<sup>62</sup> There was a Greek textual tradition among the six versions of Pachomios' *Life*, so some details of the saint's life were considerably better known to later Byzantine authors than was his monastic legislation.

### 3. Utilization by Later Authors of Monastic *Typika*

Later Byzantine authors represented in our collection of documents made only erratic use of the Pachomian texts, often just the less authentic *Rule of the Angel*. They were surely limited by the unavailability of Greek texts for the *Rule*, except possibly for the Greek *Excerpts* mentioned above. Among our later Byzantine authors, only John, the author of (2) *Pantelleria*, provides some indication of his acquaintance with the Pachomian *Rule*, specifically the *Precepts*, though even he does not acknowledge this dependence.<sup>63</sup> In the late eleventh century, Nikon, author of (20) *Black Mountain*, cites the *Rule of the Angel* as well as the Greek *Life* of Pachomios; he also provides for the observance of the saint's feast.<sup>64</sup> In addition to Nikon, the Greek *Life* was known about the same time to the author of (24) *Christodoulos* [A18], who cites it for election of the superior by the brotherhood, and the author of (30) *Phoberos* [19]. Later, the *Rule of the Angel* was known to the author of (45) *Neophytos* [C9] in the early thirteenth century and to Patriarch Matthew I,

<sup>60</sup> *Regula ab Angelo Allata*, ed. Cuthbert Butler, *The Lausiatic History of Palladius*, vol. 2: *The Lausiatic History*, chap. 32, pp. 87–96; English translation by Veilleux, *Pachomian Chronicles*, pp. 125–29; there is also a free-standing exemplar of the text, ed. François Halkin, *Le Corpus athénien de saint Pachôme* (Geneva, 1982), pp. 95–97.

<sup>61</sup> See summary of the scholarship in Veilleux, *Pachomian Chronicles*, pp. 50–56.

<sup>62</sup> Ed. François Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii vitae graecae* (= Subsidia Hagiographica 19) (Brussels, 1932); see also Halkin, *Corpus*; English translation of the first Greek life by Apostolos Athanassakis, *The Life of Pachomius (Vita Prima Graeca)* (Missoula, Mont., 1975), and by Armand Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia*, vol. 1: *The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980), pp. 297–423. Veilleux also has translations of a Bohairic version and three Sahidic versions. For the *Vita Prima Graeca*, see Derwas Chitty, "Pachomian Sources Reconsidered," *JEH* 5 (1954), 38–77.

<sup>63</sup> For the Pachomian link, see Vera von Falkenhausen, "Patellaria," *ODB*, p. 1594.

<sup>64</sup> (20) *Black Mountain* [28], [29], [72], [78] (*Rule of the Angel*); [20], [29], [39], [42], [56], [78], [83] (*Life*); [89] (feast).

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

author of (60) *Charsianeites* [C1] in the early fifteenth century. In the mid-twelfth century, Athanasios Philanthropenos, author of (32) *Mamas* [24], and in the early thirteenth century, Neilos of Tamasia, author of (34) *Machairas* [133], both fail to recognize a provision from the Pachomian *Rule*; the latter mistakenly attributes it to Basil of Caesarea, into the manuscript of whose unauthentically attributed *Penitential* it had become incorporated.

### 4. Legacy of the Pachomian Tradition

The foundations for much of cenobitical monasticism as practiced in medieval Byzantium had already been fairly well established in the Pachomian tradition by the time of Jerome's Latin translations of many of its regulatory documents at the beginning of the fifth century, if not before. The Byzantine monasteries portrayed in the later foundation documents found in our collection unknowingly followed many Pachomian usages, particularly in matters of daily life, even though it is only very rarely possible to trace back a direct lineage to the Pachomian texts.

The major differences between the Pachomian and the later Byzantine monastic traditions are held in common by the Pachomians with the roughly contemporary Basilian tradition: 1. the greater scale and complexity of foundations; 2. the importance of manual labor; 3. the expectation of literacy; 4. the absence of overt misogyny; 5. the openness of the communities to boys; 6. a rather stricter personal regime (no use of wine or bathing); and 7. the relative accessibility to the outside world, with travel and visits accepted as normal phenomena of social intercourse. Despite a oft-stated yearning for a revival of early ascetic practices on the part of certain Byzantine monastic reformers starting in the late eleventh century, these features of genuine Pachomianism remained largely alien to the medieval monastic tradition.

The actual relationship of the ideology and practices popularized by the later Byzantine monastic reform to those of late antique asceticism is now fairly obscure. It need not remain so, however, since a great deal is known about what the reformers were reading in the way of ascetic literature from their acknowledged forebears.<sup>65</sup> The Pachomian *Book of Horsiesios*, while clearly a text that would have been ideologically attuned to the concerns of the reformers, could not itself have been on their reading list since it apparently did not circulate in a Greek version. However, eventually it will be possible, from the vantage point of future work on the subject,<sup>66</sup> to show just what works were most influential in development of the medieval reform program.

### C. Monastic Rules of the Syrian Orient

Arthur Vööbus' recent, posthumously published study of the monastic rules of the Syrian Orient<sup>67</sup> has laid the foundations for the study of Syrian monasticism from an institutional viewpoint. The

<sup>65</sup> This was in essence the *Evergetinon* of Paul Evergetinos, as Paul Gautier, "Le typikon de la Théotokos Évergétis," *REB* 40 (1982), 7, n. 9 recognized, based on its coincidence with the corpus of ascetic literature recommended by the reformer John V, patriarch of Antioch in the latter's *De monasteriis*, ed. Paul Gautier, "Réquisitoire du Patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat," *REB* 33 (1975), 101–3.

<sup>66</sup> Especially that currently being undertaken by the *Evergetis* Project, based at Queens College, Belfast, which proposes to produce an annotated translation of the *Evergetinon*.

<sup>67</sup> *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, vol. 3 (Louvain, 1988) = *CSCO*, vol. 500, *Subsidia*, 50, *Tomus* 81.

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

documents for which his study provides English translations or summaries are outside the scope of our own collection of medieval Byzantine monastic rules, but since they provide the only link between the monastic traditions of late antiquity discussed above and our medieval rules, a brief discussion seems in order here.

### 1. *Canons of Rabbula of Edessa*

The *Canons of Rabbula of Edessa* (trans. Vööbus, *History*, pp. 71–74) were considered by their translator to be the oldest example of the genre in Syriac. Attributed to Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, they reportedly date to the early years of the fifth century, about the same time as Jerome’s translation of the principal Pachomian rules. There are 26 canons in the main collection; Vööbus also translated four additional canons from what he called a “supplement” [S] attributed to the same author. Nearly the entire document is couched in terms of prohibitions, a convention typical of the canonical genre of monastic legislation. Vööbus noted (p. 70) the focus of the canons on problems of immediate concern, to the exclusion of more systemic treatments of ascetic practices, liturgical observances, and administrative matters. Despite this important difference with the more fully developed Byzantine monastic foundation documents, there are many areas of common concern, e.g., the regulation of commemorative feasts [8], the restrictions on the ownership of animals [9], obstacles placed in the way of monks wanting to adopt a solitary life [18], and the requirement that a monk have the permission of his superior before transferring to another monastery [26].

Vööbus believed (p. 70) that these canons anachronistically reflected early trends in Syrian monasticism. It seems more likely, however, that they are part of a later stage in the evolution of cenobiticism in which there was a greater awareness of the threats to institutional stability posed by the failure of earlier founders to restrict monks’ ties to the secular world. Many of the *Canons* testify unmistakably to this distrust of the secular world, such as various restrictions on entering local villages [2], on the ownership of animals [9], and on commercial transactions [11], as well as the prohibitions on visiting relatives [13] and on testifying in court [15]. The laity were discouraged from attending monks’ burials [24] or commemorative feasts [8], and for their part monks were told not to provide scriptural exegesis [19]. The admonition not to speculate in grain [25] fits in with the general hostility towards commercial activity [11] seen also in the Basilian *Rules*. The hostility of these canons to the use of medicine [14] also has a parallel in Basil’s *Longer Rules*.

Scruples against commercial activity might have led to a greater reliance on public charity [S15], mentioned here for the first time in the supplement, though manual labor [16], cf. [25] had not yet disappeared. The dependence on private charity was possible thanks to the existence of a network of monastic private churches [21], [22], [S15], [S29], another of this document’s novel features. The distinctly un-Pachomian banning of women [1], [S15] is another reflection of fears of external entanglements, as also, in a different way, the concern about heresy [10], [S49], yet the tradition of monastic hospitality [17] survives. The evident concern for maintaining a good public image (cf. [5], [6], and [19] ?) demonstrates an awareness that the late antique monastery for which these canons were written still had to relate to its surroundings. As in the Basilian and Pachomian traditions, personal property [12] and the use of wine [4] are not permitted. Literacy, vigorously promoted by the early traditions, is less prominently attested here [10], [19].

According to Vööbus (p. 76), an extensive manuscript tradition testifies to the enduring inter-

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

est of this collection of canons. Later copyings produced small textual variations and reorderings in the interest of “greater accuracy and precision.” This phenomenon anticipates the adaptive use of some later Byzantine foundation documents, e.g., (4) *Stoudios*, (22) *Evergetis*, and (32) *Mamas*.

### 2. *Canons of the Monastery of Mar Mattai*

These canons (trans. Vööbus, pp. 173–75), composed for a West Syrian monastery and dated to 508/09, are another example of the genre of Syrian monastic canons that help fill in the gap between the earlier monastic traditions and the later Byzantine monastic foundation documents. Vööbus’ translation provides only summaries of the 24 canons. The monastery for which the canons were written was a private religious foundation in which the monks retained their personal property [10], [11], [12], [15], [23]. This was opposed to both the Pachomian and the Basilian tradition, and the practice of most (though not all) of the foundations represented by the later Byzantine foundation documents. The system of fines [4], [5], [6], [7] featured in these canons for punishing offenses was possible only because the monks retained their private resources after entrance. Resident monks apparently shared in the revenues of the monastery [15] even though there was some common property as in more conventional cenobitic institutions. The belongings of deceased monks were redistributed at death [10].

The *Canons* declare that the superior could not be removed from his office by a monk, layman or *pasnasa* (patron?) [21], and monks were explicitly warned against appealing to outsiders [6], [22] to settle internal disputes. These provisions imply that institutional governance was weak, with the superior possibly being obliged to share his authority with a non-resident patron. This combination of a weak superior and contentious monks with vested economic rights in their foundation would reoccur in Byzantine times (see (21) *Roidion*); it is a hallmark of the ambiguous governing structure under which many traditional private religious foundations operated.

### 3. Other Collections of Regulatory Canons

The sixth-century *Canons of Johannan bar Qursos* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 178–79) are really more a general letter of advice to sympathetic monasteries by this Monophysite bishop of Tella rather than a systematic attempt at legislation. The document is notable for its active encouragement of bringing lay children to the monastery [9], [10], [11] for their education. The *Canons for the Nuns* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 183–185), are a series of fourteen prohibitions regulating the life of an unnamed convent. Vööbus implied that this is a fifth-century text (an inference from the mention of stylites in [7]) of West Syrian provenance. This interesting document, possibly the earliest surviving regulation for female ascetics in the Eastern Mediterranean world, shares with subsequent Byzantine foundation documents for nunneries the overriding concern to maintain sexual segregation (though not claustration) for the sake of the moral probity of its inhabitants. The hostility of the canons to nuns receiving gifts from outsiders [3] (except for books!) and the restriction on conducting correspondence [9] with anyone except with close relatives would reappear in reform monasteries of the Byzantine era. Such suspicion of the outside world is also not out of character for an institution of the fifth century when the danger posed to a monastery by its inhabitants’ maintenance of close family ties had become fairly generally recognized.

## EARLY MONASTIC RULES

The *Canons for the Novices* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 187–91) continue this unusual series of regulations for special audiences from the Syriac tradition. Preserved in a manuscript tradition going back to the ninth century, it is attributed later to a certain Johannan of Dalyata (Vööbus, pp. 186–87). Evidently intended for youthful postulants, the canons emphasize obedience to elders [2], [6], [7], etc., suppression of homoeroticism [9], [10], [12?], [26], [39], [46] and masturbation [11], and avoidance of female sexual temptations [35], [36], [37], [45]. There are obvious parallels to the *Precepts* of the Pachomian tradition as well as to the early Byzantine foundation documents (e.g., (2) *Pantelleria*) that reflect that tradition. The hostility towards maintaining family ties [38] marks this document as being no earlier than the fifth century, but the endorsement of consuming wine [5] (a staple of the Byzantine monastic diet) suggests strongly that it is actually later, perhaps from the sixth century.

The *Canons for the Solitaries* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 192–93), the third in this collection of canons for specialized audiences, is preserved only in a modern manuscript from an original of uncertain date and provenance. There are some other monastic rules in Vööbus' collection, e.g., the *Alphabetical Admonitions Attributed to Aphrem* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 79–81), the *Rules from the Letter of Philoxenos of Mabbug* (trans. Vööbus, p. 172), and the *Rules for the Monastery of Mar Zakkai* (trans. Vööbus, pp. 180–81), but these seem to have no obvious importance for the evolution of the medieval Byzantine monastic tradition.

### 4. General Observations

It is difficult to generalize about the Syrian monastic tradition from this diverse group of documents of which we have at present only a very rudimentary understanding. Characteristically, Syrian rules composed for men show a greater aversion to women than in the early Pachomian tradition. Like the later Pachomian documents (especially the *Book of Horsiesios*), Syrian monastic rules feared the consequences of allowing monks to retain close ties to their family members. Literacy, education and manual labor remained features of the Syriac tradition as they had been in Basilian and Pachomian monasticism, but seemingly less so than before. The *Canons of Rabbula of Edessa* show one monastery moving away from self-sufficiency and provide an early foreshadowing of the typical economic dependence of medieval Byzantine monasteries on outside support. Therefore, the Syriac tradition is an intermediary one both chronologically and in terms of its evolving institutions and concerns as these texts anticipate the medieval foundation documents presented in this collection.