MONASTIC REFORM AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF CHRISTENDOM: EXPERIENCE, OBSERVATION AND INFLUENCE

Andrew Jotischky

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0080440112000060

How to cite this article:
Andrew Jotischky (2012). MONASTIC REFORM AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF CHRISTENDOM: EXPERIENCE, OBSERVATION AND INFLUENCE. Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 22, pp 57-74 doi:10.1017/S0080440112000060

Request Permissions : Click here

MONASTIC REFORM AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF CHRISTENDOM: EXPERIENCE, OBSERVATION AND INFLUENCE

By Andrew Jotischky

READ 17 JUNE 2011 AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

ABSTRACT. Monastic reform is generally understood as a textually driven process governed by a renewed interest in early monastic ideals and practices in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and focusing on the discourses of reformers about the Egyptian 'desert fathers' as the originators of monasticism. Historians have suggested that tropes about the desert, solitude, etc., drawn from early texts found their way into mainstream accounts of monastic change in the period *c.* 1080–1150. This paper challenges this model by proposing that considerations of 'reform' must take into account parallel movements in Greek Orthodox monasticism and interactions of practice between the two monastic environments. Three case-studies of non-textually derived parallel practices are discussed, and the importance of the Holy Land as a source of inspiration for such practices is advanced in place of Egypt.

In 1151, Aelwin, a monk of Durham living in retreat on the island of Inner Farne off the coast of Northumbria, was surprised by the arrival of another Durham monk, Bartholomew. Aelwin's surprise was doubtless occasioned not only by the disturbance to his solitude but also by the startling appearance of the new arrival. Bartholomew was dressed in a long-sleeved tunic of animal skins and a separate hood or *cuculla*, over which he wore a black cloak (*pallium*). In this costume 'he showed to all who saw him', asserts his biographer, 'the figure of the ancient fathers'.[1] Bartholomew was, in fact, bringing the Egyptian desert to the North Sea. His clothing was the closest approximation he could manage to the garb of the monks of Egypt, as described in John Cassian's *Institutes*.[2]

---

[1] *Vita Bartholomaei Farnensis*, VIII–IX, Symeon of Durham, *Historia Ecclesiae Dunhemlensis. Appendix II*, ed. Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series (1882), I, 300–2. See also V. M. Tudor, 'Durham Priory and its Hermits in the Twelfth Century', in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093–1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), 67–78.

[2] John Cassian, *De institutis monachorum*, I, 3–9, ed. J.-C. Guy, Sources Chrétiennes 109 (Paris, 1965), 43–51, specified a 'cuculla', 'pallium' and linen tunic to be worn at all times together with 'subcinctoria', or shoulder straps. This clothing is also described in the earlier *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, III, *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (215 vols., Paris, 1844–)

Bartholomew was signalling his adherence to a specific way of life – the monasticism of the 'golden age' of the desert fathers.

The keynote of the religious life of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries has been characterised in two particular features: the range and variety of the types of life adopted and the foundation of new monastic houses, often in rejection of existing ones. The discourse of contemporary writers invites such assessments: there is talk in the sources of *renovatio*; monks are said to be engaged in processes characterised by words such as *recalescere* and *recuperari*.[3] One of the most obvious elements of this 'new monasticism' was the notion that it represented a return to an original form of the religious life. Thus, new foundations laid emphasis on the idea that they were not in fact starting anything new but simply polishing up a model that had become tarnished. The circumstances and types of reform enterprise were almost infinitely varied, but much of the language accompanying reform assumes that there is a model of 'proper' monastic life, and that this model, however resistant to definition, conforms to some historical prototype.[4] In his own small way, Bartholomew was taking a part in this discourse by signalling his search for authenticity in the religious life.

If there was an historical prototype – a moment at which monasticism was born – it follows that there must also have been some geographical specificity to this ur-monaticism. Another Benedictine, William of Saint-Thierry, described the early days of the Cistercian foundation of Clairvaux in the 1120s thus: 'Wherever I turned my eyes I was amazed to see as it were a new heaven and a new earth, and the well-worn path trodden by the monks of old, *our fathers out of Egypt*, bearing the footprints left by men of our own time.'[5] William sees a direct association between the monastic reform of his day and the emergence of monastic life in the Egyptian desert. The East – specifically, the Egyptian desert of Anthony, the first solitary monk, and Pachomius, the first to found monastic communities – was similarly identified by Orderic Vitalis as the wellspring of Cistercian reforming ideals. In his account of the founding of Citeaux in 1098, he makes the reforming prior Robert of Molesme try to persuade his monks that they needed to imitate the lives lived by their fathers in the Egyptian desert.[6] The Cistercians were willing to take on this parentage for themselves. Two generations or so after

---

(*PL*), XXI, col. 407. For standard Benedictine clothing, *La règle de Saint Benoît*, V–VI, ed. A. De Vogüé and J. Neufville, Sources Chrétiennes 35 (2 vols., Paris, 1972), II, 618.

[3] Among many examples, Haimo of Hirsau, *Vita Willelmi Hirsaugiensis* XXI, *PL*, CL, col. 913; Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), 144, 153–61.

[4] See the remark of Constable, *Reformation*, 125.

[5] William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita prima sancti Bernardi*, I, vii, 34, *PL*, CLXXXV, col. 247.

[6] *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, VIII, 26, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (6 vols., Oxford, 1969–80), IV, 312–14.

Orderic, the Cistercian Conrad of Eberbach's *Exordium Magnum* sought to give his Order an historical lineage reaching back to the Egyptian desert and beyond. According to his spiritual genealogy, the pioneers of monastic life in Egypt were themselves conscious heirs of the first Christians to live communally: the disciples of Christ in Jerusalem, as described in Acts. Monasticism – genuine monasticism – inescapably had its origins in the East, in the birthplace of Christianity.[7] There was nothing startlingly original about Conrad's formulation of the monastic heritage. The conviction that monasticism began with the Apostles and was transferred to Egypt, where it developed the forms that subsequently became recognisable as the reference point for 'correct' religious life, had been popularised in the West as early as the fifth century by John Cassian.[8] The idea of Egypt as the true heartland of monasticism owed its force to Cassian's own travels among the monks of Nitria and Skete, in the Nile Delta. Cassian's textual elaboration of this idea became canonical in the West through the adoption of his *Conferences* and *Institutes* by Benedict's Rule in the sixth century.[9] Alongside the Rule itself, the non-liturgical books most Benedictine monasteries could be relied on to own were probably those by Cassian, and the *Sayings of the Fathers*.[10]

   Modern historians of monasticism have been rightly sceptical about how much meaning we should ascribe to the knowledge of such texts, and of the 'myth of Egypt', among monastic western reformers. As Orderic Vitalis pointed out in his commentary on Cistercian reform, northern France was not Egypt, and it was foolish to pretend that monks who wanted to live a purer monastic life could do so by pretending that they lived in a real desert rather than wooded valleys, and by cooking in olive oil instead of butter.[11] The appeal to Near Eastern origins was, in the words of one recent historian, 'the desert myth' – a 'literary ideology' constructed in search of the kind of respectability conferred by a sense of antiquity, rather than a genuine programme of reform.[12] Indeed, Orderic's account of the origins of Citeaux can be read as a critique of such an ideology.

[7] Conrad of Eberbach, *Exordium Magnum Cisterciense*, Dist. I, 2–3, ed. B. Griesser, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis (CCCM), 138 (Turnhout, 1994), 7–9.

[8] John Cassian, *Conférences XVIII–XXIV*, XVIII, 4–6, ed. E. Pichery, Sources Chrétiennes 64 (Paris, 1959), 13–18.

[9] *La règle*, LXXIII, 672.

[10] Taking England as an example, the *Vitas patrum* was certainly known at these monasteries by the early thirteenth century: Burton, Bury, Christ Church Canterbury, Flaxley, Glastonbury, Peterborough, Reading and Rochester. Cassian (either the *Institutes* or *Conferences* or both) was known at all the same houses, and also at Whitby and Rievaulx before the end of the twelfth century: list by Richard Sharpe at www.history.ox.ac. uk/sharpe/key.pdf.

[11] *Orderic Vitalis*, VIII, 26, 314–20.

[12] Benedicta Ward, 'The Desert Myth. Reflections on the Desert Ideal in Early Cistercian Monasticism', in *One Yet Two. Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. M. Basil Pennington

If Robert of Molesme was in this account trying to persuade his monks to imitate the Egyptian desert fathers, the monks in response offered an alternative reading of monastic history, according to which the true essence of monasticism had passed from Egypt to Italy, with the writing of Benedict's Rule in the sixth century, and from Italy to France with the spread of the Rule westwards. Besides, Egypt was not invariably associated in monastic discourse with monastic precursors. Walter Daniel's *Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, for example, uses Egypt to invoke the lives led by the secular clergy, in the story of the unstable clerk whose struggles with the Cistercian life cause such troubles to Ailred.[13] Authority had moved from East to West.

Moreover, consciousness of a lineage traceable back to Egypt did not necessarily incline monks such as Guibert to look favourably or respectfully at his contemporary eastern Christian brethren – in Egypt or elsewhere. Writing about the preaching of the first crusade in 1095, Guibert invoked the idea of a world beset by perversions of the Christian truth, in which the Frankish people have the sole responsibility of leading the defence of true religion. His configuration of Europe was the world outside the cloister, writ large. 'The East' was an amorphous region whence threats to Truth arose. In Guibert's eyes, it was no coincidence that Islam, the latest such threat, had arisen in the East. Climatic conditions made it inevitable that the East, once the birthplace of truth, should in his own times be the arena of confusion, doubt and error, because dry heat rendered peoples inconstant. Citing Isidore of Seville, Guibert pinpointed the overriding psychological characteristic of the East as *levitas* – 'lightness'. It was not only Turks and Arabs who were prey to such climatic forces, but also the Greeks: 'According to the purity of the air in which they are born, the Greeks have a lightness of body, and therefore keen talent.' But the Greeks of his day – the Byzantines – had abused this talent with 'Asiatic instability' to question the true faith with 'many useless commentaries'. In consequence, the faith of all peoples in the East was 'staggering and inconstant . . . always derailing the rules of true belief'. Guibert's account of the first crusade is notable for the hostility he shows not only to the Turks and Islam but to the Greek Orthodox Christians whose delivery from oppression represented the *casus belli*. It was not surprising that they needed military intervention from the West: feeble and unwarlike, they were unable to defend either themselves or Jerusalem, the iconic centre of the world.[14]

(Kalamazoo, 1976), 183–99; Constable, *Reformation*, 136, and see also 131, where he doubts whether most twelfth-century monks knew much about the early Church.

[13] Walter Daniel, *Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, XV, ed. F. M. Powicke (Edinburgh, 1950), 24.

[14] Guibert de Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, II, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM, 127A (Turnhout, 1996), 89–90. See now LéanNí Chléirigh, 'The Impact of the First Crusade on

Guibert's prejudices against 'the East' explain why, in describing the phenomenon of monastic reform, he looks no further than French-speaking territories, implying that the 'swarms of new monks' were spontaneously generated from his own Gallic soil. But even if we dismiss the 'myth of the desert' as just that, there are other possibilities to be considered in thinking about the relationship between monastic reform and the East. Not least is the fact that reform of monastic communities was also going on throughout the Greek Orthodox world in the same period – the second half of the eleventh and first half of the twelfth centuries. As in the West, existing monasteries were restored and new ones founded by combinations of pious lay benefactors and energetic monastic entrepreneurs.[15] Among the ideals articulated as a reason for reform in the Orthodox world was one that would have been familiar to Guibert – the need to 'return' to a supposed lost 'original' form of religious life.[16] The reasons assumed for the loss of this original form may have differed in West and East, but the desired end result was often the same: cenobitic monasteries organised on coherent principles under strict observance of a given set of disciplinary codes.

How much of reforming Orthodox monastic practices was known to western monks in the eleventh century is unclear. The costume adopted by Bartholomew of Farne was more or less that still worn by Greek Orthodox monks in Egypt in his own day: a manuscript of John Climachos's *Heavenly Ladder* illuminated at Mt Sinai in the eleventh century shows Sinai monks wearing tunic, *cuculla* and *pallium* with scapular over the shoulders.[17] Bartholomew, however, is more likely to have obtained his knowledge of monastic dress textually than from actual observation.[18]

Monasticism that tends to be characterised as 'traditional' or pre-reforming had also looked to the East – but to a different east: Jerusalem. As Daniel Callahan and John France have shown, evidence for the place of Jerusalem in the western monastic imagination of the eleventh century is abundant.[19] The accounts of the Fatimid threat to Jerusalem in the

Western Opinion towards the Byzantine Empire', in *The Crusades and the Near East. Cultural Histories*, ed. Conor Kostick (2011), 164–8.

[15] John P. Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire* (Washington, DC, 1987), 186–213; Rosemary Morris, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium* (Cambridge, 1995), 9–31.

[16] Compare the ideas expressed by John the Oxite in late eleventh-century Byzantium about monastic origins to those of Conrad of Eberbach a century or so later, 'Requisitoire du Patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charistikarioi', ed. P. Gautier, *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 33 (1975), 77–131.

[17] Princeton University Library Garrett MS 16, fo. 194r.

[18] Durham Cathedral MS B.IV.10 (Cassian's *Conferences*) and Durham Cathedral B.IV.11 (Cassian's *Institutes*).

[19] Daniel Callahan, 'Jerusalem in the Monastic Imaginations of the Early Eleventh Century', *Haskins Society Journal*, 6 (1994), 119–27; John France, 'The Destruction of Jerusalem and the First Crusade', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 47 (1996), 1–17.

monastic chronicles of Ralph Glaber, Adhémar of Chabannes and Hugh of Flavigny show a long-standing attachment to the earthly Jerusalem as a place of pilgrimage, and therefore as the source of penitential absolution, in the Benedictine mentalité.[20] The affinity for Jerusalem found material form in various ways, among them the annual re-enactments of the Resurrection in purpose-built copies of the Holy Sepulchre at Easter in German, French and English monasteries from the tenth century onward.[21] It also took liturgical form. Prayers associated with the holy cross survive from Benedictine sources as far apart as England and the Iberian peninsula.[22] This attachment, moreover, did not necessarily reify the symbolic or spiritual at the expense of contemporary realities. Jerusalem was the source of salvation, but it was also the centre of a living church. Hugh of Flavigny, writing in the 1090s, records the participation in the Easter liturgy at Jerusalem by the Benedictine abbot Richard of Saint-Vanne on the 'Norman pilgrimage' of 1027.[23] It was a church, moreover, that stood in need of continuing support from the West. The returning pilgrim Odilo, son of the count of Rouerge, founded a monastery on his return from the Holy Land in 1053 dedicated to the Holy Sepulchre. The abbot appears to have been an honorary member *ex officio* of the clergy serving at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and an annual donation was to be paid for the incense burned at the tomb of Christ itself. [24]

Pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the eleventh century was a distinctively Benedictine practice, and nowhere was the practice more firmly established than in Normandy. Ralph, abbot of Mont Saint-Michel resigned his office in order to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1054, from which he may not have returned, since he died in 1055/6. Thierry de Mathinville, abbot of Saint-Evroult, did the same in 1057, dying in Cyprus on his return. Likewise Nicholas of Saint-Ouen in Rouen died in 1092 on his return from Jerusalem. William, later the first abbot of Saint-Etienne, Caen, made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem as archdeacon of Rouen before 1070.[25] Although eleventh-century Benedictine pilgrimage

[20] Adhémar, *Chronicon*, III, 47, ed. P. Bourgain, CCCM 129 (Turnhout, 1999), 166–7; *Rodulfi Glabri Historiarum Libri Quinti*, I, 21, III, 24, ed. J. France (Oxford, 1989), 37, 132–6; Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, II, 27, ed. G. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (*MGH*) (SS), VIII (Hanover, 1848), 399.

[21] Colin Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2005), 107–27.

[22] *Corpus Orationum*, ed. Edmond Eugène Moeller, Jean-Marie Clément and Bertrand C. T. Wallant, CCSL 160 A–L (13 vols., Turnhout, 1992–2003), I, 83–4.

[23] Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, II, 21–2, *MGH* (SS), VIII, 395–6.

[24] J. Bousquet, 'La foundation de Villeneuve d'Aveyron (1053) et l'expansion de l'abbaye de Moissac en Rouergue', *Annales du Midi*, 75 (1963), 517–42, with foundation document at 538–9. See also Andrew Jotischky, 'The Christians of Jerusalem, the Holy Sepulchre and the Origins of the First Crusade', *Crusades*, 7 (2008), 53–4.

[25] Veronique Gazeau, *Normannia Monastica* (2 vols., Caen, 2007), II: *Prosopographie des abbés bénédictins*, 208, 244–7, 254, 274.

to Jerusalem was certainly not exclusive to Norman monasticism,[26] it is especially striking to find enthusiasm for the Holy Land in a region where Benedictine monasticism was still relatively young. Saint-Etienne, Caen, was founded as late as 1070. Another Norman monastery that had connections to the Holy Land through pilgrimage and in supporting at least three first crusading families financially – Troarn – was founded in *c.* 1050.[27] Moreover, much of the new impetus for Norman Benedictinism continued to come from outside Normandy and northern France, just as the first steps had been taken by importing the Italian William of Volpiano, via Saint-Benigne, Dijon, to found Fécamp in 1001. Troarn's first abbot, Durand (1059–88), had been a monk of Fécamp before entering Holy Trinity Rouen, itself a foundation of *c.* 1030, whose first abbot was the German Isembert.[28] If the myth of Egypt was part of a new rhetoric of reform from the early twelfth century, an affinity to Jerusalem may be characterised as a feature of a previous, eleventh-century wave of monastic reform.

Monastic pilgrimages to Jerusalem engendered contacts with monasteries and monastic communities in the Holy Land. Yet, just as historians have seen through the rhetoric of antiquity, so they have tended to dismiss the possibility that any mutual influences might have been at work in the reform phenomenon in the Orthodox and Latin worlds. The proximity of Latin- and Greek-speaking monks in eleventh-century Calabria, Apulia and Sicily; the presence of Nilus of Rossano, the doyen of Orthodox Calabrian monks, at Monte Cassino in the late tenth century; the adoption of Orthodox saints' cults, including those of St George, St Nicholas of Myra and St Katherine of Alexandria, to western monasteries can be seen as contextual but not explanatory factors in the emergence of 'monastic reform' in the West.[29] The current consensus

[26] See for example, Meinwerk, bishop of Paderborn, who sent monks to Jerusalem to take the dimensions of the Holy Sepulchre to copy the building for his own new monastic foundation, *Vita Meinwerci episcopi*, CCXVII, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH* (SS), XI (Hanover, 1854), 158–9.

[27] Gazeau, *Normannia Monastica*, II, 374–6, for details of contracts with Adelaide and William de Bordouville, Richard de Troarn and William de Milly; *L'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Troarn*, ed. R. N. Sauvage, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 4th series, 4 (Caen, 1911), 26, 222. For the Milly descendants in the Holy Land, see Malcolm Barber, 'The Career of Philip of Nablus in the Kingdom of Jerusalem', in *The Experience of Crusading*, II: *Defining the Crusader Kingdom*, ed. Peter Edbury and Jonathan Phillips (Cambridge, 2003), 60–75.

[28] Gazeau, *Normannia monastica*, II, 263–5.

[29] *Vita sancti Nili, PL*, CXX, cols. 124–32, for the impression made by St Nilus on the monks of Montecassino. See also Bernard Hamilton and P. A. McNulty, '*Orientale lumen et magistra Latinitas:* Greek Influence on Western Monasticism (900–1100)', in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos. Études et mélanges* (2 vols., Chevtogne, 1963), I, 181–216; Graham Loud, 'Montecassino and Byzantium in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, ed. M. Mullett and A. Kirby (Belfast, 1994), 30–58; H. Bloch, 'Montecassino,

among monastic historians is that the reform movement in the West was self-generated. Similarities between ideals and practices found in both Orthodox and Latin monasticism are thus put down to the coincidence of reformers in both spheres reading and being influenced by the same 'classic' early monastic texts, especially Cassian, the corpus of Basilian and pseudo-Basilian regulatory texts and the 'literature of the desert' such as the *Sayings of the Fathers*.[30] This process entailed the emergence of new 'textual communities' with mindsets that enabled them to articulate their own positions in relation to past ideals: such communities identified themselves as 'reformers'; as undertaking *renovatio*. A corollary is that those who were not so identified were, by definition, 'unreformed', or enemies of 'reform'.[31] Western monastic discourses of the period from *c.* 1050 to 1200 were very largely informed by this agenda. It is hard to escape the conclusion that the historiography of monasticism has been no less driven by the same agenda, an agenda that sees religious life in this period according to a model of 'reform' versus 'tradition'. Such an agenda allows little place for reform to have come from anywhere but within, from reading texts, rather than from observation and shared experience; in fact, it allows no place for the geography of monasticism. In what follows, I offer a few examples that suggest greater complexity than the current model allows, and that might make us rethink the context of the 'myth of the desert'.

One of the underlying principles of reform in practice in the West, insisted upon in the rhetoric of just about all reforming foundations, was the performance of manual labour by the monks.[32] The first monks had done manual labour, therefore monks who did not perform such labour were not to be classed alongside the progenitors of the monastic profession. One of the earliest texts to mention manual labour in this

Byzantium and the West in the Early Middle Ages', in H. Bloch, *Montecassino in the Middle Ages* (Rome, 1968), 1–136; J. MacGregor, 'Negotiating Knightly Piety: The Cult of the Warrior Saints in the West ca. 1070–ca. 1200', *Church History*, 73 (2004), 317–45; Elizabeth Lapina, 'Demetrius of Thessaloniki, Patron Saint of Crusaders', *Viator*, 40 (2009), 93–112; Paul Oldfield, 'St Nicholas the Pilgrim and the City of Trani between Greeks and Normans c. 1090–1140', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 30 (2008), 168–81; C. W. Jones, 'The Norman Cults of Saints Catherine and Nicholas', in *Hommages à André Boutemy*, ed. G. Cambier (Brussels, 1976), 216–31; Christine Walsh, *The Cult of Saint Katherine of Alexandria in Early Medieval Europe* (Aldershot, 2007).

[30] Thus Henrietta Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism* (New York, 1992), 24–5; Marilyn Dunn, 'Eastern Influence on Western Monasticism in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 13 (1988), 245–59.

[31] See the discussions by Conrad Leyser, 'Custom, Truth and Gender in Eleventh-Century Reform', in *Gender and Christian Religion*, ed. R. N. Swanson, Studies in Church History, 34 (Woodbridge, 1998), 75–91; and Kathleen Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2005), 111–33.

[32] Constable, *Reformation*, 210–12.

context, however, is not a classic 'reform' text at all, but the chronicle of Monte Cassino, Benedict's original foundation in Campania. In the 990s, a group of monks left Monte Cassino for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, then went on to the Greek monastery of Mt Sinai, and on to Mt Athos. On their return to Monte Cassino in 998, one of the monks, Liutius, founded a dependent cell where he devoted himself to a life of asceticism and, to the astonishment of both his contemporaries and to the Monte Cassino chronicler writing nearly a century later, to manual labour such as grinding the corn for the monks' food.[33] This episode appears to show – at least, in the mind of the chronicler who juxtaposes the story of the pilgrimage with the introduction of manual labour – the influence of a rather different monastic tradition – the laura monasticism of Mt Athos, founded earlier in the tenth century as a conscious revival of the practices of the early monks of the Holy Land.[34] In fact, this was not the first time such an influence had informed practice in a western monastery: in 933, John of Gorze had introduced manual labour at his new foundation after seeing Greek monks at work at Monte Gargano in Italy.[35]

Influences can be subtler than the appropriation of a custom or way of life. One of the earliest of the new monastic foundations in Normandy in the eleventh century was Holy Trinity, Rouen, founded in 1030. Within a few years of its foundation, the monastery had developed a cult dedicated to St Katherine of Alexandria, at that time a relatively obscure virgin martyr known largely in the Greek-speaking world.[36] By mid-century, Holy Trinity, Rouen, claimed to possess relics of the saint's finger bones, which oozed a clear oil that performed miracles of healing.[37] An anonymous account of the foundation of the monastery and of the acquisition of the relics was written by a Rouen monk at some point in the second half of the eleventh century. The account seeks to tie the founding of the monastery to the colourful Greek monk, Symeon, originally a native of Sicily who subsequently became a monk in the Holy Land and at Sinai, and who apparently brought the relics of the saint with him to Normandy after participating in the pilgrimage to Jerusalem led by Richard of Saint-Vannes and Richard II of Normandy.[38] In fact,

[33] *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, II, 12, 22, ed. H. Hoffman, *MGH* (SS), XXXIV (Hanover, 1980), 190, 206.
[34] '*Rule* of Athanasios the Athonite for the Lavra Monastery', XXIX–XXX, trans. George Dennis, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, ed. John Thomas and Angela Hero (5 vols., Washington, DC, 2000), I, 227.
[35] *Miracula Sancti Gorgonii*, XXVI, *MGH* (SS), IV (Hanover, 1841), 246.
[36] Walsh, *Cult of Saint Katherine*, 63–78.
[37] *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité de Rouen*, ed. A. Delville, in *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Bertin*, ed. M. Guérard (Paris, 1841), no. 97, 466–7.
[38] 'Sanctae Catherinae virginis et marytris translatio et miracula Rotomagenia saec. XI', ed. A. Poncelet *Analecta Bollandiana*, 22 (1903), 423–38.

Symeon cannot be shown to have had anything to do with the founding of Holy Trinity, and the whole account can be seen as part of a genre of institutional foundation-legends.[39] But the significance of the account lies not in whether Holy Trinity was or was not founded by a Greek monk, but the plausibility of such a claim to contemporaries. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the foundation story is the insouciance with which a Benedictine monastic author of the second half of the eleventh century can narrate the circumstances of the foundation of his house by a Greek Orthodox monk. We assume that the chronicler was aware of the quite separate regulatory traditions operating in the Orthodox world, where the Rule of Benedict was, although known, not followed by Greek monks;[40] where, in fact, monastic founders adopted or composed their own Rules. There is nothing in the known history of Holy Trinity that suggests anything other than Benedictine observance; yet, according to the Rouen chronicler, Symeon not only founded the monastery according to his own customs, but put its running in charge of Greek companions he had brought with him from Sinai.[41] One might argue that the purpose of the text – promotion of the monastery's claims to powerful relics – trumped the need for anything like historical veracity or even plausibility. The fact remains that in the language and terms of reference of the text itself, for a Norman monastery to have been founded by a Greek monk was apparently uncontroversial – or, to put it another way, a Norman contemporary of Guibert of Nogent had no objection to being thought of as the product of a Greek Orthodox foundation.

Perhaps it was uncontroversial because to monks adherence to a particular set of regulations or to a doctrinally determined body of religious customs was a secondary consideration. During the siege of Antioch on the first crusade, the Frankish knight Peter Jordan of Châtillon, who had been wounded and thought he would not recover, wanted to end his life as a monk. He professed at the only monastery available in Antioch – the Greek Orthodox monastery of St Paul.[42] Neither the knight nor the Greek monks saw any difficulty about a Latin becoming a monk at an Orthodox monastery. Nor did this kind of interchange only apply to the dying. The Orthodox laura of St Sabas, in the Judaean desert south of Jerusalem, altered its *typikon* in the early years of the twelfth century in order to make liturgical provision for Franks who might become monks

[39] R. Fawtier, 'Les reliques rouennaises de Sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie', *Analecta Bolladiana*, 41 (1923), 365.

[40] Jerusalem, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate Taphou MS 35, an eleventh-century codex owned by the monastery of St Theodosius, south of Jerusalem, contains the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great in Greek.

[41] 'Sanctae Catherinae', ed. Poncelet, 429.

[42] *Le cartulaire de Cormery*, ed. J. J. Bourassé (Tours, 1861), 104.

there.[43] There would be no point in making the change unless it reflected some kind of reality. There were precedents for this. Toward the end of the tenth century, a Latin bishop on pilgrimage in the East as a penance for the accidental murder of his nephew asked the advice of Patriarch Genasios, while in Constantinople, for a suitable place to settle as a hermit. Genasios discouraged him from this course, but recommended instead that he follow an eremitical life within a cenobitic community. The bishop asked where such a thing, of which he had never heard, might be done, and was sent to the monastery of St Mamas, where he would find 'another Arsenios the Great' in the person of the superior Symeon 'the New Theologian'. The bishop professed as a monk, taking the name Hierotheos.[44]

The conquest and settlement of the Holy Land and western Syria by Franks as a result of the crusade brought two overlapping monastic traditions, the Benedictine and the Greek Orthodox, into the same geographical space. Some of the results of this sharing of space have already been noted in the religious architecture of the Crusader States: for example, the extension of the Orthodox church at 'Abud to allow for Latin congregations, the double use of the shrine church of St John the Baptist at 'Ain Karim, and the monastery at al-Ba'ina, the confessional status of which remains uncertain.[45] I offer three examples of how the Holy Land functioned as what might be termed a laboratory of monastic 'invention' – in the original sense of the word, as a 'finding' of practices transmitted through observation and imitation.

The first concerns a link between demonic possession and certain types of manual labour. A fragmentary monastic text of the mid-twelfth century from the Crusader States, Gerard of Nazareth's *On the Way of Life of the Servants of God* gives a brief account of a solitary hermit called Ursus who lived on the Jebel Lakoum (Black Mountain) north-west of Antioch. Periodically tormented by demons in his solitude, he rid himself of the problem by entering a monastery and undertaking a particularly menial kind of labour – work in the kitchen and bakery.[46] The connection

[43] 'Die klösterregeln des hl. Sabbas', ed. E. Kurtz, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 3 (1894), 167–70.

[44] *Un grand mystique byzantine: la Vie de Syméon le nouveau théologien*, ed. and trans. I. Hausherr, LII–LVII, Orientalia Christiana XII (Rome, 1928), 68–72.

[45] Ronnie Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1996), 128–36; Andrew Jotischky, 'The Frankish Encounter with the Greek Orthodox in the Crusader States', in *Tolerance and Intolerance. Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. Michael Gervers and James M. Powell (Syracuse, 2001), 102; *Les sains pelerinages*, V, 20, *Pelerinaiges*, XX, *Chemins et pelerinages*, A.IV, 17, in *Itinéraires à Jérusalem et descriptions de la Terre-Sainte rédigés en français au XIe, XIIe et XIII siècles*, ed. H. Michelant and G. Raynaud (2 vols., Geneva, 1879–80), II, 104, 102, 188; Denys Pringle, *The Churches of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. A Corpus. Vol. I A–K* (Cambridge, 1993), 82–92.

[46] Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'Gerard of Nazareth, a Neglected Twelfth Century Writer in the Latin East', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (1983), 71–7, from Matthias Illyricus Flacius, *Historia*

between mental health and this specific kind of manual labour is striking. The only parallels known to me come from the Orthodox monastic tradition. A younger contemporary of Ursus was the Georgian monk Gabriel, who, although a monk of St Sabas, was living of his own volition as a stylite on a pillar in the desert near the monastery. What is known about Gabriel comes from a Greek instructional homily by the Cypriot monk Neophytos the Recluse, the purpose of which is to advise monks how to recognise and deal with demons and demonic possession. Gabriel, assailed by demons on his pillar, failed to recognise them for what they were, and after trying unsuccessfully under their influence to murder another solitary monk, he was taken in disgrace back to St Sabas. The superior of St Sabas expelled him to the cenobitic monastery of St Euthymius, also in the Judaean desert. Here, he was put to work collecting and carrying wood for the monastery's kitchen and bakery. Each load, says Neophytos, was like the cargo borne by a camel on its back: 'You could see this man every day bringing a load of wood on his shoulders hardly less than a camel's load . . . he was in subjection, slaving away zealously in the monastery.'[47] The purpose of this was clearly to rid Gabriel of the demons. There were established connections between monastic discipline, kitchen work and humility in the early Palestinian tradition, with which Neophytos was certainly familiar. According to Cyril of Scythopolis, John the Hesychast, wishing to hide his real identity as a bishop when he entered the *laura* of St Sabas, welcomed the job of kitchen servant. Similarly Cyriacus, when turned away from St Euthymius because of his youth, proved himself as a monk by chopping wood and carrying water for the kitchen.[48] In these cases, volunteering for low-status manual labour associated with the kitchen was a means of proving oneself in the *coenobium*. In the early Egyptian monastic tradition, a further connection tied manual labour concerned with kitchen and bakery to demonic possession. In Palladius's *Lausiac History*, a nun at Tabennisi pretends to be possessed by demons so that she can be assigned the most menial of kitchen work – serving the food and clearing plates afterwards. The nun is continually maltreated and mocked by the others for her apparent affliction and for her willingness to carry out humble work. An anchorite, told about the nun in a vision, visits the convent and tells the nuns that she whom they think is the lowest of them all is in fact their

Ecclesiastica, integram ecclesiae Christi ideam . . . secunda singulas centurias perspicuo ordine complectens (7 vols., Basel, 1562–74), XII, *Duodecima Centuria*, cols. 1603–10.

[47] *Narratio de monachi Palestinensis*, *in* 'Saints de Chypre', ed. H. Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 26 (1907), 162–75.

[48] *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz (Leipzig, 1939), 205–6, 225.

spiritual mother. As in Gabriel's story, a menial form of manual labour becomes a path to spiritual growth.[49]

It is easy enough to trace the influences on Neophytos in compiling his homily on Gabriel. More puzzling is the question of how Gerard of Nazareth, the earlier writer of the two, might have known about them. Knowledge of Greek was nugatory among western clerics such as Gerard, and none of the texts in which these practices occur was available in Latin. We are seeing, then, either the parallel development of the same traditions – manual labour as a disciplinary antidote to demonic possession, coupled with a particular relationship between solitary and communal monasticism – or evidence for interplay between Orthodox and Latin practices based not on textual influences but on observation and experience. A recent study of demonic visitation in twelfth-century western monasticism has concluded that although demons and the dangers of demonic affliction were common in monastic discourse, the treatment of the subject by most writers concentrated on the heroism of monks' resistance to demons, without showing much interest in the spiritual meaning of demonic assaults on monks.[50] Only among twelfth-century Cistercians, Tom Licence argues, can a more ambiguous and adventurous attitude to demonic visitation be discerned. The ability to see demons was explored by Cistercian writers, notably Herbert of Clairvaux and Caesarius of Heisterbach, as a spiritual gift and therefore as a mark of special visionary powers.[51] This does not quite correspond to Neophytos's use of Gabriel, who is set up by Neophytos as a cautionary example to be avoided rather than emulated. Nor do the Cistercian writers explore the possible meanings of demonic visitation in the same manner as Neophytos in his discussion of Gabriel. It is nevertheless striking to find an interest among the Cistercians in the spirituality of demonic visitation as it reflects on the experience and inner life of the monk in a way that is markedly different from the usual treatment of the theme in western hagiography.

Two further examples take us from the Holy Land to England. Ten years before his death in 1167, Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx, had a special building constructed for him at the monastery in which he could live because his infirmities no longer permitted him to move around or to exercise his office freely. The exact form of this building remains unclear, but it is described in Walter Daniel's *Life of Aelred* as a 'mausoleum', or free-standing tomb.[52] It was large enough to house up to thirty monks at

[49] Palladius, *The Lausiac History*, XXXIV, ed. Cuthbert Butler (Cambridge, 1898–1904), 98–100.
[50] Tom Licence, 'The Gift of Seeing Demons in Early Cistercian Spirituality', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 39 (2004), 49–65.
[51] *Ibid.*, 62–4.
[52] Walter Daniel, *Life of Aelred of Rievaulx*, XXXI, 39–40.

a time, and it functioned as a separate cell in which he followed his own dispensation: its purpose was to free him from strict observance of the Rule on health grounds, without the need to be confined to the infirmary. The curious feature is the term used to describe it. There is no comparable usage known to me in medieval Latin of 'mausoleum' as a space for the living rather than the dead; nor is a strictly comparable monastic structure known from archaeological or literary evidence. One can see why it made particular sense in this instance, given that Aelred was considered to be near death, and the rich symbolism of inhabiting a mausoleum reinforced the image of the monk as dead to the world. But the construction of a building called a mausoleum but not actually functioning as such, in a monastic setting, is unusual, perhaps unique. There is a specific example that we can connect to Ailred's 'mausoleum'. Aelred's contemporary Godric of Finchale, the anchorite of Wearside, had according to his biographer Reginald of Durham been inspired by the example of solitary monks he had encountered in Jerusalem on pilgrimage. Now, hermits are known to have inhabited the rock tombs in the Kidron Valley, to the east of the city walls, in the twelfth century.[53] These tombs offered at the same time commodious accommodation near the holy city and the symbolism of being dead to the world. Aelred of Rievaulx's connections with the monks of Durham are well known, and the earliest manuscript of his *Life* comes from the Durham monastic library.[54] Moreover, Aelred is known to have sought out Godric himself in 1159, perhaps in the company of Godric's biographer, Reginald; certainly Reginald attests that it was at Aelred's prompting that he wrote the biography of Godric.[55] I suggest that the mausoleum he had built for him at Rievaulx came from the direct example of the tomb chambers at Jerusalem, through the mediation of Godric. More broadly speaking, Aelred's removal of himself as abbot from the community into a dwelling sited within the monastery but immune from the monastery's regulation is reminiscent of contemporary Orthodox rather than Benedictine practices – Neophytos's cave at the Enkleistra comes to mind.[56]

Another Godric, the anchorite of Throkenholt recently rescued from oblivion by Tom Licence, provides a further possible example of such a

[53] Andrew Jotischky, *The Perfection of Solitude. Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States* (University Park, PA, 1995), 69–71.

[54] Walter Daniel, *Life of Aelred of Rievaulx*, XXVIII–XXIX.

[55] Reginald of Durham, *De vita et miraculis S. Godrici heremitae de Finchale*, ed. J. Stevenson, Surtees Society (1847), 176–7.

[56] 'The Rule of Neophytos the Recluse', XIV–XV, ed. and trans. Nicholas Coureas, *The Foundation Rules of Medieval Cypriot Monasteries: Makhairas and Neophytos*, Cyprus Research Centre Texts and Studies in the History of Cyprus XLVI (Nicosia, 2003), 146–9.

link in monastic practices.[57] Godric retired to a purpose-built hermitage in East Anglia in the late eleventh century. Among the amenities of his hermitage was a chair with a curved back of shoulder height and with a separate neck-rest that he designed himself. This he used instead of a bed, so that he could stay up all night in vigils of prayer while still availing himself of some rest.[58] Godric's chair is worthy of note as an unusual detail of twelfth-century western ascetic practices. Where did the idea come from? It is possible, of course, that the idea as well as the design originated with Godric himself. Nevertheless, the practice of spending the night in a chair rather than lying down is also found among early Orthodox monks. It is first attested in Pachomius's *Rule*, as cited by Palladius, in a passage that requires monks to sleep on inclined benches or seats rather than in a fully supine position.[59] It seems to have been more common, however, in Palestine rather than Egypt or Syria, where mats on the floor became standard.[60] John Moschus reports that the monks of the laura of Ailiotes slept on chairs made of wicker (*sella viminea*).[61] But even if Godric had been educated, he is unlikely to have known Moschus or the Syrian texts. Although Pachomius's *Rule* was known in the West through the Latin translation by Jerome, tellingly, Jerome's version omits any mention of a chair, preferring the more common sleeping mat.[62] Contemporary Orthodox monastic practice preferred the use of mats or benches of wood or stone. At the monastery of St John on Patmos, for example, the only beds were of the collapsible variety, and used exclusively for sick monks.[63] The closest near-contemporary use of a chair for sleeping appears to be in the *Life of Lazaros of Mount Galesion*, a mid-eleventh-century text. Lazaros, who became a stylite in his own foundation at Mt Galesion in Asia Minor, had learned his ascetic practices as a monk of St Sabas in the last decade of the tenth and first decade of the eleventh century. According to his biographer, Lazaros used a specially designed chair rather than a bed so

[57] 'The *Life and Miracles* of Godric of Throkenholt', ed. Tom Licence, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 124 (2006), 15–43.

[58] 'ligneum sedile usque ad humeros in altitudine, in modum circuli rotundi, super quod die noctuque sedit', Licence, '*Life and Miracles*', 25–8. At other times he sat outside on a particular piece of turf for the same purpose, which after his death was kept and venerated by his patron.

[59] Pachomius, *Koinonia*, II. *Pachomian Chronicles and Rules*, trans. A. Veilleux (Kalamazoo, 1981), 126; also Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, XXXII, 3, ed. Butler, 88.

[60] For early Syrian practices, see A. Voobus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum 184, 197 (2 vols., Louvain, 1958–60), II, 264–5, where examples of standing and lying in contorted positions are given, but without reference to chairs.

[61] John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, LXIII, *PL*, LXXIV, col. 148.

[62] Pachomius, *Regula*, LXXXVIII, *PL*, XXIII, col. 74.

[63] N. Oikonimides, 'The Contents of the Byzantine House from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Centuries', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 44 (1990), 205–14.

that he could never lie down at full stretch.[64] This practice Lazaros derived from the story that an angel had instructed Pachomius that monks should not lie down on their sides to sleep but doze while sitting up.[65] The word used to describe the preferred seat, *pezoulion*, has only one other known usage in Byzantine Greek: a Palestinian monastic text of the sixth century, the *Life of George of Choziba*.[66] All the evidence, therefore, points to the chair as a Palestinian Orthodox monastic practice, apparently still in use in the early eleventh century. Now, Godric certainly could not have known the *Life of Lazaros*, which did not achieve wide circulation even in the Byzantine world before a short summary version was composed in the fourteenth century.[67] It is quite possible that the custom arose independently in East and West, and that its adoption by Godric was coincidental. This might be a convincing argument for a custom so widespread or so obviously derivative from standard sources in common use in both Orthodox and Latin Christendom as to be picked up sooner or later without reference to corresponding usage by contemporaries. But the 'sleeping chair' is in fact a rather unusual detail, evidently known but not widespread in either East or West, and the likeliest explanation therefore is that it is a further example of a non-textual influence, picked up at some degree of remoteness – perhaps from something heard by a pilgrim or crusader returning from the East.

The fact that in none of these cases is there any textual attestation of influence should not deter us from seeing the transmission of ideas. Reluctance to attribute any aspects of reforming monasticism to knowledge of the contemporary monastic scene in the East is rooted in a methodology that reifies textual transmission as the main agent of praxis. Influences are generally established by historians' demonstrations through textual reference points that a given source of knowledge was available to a writer at a given time and could thus be transmitted through reading, internal absorption and composition. Reform monasticism thus takes the form of a 'communicative repertoire' through the composition and dissemination of texts from one monastic community to another. Reform texts generated by a fluid group of like-minded writers communicated ideologies through rhetorical conventions. Monasticism, however, provides a field of enquiry in which textual study offers only partial understanding of praxis. The regular life was based on

[64] *The Life of Lazaros of Mt Galesion*, XVIII, XXXV, ed. and trans. Richard P. Greenfield (Washington, DC, 2000), 99, 122. Lazaros, as superior at Mt Galesion, refused to permit beds even for sick monks, CLXII, 253–4.

[65] *Ibid.*, CLII, 253–4.

[66] A. N. Athanassakis and T. Vivian, 'Unattested Greek Words in the *Life of St George of Choziba* and the *Miracles of the Most Holy Mother of God of Choziba*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 45 (1994), 625.

[67] *The Life of Lazaros*, 1.

imitation and repetition: the continual practice of 'regulation of cycles of repetition'.[68] This is, indeed, implicitly recognised in some twelfth-century western monastic discourses. As Caroline Bynum remarked, Cistercian spirituality provided a laboratory for the nurturing of souls through observing and replicating the exemplary behaviour of others.[69]

Monasticism was a process of *doing* as well as of reading and studying – as Peter Damian famously observed of his visit to Cluny in 1063. The nature of influences from observation is that it is rarely possible to demonstrate the mode of transmission. But just as Liutulf and the other Cassinese monks brought knowledge of contemporary Orthodox practices to Campania in the early years of the eleventh century, and Franks saw Orthodox monasteries in Syria at work during the first crusade,[70] so the Greek bishop Barnabas became a monk at the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Benigne, Dijon, before 1031, and Constantine of Trebizond was planting a vineyard as a monk at Malmesbury in the 1030s, while the Greek Sicilian Symeon, professed as a monk of Sinai, ended his life in Trier.[71] Exchanges from Orthodox monastic practice to the West are by their nature elusive, but they are implicit in both western and Orthodox sources. We might likewise pay closer attention to the kinds of shared practices implicit in the re-use or simultaneous use of the same spaces for monastic life by Orthodox and Latin monks, to the shared veneration of relics in regions where Orthodox and Latin monks came into contact, and especially to the introduction of eastern liturgical feasts in western monasteries.[72] In short, there is scope

---

[68] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Harmondsworth, 1979), 149.

[69] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother. Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), 72–6.

[70] For an example of first crusaders at a Greek Orthodox monastery, 'Narratio quomodo reliquiae martyris Georgii ad nos Aquicinensis pervenerunt', *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens Occidentaux*, V (Paris, 1895), 248–52; see also Charles H. Haskins, 'A Canterbury Monk at Constantinople c. 1090', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 293–5; although there is no evidence that the monk in question spent time at a Constantinopolitan monastery, it would have been strange if he had not at least visited one; for another western visitor, Krijnie Ciggaar, 'Une description de Constantinople dans le *Tarragonensis* 55', *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 53 (1995), 17–40.

[71] *Vita S. Guillelmi Divionensis*, in *Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. L. D'Achery and J. Mabillon (9 vols., Paris, 1668–1701), VI, 302; William of Malmensbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, V, 260–1, ed. Michael Winterbottom and Rodney M. Thomson (2 vols., Oxford, 2007), I, 620–1; *Vita S. Symeonis*, *Acta Sanctorum*, ed. J. Bollandus *et al.* (69 vols., Paris, 1643–1940), June I, 88–101; see also Michael Lapidge, 'Byzantium, Rome and England in the Early Middle Ages', in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 49 (2002), 363–400; Krijnie Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium 962–1204* (Leiden, 1996), 130–1.

[72] E.g. the feast of St Katherine in eleventh-century Canterbury, British Library Cotton MS Vit. E. XVIII, fo. 7r, and the early twelfth-century Cambridge Corpus Christi MS 270.

for a widening of the grammar of reform so as to include observation and imitation as valid agencies in determining monastic practice.

The monastic reform of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is now recognised to have been a complex, porous and malleable phenomenon. The variegated monastic scene inhabited by figures such as Dominic of Foligno in eleventh-century Italy, in which the Rule of Benedict was only one of a number of possible alternative ways of living a monastic life, makes for a picture of rich hues and textures.[73] Above all, historians have learned to be wary of the rhetoric of reform. Acute awareness on the part of reform-minded solitaries and communities of the ideals and practices of their forebears – the 'ancient fathers' whose costume Bartholomew of Farne tried to imitate – was honed by the study of the texts in which they were transmitted. But the range of such texts available to western monks of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was not only limited, but also skewed towards a particular type of early monasticism – that practised in Egypt. The *Institutes* and *Conferences* of John Cassian, Athanasius's *Life of Anthony*, Jerome's *Vitas patrum*, *Life of Paul the Hermit* and translation of one version of Pachomius's *Rule*, are all concerned primarily with Egyptian monasticism. Rufinus's translation of Basilian monastic regulations, and similar pseudo-Basilian material, were also known in some western monasteries, but this still left out of consideration a large corpus of monastic texts from Syria and Palestine. The monasticism described by Cyril of Scythopolis, John of Ephesus and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, to name only the most obvious examples, could scarcely have been known in the West from textual transmission. Yet, it is clear that some of the monastic practices and ideals of the Holy Land and to a lesser degree Mt Athos were known, however tenuously, in pockets of the West in the eleventh century, and known largely from personal experience and observation, through modes of transmission that are only implicit in the sources. These practices and ideals owed less to the Egypt seen through the lens of Cassian and Jerome than to the Holy Land. In this respect, Jerusalem stood at the heart of western monasticism during the period of reform.

Paul of Caen, abbot of St Albans (1077–93), is said to have adopted eastern monastic disciplinary norms, *Gesta abbatum sancti Albani*, ed. T. Riley (3 vols., 1867–9), I, 60. The Cistercian monastery of Vallis Lucens (Vaulvisant) owned a Latin translation of the liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom in the twelfth century, now Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Nouvelles Acquisitions Latines 1791; A. Jacob, 'La traduction de la liturgie de S. Basile par Nicholas d'Otrante', *Bulletin de l'Institut Belge de Rome*, 38 (1967), 51–2.

[73] John Howe, *Church Reform and Social Change in Eleventh-Century Italy: Dominic of Sora and his Patrons* (Philadelphia, 1997); Graham Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy* (Cambridge, 2007), 53–9; and the forthcoming book by Paul Oldfield, *Sanctity and Pilgrimage in Medieval Southern Italy (1000–1200)* (Cambridge); on Greek monasticism in Italy, S. Borsari, *Il monachesimo bizantino nella Sicilie e nell'Italia meridionale prenormanne* (Naples, 1963), 60–76; G. Vitolo, 'Les monastères grecs de l'Italie mériodionale', in *Moines et monastè res dans les sociétés de rite grec et latin*, ed. J.-L. Lemaitre, M. Dmitriev and P. Gonneau (Geneva, 1996), 99–113.