Double Monasticism in the Greek East: Eighth through Fifteenth Centuries

Dr. Daniel F. Stramara Jr.

Various scholars have claimed that the ascetical institute known as the "double monastery"—a single monastic unit of monks and nuns following the same rule, under the same superior, living in the same locality, but in separate quarters[1] —was officially condemned and therefore disappeared from the church's history.[2] This article will address such an interpretation by situating the data in its historical context. I will demonstrate that double monasteries disappeared in the Greek East primarily because of economic reasons compounded by the fall of Constantinople in 1453, instead of ecclesiastical proscription as hitherto alleged.

DEFINITION

Before one can examine the demise of double monasticism in the Greek East, one must first delimit some various early forms of cenobitic life.[3] The designation "double monastery" can be cause for some confusion. A few modern scholars of western monasticism have questioned the appropriateness of the term.[4] I have utilized it for three reasons. First, the term is historical and has canonical import. Second, it is of Greek coinage and contemporaneous with the time period being examined. And third, the term enjoys the sanction of regular usage among scholars.[5] It seems that the first ecclesiastical witness to the term "double monastery (διπλοῦν μοναστήριον / *duplex monasterium*)" comes from the Seventh Ecumenical Council. However, the earliest legal usage of the appellation is found in Justinian I's *Novellae* 123.36 in A.D. 546.[6]

Canonists and historians both underscore that a "double monas-

tery" is not to be confused with a "mixed monastery."[7] Concerning Greek monasticism, the Byzantine scholar, Pargoire, emphasizes,

> It is necessary to distinguish the double monastery from the mixed monastery. The first simultaneously houses a community of men and a community of women, both communities placed under the governance of the same person, but separated one from the other. In the case of the second, men and women live together.[8]

The mixed monastery is an ascetical abode of men and women in which there is cohabitation, the sharing of common sleeping quarters. Such celibate ascetics were known as *agapetes* and *virgines subintroductae*.[9] This form of life was prevalent in the fourth century and persisted despite ecclesial prohibition.[10] Gribomont asserts that it is within this context that double monasteries arose as a corrective, especially with the institutionalization of monasticism.[11] Functionally, a household of *agapetes* is a mixed "monastery" and must not be confounded with a double monastery, which is comprised of strictly regulated separate quarters under one superior.[12] Basil of Caesarea, the architect of Greek monasticism (which was double),[13] spoke against male and female ascetics sharing common quarters, as well as priests maintaining virgins in their houses.[14]

The double monastery is quite different. It must be noted that 'double' does not mean two monasteries. "Juridically, the two groups [monks and nuns] form a unity, a moral person, a single whole: the 'double monastery.'"[15] Despite its name, a double monastery is *a single monastic unit* of monks and nuns following the same rule or *typikon*, under the same superior, living in the same locality, but in separate buildings. This type of monastic institution was widespread throughout the East, particularly in the early church.[16]

Furthermore, Leclercq, a western monastic historian, points out that besides double monasteries "there were what one might call 'twin monasteries,' and this was the case when a community of monks and one of nuns were in close proximity without being dependent on the other."[17] The same holds true for monasteries in the Byzantine Empire. Twin monasteries arose when one monastic enclave was built in the same locality as another without having a common governance. Although the term "twin" has no historical grounding in the eighth through fifteenth centuries, it nevertheless denotes a methodological distinction crucial to research and classification.[18]

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It is with this background in mind that one must analyze the texts often cited to argue the prohibition of double monasticism. The first civil regulation of monasticism was initiated by Emperor Justinian I in the sixth century. The canonist Jombart points out that "There were in Constantinople several monasteries where monks and nuns lived together under the same roof. This cohabitation was forbidden by Justinian."[19] Such monasteries were in fact "mixed" and not double. As Pargoire remarks, because there was sexual misconduct "Justinian could not but condemn mixed monasteries."[20] The same historical interpretation is maintained by Leclercq.[21] Understandably, all forms of sexual impropriety were censured in all monasteries.[22] It is quite probable that the monasteries of men and women established in Constantinople in the fourth century by Macedonius and Marathonius followed the mixed model.[23] Had some of these monasteries survived to Justinian's day? Had new mixed houses sprung up?

Significantly, Justinian's first legislation, issued in 529, seeks to redress the problem of cohabitation.

> We forbid all men dwelling in monasteries to live with women who are nuns or to contrive any pretext for having any association with them (for this introduces a just suspicion of meeting with them continually and whenever they wish), but so to be segregated that they shall have no participation with one another for any reason whatever and that no pretext of a course of life with one another should be sought either by the latter or by the former. But men alone by themselves should live in each monastery, segregated from the nuns who are *near-by* for any reason whatever, and the women alone by themselves, not mingled with men, for the purpose that all supposition of indecorous social intercourse should be destroyed absolutely (my emphasis).[24]

Justinian granted them one year in which to comply, dividing equally between the male and female ascetics the resources held in common. Arguably, double monasteries following Basil's model of segregated quarters were not envisaged in this proscription since they were not mixed nor were they twin, built near by one another. The decree of 529 must have been ineffective, for a similar mandate was

promulgated in 539. Evidently problems persisted, because in 543 Justinian issued another statute concerning the matter. Again cohabitation was clearly the focus.

> In all monasteries which are called cenobia, we order that canonical monks all dwell in a single building and eat in common, and in a similar manner all are to sleep separately in the same building, so that in turn they might bear witness to chaste conduct with each other ... All of these things are likewise to be observed carefully in monasteries and ascetical institutes of women. In not a single region of our empire do we permit monks and nuns to dwell in the same monastery or for there to exist so-called double monasteries. Wherever such monasteries are found we absolutely order that the men be separated from the women, and that the women remain in the monastery where they are and that the men build another monastery for themselves.[25]

To my knowledge, this is the first instance in which the designation "double monastery" appears. Justinian is obviously concerned with sexual impropriety, even between the monks.[26] At first glance, this decree appears to address Basilian double monasteries, however the focus is upon making sure that all the monks dwell in the same building and not be scattered about, living separately abroad. Communal life was, in fact, the norm as envisioned by Basil. Naturally, it follows that monks and nuns could not reside in the same monastic building. Basil had likewise laid down rules for the separate quarters of monks and nuns within one *adelphotes*,[27] or double monastery.[28] Diehl understands Justinian's legislation as directed against monks and nuns living together under the same roof.[29] Gerostergios likewise reads these laws as prohibition of cohabitation.[30] Therefore, historians are incorrect when they cite this decree as the end of Basilian double monasticism.[31]

In fact, history attests that Justinian's decrees were ineffectual, for double monasteries continued to exist and to be founded. Crowds of men and women assembled around Alypius the Stylite drawn by his way of life. His community sprung up in northern Asia Minor at the second half of the sixth century, during Justinian's reign or soon after his death.[32] Possibly another double monastery was founded around the charismatic figure Daniel the stylite.[33] Pargoire provides an example of a post-Justinian double institute which he himself asserts was demonstrably not mixed.[34] This community grew out of a household which devoted itself to the monastic way of life. In the seventh

century a double monastery of Egyptian monastics might have existed in Constantinople, for the life of St. Patapios frequently mentions nuns, although these could have been members of a nearby, yet separate, female monastery.[35] In the mid-eighth century Anthusa erected a double monastery in Bithynia called Tomantion which she governed.[36] In fact, double monasteries were flourishing in the Byzantine empire during the last quarter of the eighth century.[37]

NICAEA II AND SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Quite often canon 20 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council has been cited as testimony to the proscription of double monasticism.[38] However, a close examination of the decree does not substantiate such an unqualified assertion. The Council Fathers of Nicaea II in 787 declared,

> We decree that from now on no more double monasteries are to be started, because this becomes a cause of scandal and a stumbling block for ordinary folk... The double monasteries that have existed up to now should continue to exist according to the rule of our holy father Basil, and their constitutions should follow his ordinances. Monks and nuns should not live in one monastic building, because adultery takes advantage of such cohabitation... A monk should not sleep in a female monastery, nor should he eat alone with a nun.[39]

Demonstrably, the concern was with cohabitation and sexual impropriety. Rather than condemn double monasticism, the Council Fathers sought to regulate the association between male and female monastics. They purposely endorsed the Basilian form and upheld it as the model to be imitated, consequently safeguarding against such mixed monasticism in which "monks and nuns lived in one monastic building." Not surprisingly, such a living arrangement was to be censured and eradicated.

This was hardly the demise of Basilian double monasticism, which had flourished for four centuries. Not only had it survived in the Greek East but it now received official sanction as well. Furthermore, technically the canon did not preclude the possibility of a formerly established double monastery expanding and subsequently founding a new one to provide for its growing members. The daughter house could remain under the aegis of its ancient patrimony.

The Council did, however, encourage families which wanted to

embrace monasticism to have their male and female members join single-sex monasteries as opposed to entering a double monastery so as not to cause scandal for the simple minded. Canon twenty thus testifies to one of the prevailing reasons for the erection of a double monastery—families devoting themselves to a monastic mode of life. Basil had envisioned such within his Rule.[40]

While double monasteries were susceptible to scandal, this was no less true for same-sex institutes. Monasticism in the eighth century was fraught with many challenges, moral decay, as well as economic corruption.[41] The iconoclastic period witnessed the repression as well as secularization of monasteries in general. Monks and nuns were harassed, jailed, and even put to death. This furthered the moral decline while concomitantly engendered some outstanding monastic saints.[42]

At the beginning of the ninth century, matters had not significantly improved.[43] Because of scandal or the suspicion thereof, around the year 810, Patriarch Nicephorus I had to regulate male and female monasteries. Numerous scholars claim that Nicephorus in fact waged a campaign against double monasteries, causing the institution to disappear.[44] This assertion is based upon an account in the *Life of St. Nicephorus*.[45] However, a critical reading of the text proves nothing of the sort. I reject such an interpretation for the following reasons. 1) The term double monastery (διπλοῦν μοναστήριον) figures nowhere in the text. 2) Rather, the biographer speaks of men recently, and not so recently, erecting their monasteries near those of previously existing convents of nuns. This is clearly a case of twin monasteries. 3) The concern in *Vita* 4.27 is with cohabitation (συνδιαίτησιν) which would have been strictly precluded in a double monastery. Canon 20 of Nicaea II stipulated: "Monks and nuns should not live in one monastic building, because adultery takes advantage of such cohabitation (συνδιαίτησιν)." The biographer also uses the verb συνοικέω, the same one employed by Gregory of Nyssa regarding the cohabitation of *agapetes*.[46] (The Council had just proclaimed Gregory of Nyssa the "Father of the Fathers.")[47] Unmonitored twin monasteries could give occasion for such activity. 4) The biographer mentions Nicaea II in chapter ten of his *Vita*, but nowhere mentions it here. If Nicephorus I were going beyond the directives of this Council and closing double monasteries already given permission for their continued existence just a quarter of a cen-

tury ago, some mention of the Council should have been made. 5) The text is hagiographical, filled with pious generalities, referring to the "zeal of Phineas" and the "bite of the serpent;" it is not a reliable historical text upon which to base the complete suppression of double monasteries in the ninth century. And 6) a far more plausible interpretation can be offered for the text: Nicephorus I enforced Nicaea II and made sure no cohabitation occurred between twin monasteries— independent monasteries built by monks in the vicinity of autonomous convents of nuns. Because new double monasteries could not be founded, a way around the proscription was probably being devised: establish monasteries of men near already existing convents of women. Twin monasteries were the compromise between canonically regulated double monasteries and uncanonical mixed monasteries in which cohabitation was normal.

In fact, Dumortier has sufficiently demonstrated that Nicephorus I was responsible for the production and circulation of the *Corpus Asceticum* in which was contained a copy of St. John Chrysostom's tract against cohabitation.[48] Unfortunately, Dumortier believed that cohabitation was no longer a threat in the beginning of the ninth century, disregarding the evidence found in the late eighth century. He writes, "But if cohabitation no longer existed, a custom no less pernicious threatened to implant itself in the religious society, that of double monasteries."[49] If double monasticism were so pernicious why did the Council Fathers allow its continued existence, noting the "rule of our holy father Basil" as its basis?

To the contrary, practical matters probably occasioned Nicephorus' concern. Priests from neighboring monasteries would spend the night in convents of nuns because of celebrating the long night vigils and monastic liturgies. As Hefele notes, this raises the suspicion of cohabitation and sexual impropriety.[50] Records show that one such instance took place between twin monasteries in the eighth century.[51] Nicephorus was arguably trying to head off such cases. Furthermore, if Nicephorus did indeed close double monasteries or separate from each other the monks and nuns living in such institutes, why are the names of such double monasteries not included in the records? Janin, the Byzantine monastic historian, provides no such examples. Nor, to my knowledge, does history record any protests from previously sanctioned double monasteries, which would be justified in the face of such closings. This brief hagiographical passage is too tenden-

tious and vague to warrant the conclusion that Nicephorus closed any true double monastery, let alone waged a campaign against them all causing their disappearance.

Whatever the complete historical facts concerning Nicephorus, double monasticism did continue to survive in the Greek East, incessantly experiencing a re-birth.[52] Despite this, there is textual evidence for the possible growing scarcity of double monasteries compared with previous centuries. Gribomont points out that the O recension of the manuscripts of Basil's Rules and other ascetical works masculinized passages originally referring to female religious. The earliest witness dates from the tenth century.[53] Some manuscripts in the S and H as well as N recensions, likewise from the tenth century, drop out these and similar feminine texts. This fact, however, should not be construed as testifying to either the widespread or complete disappearance of double monasteries as Gribomont suggests.[54] Some such institutes might have persisted, citing canon 20 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council as justification for their continued existence. Arguably, they would have had copies of Basil's Rule dating back to an earlier period, which in fact would have been superceded by their own *typikon*.

Furthermore, it must be noted that numerous Greek monasteries in the tenth century were falling into ruin. Emperor Nicephorus II Phocas decreed that no new monastic establishments could be erected since so many were laying in decay. Basil II reaffirmed the same principle.[55] Monasticism in general was experiencing a decline. Some double monasteries probably disappeared.

Nevertheless, new double monasteries were eventually created. Emperor Alexis I Komnenos and his wife Irene Ducas (1081-1118) founded two monasteries, one for monks—Christ the Philanthropist, and the other for nuns—Theotokos Full of Grace. These monasteries were founded early in their reign, at least by 1107, being divided from each other by nothing more than a wall. In his 1964 article, Janin stated that this monastic complex was not a true double monastery since each had its own superior, and property was not held in common as was normal in double monasteries.[56] But in 1969, Janin changed his mind and classified it as constituting a double monastery.[57] Even though the female monastery was served by a priest and monks from the juxtaposed monastery, it appears that this was a case of twin monasteries rather than a proper double monastery. Unfortu-

nately, no documents help clarify the relationship between the two superiors. The female superior might have been subordinate to the male who acted as major superior. However, the arrangements must have been beneficial for both parties, since the two monasteries survived until 1453. The same empress appears to have established another twin monastery: St. Nicholas for nuns and the Forerunner of Petra for monks. However by the year 1200, the two monasteries might have merged into a double monastery.[58] Of further interest is the fact that Alexis I established at the church of Sts. Peter and Paul choirs of men and women who presumably also chanted the monastic offices which preceded the liturgies.[59] Were these choirs actually composed of monks and nuns assigned to this important church? Alexis' appointment of deaconesses to this church also testifies to his appreciation for the complementary presence of religious women.

In 1175 mention is made of a Greek double monastery known as Saïdaia several hours walking distance northeast of Damascus. It was a famous monastery renowned for its miraculous ikon, but no information regarding the date of its foundation has survived.[60] Nevertheless, one may safely conclude that by the end of the eleventh century and beginning of the twelfth, there was a move towards pairing together male and female religious institutes.

Janin catalogues numerous monasteries which were built near each other. What was the relationship between such houses? While it is impossible to determine the rapport, equally challenging is deciding which monasteries were double. Quite often Janin decides that a monastery was all-male because it had a male superior, but it just as well could have been double. Even the mention of nuns does not preclude the concomitant existence of monks, as Janin presupposes.[61] Records for middle Byzantine convents of nuns are scarce; understandably testimony for double monasteries would be comparably rare.[62] Most monasteries are mentioned only because something noteworthy happened, whether positive or negative. The average same-sex and double monastery escapes the chronicler's attention.[63] Only five *typika*, or foundation charters, written by women for women's monasteries have survived; and all of these were aristocratic establishments.[64] It is primarily important information concerning monasteries of notoriety which merits preservation. Such is the case with the following double monasteries.

In the third quarter of the thirteenth century a double monastery

was built on Mt. Ganos. Its founder established another in Constantinople soon afterwards. In 1289 he was elected Ecumenical Patriarch and became Athanasius I. When he resigned from this office in 1293, he returned to the double monastery only to be re-elected in 1303. He retired to his monastery once again in 1309. In fact in 1354, Patriarch Callistus I resigned and retired to this same double monastery. The double monastery subsequently known as St. Athanasius, thrived until 1383 when Patriarch Nilus I had to separate the community into two because of disputes between the monks and nuns concerning work and finances.[65] Beck's conclusion that Nilus I thus ordered the elimination of all double monasteries is unjustified.[66] Nilus had already been in office for four years, not taking any action; the fact of its being double was not the reason for its closure—division of labor and economics were.

Concerning Patriarch Athanasius I's two double monasteries, a puzzling mandate needs to be mentioned. Laurent catalogues as no. 1747 a previously unpublished decree found in Vat. gr. 2219, fol. 137v.[67] Unfortunately, the manuscript is so rare that it is not owned by the Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University; thus I have not been able to read the original Greek. However, Laurent provides a French translation. The first mandate of twenty-seven reads, "*Ils proscriront les monastères doubles et feront cesser la coutume des diaconesses.*" The bishops are commanded to proscribe double monasteries; but does this mean to prohibit the erection of new ones or to banish those already in existence? Significantly, the custom of having deaconesses is likewise to cease in the future. Does this mandate refer to double monasteries ruled by a deaconess who thus would have been the major superior over priests and hence the decree? Several deaconesses had governed double monasteries throughout history.[68] Why is a mandate issued by Athanasius who himself built double monasteries and obviously did not close them since he and another patriarch later retired to one? Laurent assigns no date to these decrees. Could they belong to another Athanasius or was the manuscript in bad condition and misread, Antonius (IV) [1391-97] being the patriarch under question?[69] If it came from Athanasius himself this is baffling, for Athanasius retired to his own double monastery and died there.

Whoever issued this decree, it was ignored as the following data demonstrates. One of Athanasius' double monasteries continued in

existence as such, until 1383 when it was separated into two insti-
tutes for financial reasons.[70] In fact, Callistus I after having retired at
the double monastery St. Athanasius returned as patriarch the begin-
ning of 1355 and reigned until the fall of 1363. During his second
reign he never sought occasion to close this double monastery, hav-
ing experienced it first hand.

Before Niphon I became Patriarch of Constantinople in 1310 he
had been in charge of two monasteries for women.[71] This arrange-
ment might suggest a double monastic system. Nevertheless, around
1310 the double monastery Christ the Philanthropist was founded in
Constantinople under royal patronage by Irene-Eulogia Choumnaina.
This monastery is not to be confused with the one previously men-
tioned. It existed for at least a century, perhaps until 1453.[72] None of
the patriarchs closed this double monastery. At the end of the four-
teenth century yet another double monastic institute was erected in
Constantinople: Mother of God, Hope of the hopeless. Around 1400
Patriarch Matthew I was asked to divide it in two because of eco-
nomic problems.[73] The *Life of St. Philotheos* bears witness to another
double monastery struggling to survive in Asia Minor at the begin-
ning of the fifteenth century in the face of Turkish advancements.[74]

One can safely presume that other hitherto uncatalogued double
monasteries were erected throughout Asia Minor and the Greek East.
Excluding the undated decree ascribed to Athanasius I, what becomes
quite clear from the above data is that Patriarchs of Constantinople
from the mid-thirteenth century through the fourteenth, permitted new
double monasteries to be erected even after Nicaea II forbade such a
practice. As long as these monastic establishments followed the pre-
scriptions of the Rule of Basil endorsed by the Council, they were
considered valid institutions meeting the needs of monks and nuns,
even the needs of patriarchs seeking solitude. Furthermore, to my
knowledge, none of the patriarchs during this period attempted to
close any double monastery for reasons of sexual impropriety.

The liturgical ceremony for the consecration of metropolitans and
archbishops dating from the late Byzantine period likewise indicates
that double monasticism survived and that the Church accepted this.
The new prelate was charged "to suppress the culpable relations and
cohabitations occasioned by the monasteries known as double, if these
monasteries should exist in his diocese."[75] This admonition does not
call for the dissolution of double monasteries, but rather for the bishop

to make sure the canonical regulations are followed so that sexual impropriety does not occur. This text is preserved in the seventeenth century liturgical rites. While this liturgical injunction may be no more than a preservation of an earlier one, it is important to note that double monasticism endured in what is now Lebanon until the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Its dissolution was due not to systemic problems or Maronite proscriptions; to the contrary, the patriarchs defended it. It was because of pressure from the Roman papacy that these ancient double monasteries were closed.[76]

What then is the reason for the demise of double monasticism in the Greek East? The broader context provides an answer. The end of the fourteenth century witnessed numerous disasters, both natural and human in origin.[77] By the mid-fifteenth century, the empire had suffered a marked decline in population as well as a very poor and struggling economy. When Constantinople fell in 1453, there were only eighteen monasteries left in the capital; previous centuries saw as many as over three hundred.[78] Unquestionably, the general state of affairs severely impacted double monasteries as well. As Bryer demonstrates, the fall of the empire and the subsequent economic crisis caused the complete closure of the vast majority of all previously surviving monasteries.[79] Consequently, one may reasonably conclude that the double monastery as an institution disappeared because of social and economic factors rather than as the result of sexual impropriety or systemic flaws necessitating ecclesiastical proscriptions.

Conclusion

In the Greek East, double monasticism was an enduring phenomenon existing under the aegis of Basil the Great. The liturgical, sacramental and mundane needs of monastic women presented the perennial expediency of establishing double monasteries as well as the alternative system of twin monasteries. Double monasteries arose around charismatic figures drawn by the particular saint's way of life. Others were established to provide for the needs of a family which decided to embrace an ascetical regime. The Seventh Ecumenical Council saw the wisdom of the provisions laid down by Basil in his Rule and endorsed this as the model for all eastern double monasteries. Mixed monasteries were to be eradicated, thus legisla-

tion was drafted to prohibit the dwelling together of monks and nuns within the same monastic building serving as dormitory. While Basilian double monasteries met these requirements, the Council decreed that no more could be erected because such establishments were a stumbling block to ordinary folk. Ironically, the subsequently adapted alternative system of twin monasteries was more susceptible to scandal—due to a decentralized means of authority and supervision—than the double monastic institute headed by one major superior over both monks and nuns who lived in separate quarters while sharing prayers and work in common.

Significantly, (apart from the one puzzling decree ascribed to Athanasius I who himself founded double monasteries and later retired to one dying there) none of the patriarchs sought to abolish double monasticism as has been previously claimed, in fact, some actively founded new double institutes. The Ecumenical Patriarchs did not choose to enforce Nicaea II's decree prohibiting the erection of new double monasteries. The widespread disappearance of double monasticism in the Byzantine Empire was the result of the fall of the empire itself and the general upheavel which ensued, not because of ecclesiastical proscription. Perhaps a few double monasteries did continue to persist before dissolving into oblivion along with their same-sex counterparts.

NOTES

[1] For this basic definition see E. Jombart, "Les monastères doubles," section 3 in "Cohabitation, historique," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* 3:972-73; H.J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, (New York: B. Herder Books, 1937), 153-54; Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint-Benoit* (Liege: Editions de Maredsous, 1948), 7:45-46; and Micheline de Fontette, *Les religieuses à l'age classique du droit canon* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1967), 17 note 20.

[2] The following scholars make this assertion: Jules Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," *Echos d'Orient* 9 (1906): 24; Stephanus Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster: Entstehung und Organisation*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens* vol. 15 (Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen, 1928), 22; Raymond Janin, "Monachisme byzantin au moyen age: commende et typica (Xe-XIVe siècle)," *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 22 (1964): 42-44; Robert H. Trone, "A Constantinopolitan Double Monastery of the Fourteenth Century: the Philanthropic Saviour," *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines* 10 (1983): 81-82; and Alice-Mary M. Talbot, "A Comparison of the Monastic Experience of Byzantine Men and Women," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 30 (1985): 6. Schroeder claims that the institution disappeared in the East in the ninth century because of suppression; see Schroeder,

Disciplinary Decrees, 155.

[3] See my article, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East—Fourth through Eighth Centuries," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6.2 (1998): 269-312.

[4] Johnson considers the term a "definitional quagmire" and calls for a "paradigm shift" since "in reality all women's houses were 'double' insofar as they all had priests attached to them;" see Penelope D. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 7. Gold wishes the term to be dropped because it is too vague, embracing many institutions with various lived experiences; see Penny Schine Gold, *The Lady and the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and Experience in Twelfth-century France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 101-02. While Gold is correct to point out that the designation "double monastery" does not guarantee a uniformity among various monasteries regarding their histories of foundation and subsequent organizational structures, this does not warrant abandoning the term any more than jettisoning the appellation "benedictine monastery" would because benedictine houses have divergent foundational histories, types of members, structures and forms of governance. The same would hold true for the classification "Orthodox monastery." Admittedly, "double monastery" is an umbrella category, but one which is exclusive, that is to say not including same sex institutions or locally proximate monasteries of men and women. In this regard, it is helpful because it narrows the focus of investigation which, however, should always be carried out in the wider historical context.

Nonetheless, Elkins remarks that "double monastery" is a designation not used by monastic houses in her particular historical context and therefore refrains from importing it into her presentation; see Sharon K. Elkins, *Holy Women of Twelfth-Century England* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), xviii. I, on the other hand, use it especially in this article because it is a Greek term used from the sixth century onward describing certain Greek monasteries.

[5] Recent entries for "Monasteries, double" are supplied by Alice-Mary Talbot in the 1991 *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* and by Jean Gribomont in the 1992 *Encyclopedia of the Early Church.* Such continuous scholarly use of the designation "double monastery" explains the title of this article.

[6] See Jombart, "Les monastères doubles," 973 and Gribomont, "Monasteries, Double," *New Catholic Encyclopedia.*

[7] For the canonists who make this distinction see Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils,* 154 and Jombart, "Les monastères doubles," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* 3:972-73 read in connection with "Monastère," 5:929. For the historians who emphasize the difference see Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 21; H. Leclercq and J. Pargoire, "Monastère double," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 2183; Mary Bateson, "Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* NS 13 (1899): 138; Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint-Benoit,* vol. 7:45 note 3 and page 48; and V. Laurent, "Une princesse byzantine au cloitre," *Echos d'Orient* 29 (1930): 48 note 5.

[8] Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 21.

[9] See H. Hemmer, "Agapètes," *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*; E. Magnin, "Agapètes," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*; Antoine Guillaumont, "Le nom des 'Agapètes,'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 30-37; and Gillian Cloke, *'This Female Man of God': Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, AD 350-450* (London:

Routledge, 1995), 77-81. Also see Melchiorre di Santa Maria and Jean Gribomont, "Agapète (Mulieres et virgines subintroductae)," *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* and H. Achelis, *Virgines Subintroductae: Ein Beitrag zum VII. Kapitel des I. Korintherbriefes* (Leipzig, 1902).

[10] See Susanna Elm, *'Virgins of God:' The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 25-51. For a synopsis of the canonical proscriptions see Magnin, "Agapètes," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique* and Francis X. Murphy, "Virgines Subintroductae," *New Catholic Encyclopedia.*

[11] Jean Gribomont, "Monachisme," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 10:1539-40.

[12] See my article, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East—Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 273-74.

[13] For Basil the Great's form of double monasticism see my article, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East—Fourth through Eighth Centuries."

[14] See Basil of Caesarea, *Epistulae* 169-71 and 188.6, Courtonne 2:104-06 and 126 as well as Elm, *Virgins of God*, 147 & 184.

[15] Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint-Benoit*, 7:46. His clarification holds true of Greek double monasteries.

[16] For this assertion see Aimé Solignac, "Monachisme," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 10:1604; E. V. Severus and S. Hilpisch, "Monasterio doppio," *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* 51; G. Cyprian Alston, "Monasteries, Double," *Catholic Encyclopedia* 452; and Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster*, 12 as well as my article.

[17] Jean Leclercq, "Feminine Monasticism in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries," in *The Continuing Quest for God: Monastic Spirituality in Tradition and Transition*, edited by William Skudlarek (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1982), 115. Leclercq's comments are likewise apropos for monasticism in the early church. A more recent scholar makes the same differentiation; see Roberta Gilchrist, *Gender and Material Culture: The archaeology of religious women* (London: Routledge, 1994), 25.

[18] My own research had led me to the same distinction and terminology before coming across Leclercq's nomenclature. Hilpisch likewise argued that one must not confuse neighboring monasteries with double monasteries; see Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster*, 1 and 4.

[19] Jombart, "Cohabitation, historique," 973.

[20] Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 22.

[21] See Leclercq, "Monastère double," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 2184.

[22] For the proscriptions of monastic legislators against homosexual activity as well as heterosexual see, "Double Monasticism in the Greek East: Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 308-11.

[23] See Elm, *Virgins of God*, 111-12 and 125 as well as my article pages 278-79 and 308.

[24] Justinian, *Codex Justinianum* 1.3.43, translated by P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State & Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to AD 535*, vol. 3 (London: SPCK 1966), 1032.

[25] Justinian, *Novellae* 123.36, edited by Rudulfus Schell, *Corpus iuris civilis: novellae* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 619; my translation.

[26] See for example, Basil of Caesarea, *De renuntiatione saeculi* 5, PG 31:637B-C; FC 9:23-24. Regarding the persistence of homosexuality in monastic life see David

Amand, *L'ascèse monastique de saint Basile: essai historique* (Maredsous: Editions de Maredsous, 1948), 246-48 and "Double Monasticism in the Greek East: Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 294-95.

[27] For the use of *adelphotes* to mean double monastery see my article, "Ἀδελφότης — Two Frequently Overlooked Meanings," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 316-20.

[28] See Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractatae* 15, PG 31:952C, as well as Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita s. Macrinae* 16 & 37, SC 178:194 & 258.

[29] See Charles Diehl, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VIe siècle* vol. 2 (NY: Burt Franklin, 1969), 510.

[30] See Asterios Gerostergios, *Justinian the Great: The Emperor and Saint* (Belmont, NY: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1982), 170-71.

[31] See for example J.M. Besse, "Abbaye. III Monastère double," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 1.27 and John Ryan, *Irish Monasticism: Origins and Early Development* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1992 [reprint of 1931 edition]), 142.

[32] It is difficult to date this but Alypius died during the reign of Heraclius (610-41) after spending sixty-seven years as a stylite; see Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les saints stylites* (Paris: Librarie Auguste Picard, 1923), lxxix. Soon after he became a stylite a double monastery arose up around him. If he died in 611, the double monastery arose as early as 544, one year after Justinian's decree. If it arose after Justinian's death in 565, this would place Alypius' death in 633 which is possible. Even if Alypius died in 641 this means the double monastery arose in 574 thirty years after Justinian's decree.

[33] In 536 Babylas was the priest and archimandrite over three monasteries centered around Daniel the stylite: 1) Daniel, 2) St. John the Baptist and 3) St Andrew; see Raymond Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin—première partie le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique: tome III les Églises et les monastères* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969), 86. This work is henceforth cited as *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:86 etc. Volume two will also be cited; thus I.2:37 etc. Was one of these three monasteries for women like that at the base of Alypius' column? As Janin points out, we know nothing concerning the members. If this was a double monastery, Justinian's decree was not obeyed.

[34] See Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 22-23.

[35] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:12. Nothing in the *Vita* clarifies the matter.

[36] See Paul Peeters, "S. Romain le néomartyr (1 mai 780) d'après un document géorgien," *Analecta Bollandiana* 30 (1911): 394.

[37] For Greek monasticism in general from the seventh through fifteenth centuries see Peter Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 25 (1971): 63-84.

[38] See for example, Trone, "A Constantinopolitan Double Monastery," 81-82.

[39] *Concilium Nicaenum II* canon 20, Tanner 153-54.

[40] See Basil of Caesarea, *Regulae fusius tractate* 12, PG 31:948C-949A as well as my article "Double Monasticism in the Greek East: Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 280-86.

[41] See Peter Charanis, "The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 4 (1948): 53-118 as well as Rosemary Morris, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium, 843-1118* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[42] See J. M. Hussey, "Byzantine Monasticism" Chapter XXV in *The Cambridge*

Medieval History Vol. IV Part II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 161-84; Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society," 66-67; and Charles A. Frazee, "Late Roman and Byzantine Legislation on the Monastic Life from the Fourth through the Eighth Centuries," *Church History* 51 (1982): 277-78.

[43] See John Travis, *In Defence of the Faith: The Theology of Patriarch Nikephoros of Constantinople* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984), 104-06.

[44] To name a few: Pargoire, "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 24; Hilpisch, *Die Doppelklöster*, 22; Janin, "Monachisme byzantin au moyen age," 42-44; Trone, "A Constantinopolitan Double Monastery," 82; Talbot, "A Comparison of the Monastic Experience," 6; and Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees*, 155.

[45] See *Vita s. Nicephori* 4.27, PG 100:69C-72C or the more recent critical text by Carl de Boor, *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani: Opuscula Historica* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880), 159-60. de Boor's text has a few insignificant orthographic corrections with no additional words or lines; the meaning does not change whatsoever.

[46] See Gregory of Nyssa, *De virginitate* 23.4, SC 119:538/40.

[47] Nicaea II, *Actio Sexta, Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Mansi 13:293E, (Paris, 1902).

[48] See J. Dumortier, "L'auteur présumé du *Corpus Asceticum* de S. Jean Chrysostome," *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 99-102.

[49] Dumortier, "L'auteur présumé du *Corpus Asceticum*," 101.

[50] See his comment on canon 20 of Nicaea II, Karl Joseph von Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church* vol. 5 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), 385.

[51] See *Vita s. Stephani Juniorius*, PG 100:1129B and Talbot, "A Comparison of the Monastic Experience," 3.

[52] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:10 and 525 and Gribomont, "Monasteries, Double," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*.

[53] See Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des ascétiques*, 54 and 60.

[54] See Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des ascétiques*, 294.

[55] See Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society," 67 and his "The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire," 56-64.

[56] See Janin, "Monachisme au moyen age," 42. Schroeder notes that "The [double] monastery and all that belonged to it was in most cases, especially in the East, the common property of the community, monks and nuns," *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, 154. For the economic structure of double monasteries, once again see "Double Monasticism in the Greek East: Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 306-08.

[57] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:525.

[58] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:373 and 421-22.

[59] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:399.

[60] See Paul Peeters, "Le légende de Saïdaia," *Analecta Bollandiana* 25 (1906): 137-38.

[61] In fact in Janin's nearly five hundred page tome: *Les Églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)* (Paris: Institut FranÁais d'Etudes Byzantines (1975), which supplements his other opus focused on monasteries in Constantinople, he does not list a single double monastery. Janin's methodology is seriously flawed in this regard. Some of the monasteries must have been double.

[62] See Dorothy de F. Abrahamse, "Women's Monasticism in the Middle Byzantine

Period: Problems and Prospects," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985): 35-58.

[63] For monasticism in the eleventh and twelfth centuries see J. M. Hussey, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire: 867-1185* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 158-200.

[64] See Catia Galatariotou, "Byzantine Women's Monastic Communities: The Evidence of the Τυπικά," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 38 (1988): 263-90.

[65] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:10. Also see Talbot, "Comparison of the Monastic Experience," 6-7.

[66] See Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche, 1959), 138.

[67] See Vitalien Laurent, *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol. I. Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. IV. Les regestes de 1208 à 1309* (Paris: Institut FranÁais d'Etudes Byzantines, 1971).

[68] For example, Marthana of St. Thekla's, Theodora of some unspecified monastery, as well as Susanna, and Anthusa of Tomantion. See "Double Monasticism in the Greek East—Fourth through Eighth Centuries," 297-301.

[69] Apparently there was no Athanasius II since the next Patriarch of Constantinople by that name is numbered the III (1634); Athanasius I held office twice, perhaps the reason for the jump in enumeration.

[70] See Talbot, "Comparison of the Monastic Experience," 6.

[71] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:396 and 510.

[72] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:527-28; Trone, "A Constantinopolitan Double Monastery," 81-87; Laurent, "Une princesse byzantine au cloître," 29-60; and Robert E. Sinkewicz, *Theoleptos of Philadelphia: The Monastic Discourses* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992), 18-20.

[73] See Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* I.3:177 and 386.

[74] See Basilike Papoulia, "Die Vita des Heiligen Philotheos vom Athos," *Südost Forschungen* 22 (1963): 278-79 and Angeliki E. Laiou-Thomadakis, "Saints and Society in the Late Byzantine Empire," in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis* edited by Laiou-Thomadakis, 84-114 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1980), 94-95.

[75] As quoted by Pargoire in "Les monastères doubles chez les byzantins," 25 from I. Habert, Ἀρχιερατικόν, Paris, 1643, p. 521.

[76] See Georges-Joseph Mahfoud, "Chapitre IV: Les monastères doubles," in *L'Organisation monastique dans l'église maronite: étude historique* (Beirut: Bibliothèque de l'Université Saint-Esprit, 1967), 289-315.

[77] For the social and economic condition in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries see Laiou-Thomadakis, "Saints and Society in the Late Byzantine Empire," 84-114.

[78] See Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society," 68-69.

[79] See Anthony Bryer, "The Late Byzantine Monastery in Town and Countryside," in *Church in Town and Countryside*, edited by Derek Baker, 219-41 (Oxford: Ecclesiastical History Society, 1979).