

THE GREEK MONASTERIES IN SOUTH ITALY. III.

THE POLICY OF THE NORMANS TOWARDS THE GREEK MONASTERIES.

THE eleventh century was until its closing years a period of decadence in the Greek monasteries of South Italy. They increased in numbers during this period, but their character was lowered. Probably the older monasteries sent out on every side colonies of monks who left the parent house, not from any desire to propagate their faith, or to lead a more religious life, but from the wish to leave companions whom they disliked. There was not much to prevent this. The monasteries were not rich, there was no tradition of splendid buildings; any one who wished could easily start a new monastery.

Even in the older monasteries the standard of life was going down, if we may judge from the scanty evidence which we possess.

This is to be found in the Life of S. Philaretus¹ already mentioned, which presents a very different picture to that given by the earlier Lives. There is no mention of any especial knowledge, or of intellectual pursuits; no mention of the production of manuscripts; manual labour and useless asceticism are the features which are prominent.

Philaretus was first a herdsman, afterwards a gardener in the monastery of Aulinas; he was energetic in these occupations, and he was renowned for those austerities of asceticism which were as fashionable in ancient monasteries as athletics are in a modern college. Hence he became famous. He and all the other monks of the first half of the eleventh century seem to have lost the energy

¹ *A. SS.* Apr. i p. 605 ff.

and spirituality of their predecessors, and retained only the un-essential element of extreme asceticism.

Monasticism therefore was in need of new life at the dawn of the Norman period, and it was to a curiously mixed and confused country that the Normans came. There were to be found in the South of Italy three distinct races—Lombards, Greeks, and Arabs. The former predominated in the North, the two latter in the South of the district. Each had its own customs and language, and—the point which is important for our present purpose—there were scattered about over the whole country a great number of monasteries of the Basilian order, which, with the rest of the Greek world, was strongly opposed to Rome, and looked to Constantinople for inspiration.

There was little order to be found in any sphere of life; there was no organization, no real system of responsibility; and to introduce order was the first task of the Normans, when once the conquest was complete.

They allowed the customs and titles which they found in use to remain. Even so late as the thirteenth century we find references to 'exarchs,' 'strategi,' and 'themes.'

But in spite of this superficial preservation of the old order they produced a profound difference, by the introduction of the feudal system. It is only necessary here to notice the effect of this change on the ecclesiastical side. It may be summed up as producing two great alterations: (1) the Latinization of many churches and monasteries; (2) the establishment of certain Basilian monasteries to control in a new manner the Greek monastic life of the districts in which they were planted.

(1) *The Latinization of Greek churches and monasteries.* There can be no doubt that this process was justified in two ways: there came with the Norman conquest a great increase in the number of Latin-speaking inhabitants, who looked on the Pope of Rome rather than the Patriarch of Constantinople as the head of their Church; and also there was, no doubt, even before the Norman conquest, an unnecessary number of Basilian monasteries and Greek churches in a country which, in the Basilicata at least, was by no means purely Greek.

The Latinization of the churches was swiftly accomplished:

by the beginning of the twelfth century, the four metropolitan sees, Reggio, Tarentum, Otranto, and Santa Severina, and many of the suffragan sees, were in Latin hands.

But the process was not pushed beyond the limits of justice. In 1096, in appointing a Latin bishop to Squillace, Roger expressly gives as his reason that the bulk of the population is Latin. 'Ego Rogerius,' he says in his charter¹, 'Siciliae comes et Calabriae coepi condolare casui et ruinae . . . ubi tanta vigeat Normandorum copia, pontificalis et Latina nondum extiterat ecclesia, etc.:'; and so we find that in the Aspromonte, where the Christian population must have been almost purely Greek, the Greek bishoprics remain. It is not until long afterwards that Rossano, Bova, Stilo, Oppido, etc., become Latin.

As it was with the sees so it was with the monasteries. Many of these became Latinized, and passed under the Benedictine instead of the Basilian rule. But the policy of the Normans effected in their case a further change. Before their time each monastery, with but few exceptions, was a separate community. It managed its own affairs, subject to the nominal control of the bishop of the diocese, and there was no cohesion between the different houses. This was abhorrent to the Normans, and therefore many of the Basilian monasteries were given to the great Benedictine houses of La Cava and Monte Cassino.

Such was the fate of many small foundations, which seem to have sprung up only in the eleventh century; e.g. Kur-zosimo, which was given to La Cava, and is mentioned more than once in the *Codex Diplomaticus Cavensis*², though I cannot find the original deed of gift.

(2) *The establishment of new Basilian Greek monasteries.* It would at first seem as though this process were the exact opposite of the former. But it is not really so. The Normans were not so much concerned to banish Greek ecclesiastical life as to take away from it its unfair preponderance in districts where the majority of the population was Latin, and to introduce in districts which were truly Greek a spirit of order which was lacking. Obviously in the latter case Latinization would have been both unfair and useless. But it was possible to adapt the principles

¹ Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 591 D.

² e.g. vol. viii, p. 206, a Greek charter.

of the feudal system to Greek life, as well as to bring Greek life under the operations of the feudal system, already established among the Latins.

To establish, then, the feudal system in those Greek monasteries which were really necessary, when the unnecessary ones had been Latinized, was the object of their policy. It required a considerable modification of the existing condition of the Basilian monasteries.

It would be difficult to state exactly what was the rule of the Greek Church about monastic property. It is fortunately not necessary for the present purpose to attempt to do so, for it is at least certain that the Basilian rules never contemplated the existence of an abbot who was a kind of territorial lord, such as the Norman feudal system made him.

To modify the existing monasteries in this way seems to have been generally beyond the power of the Normans, and they therefore established Greek houses in various districts, endowed them richly, and put the smaller and older houses into their control.

The chief monasteries which were founded in the pursuit of this policy are S. Elias at Carbo, which may be an exception to the general rule, and really be an old monastery; S. John the Reaper, at Stilo; S. Mary of Patira, at Rossano; and S. Nicholas of Casola near Otranto.

I propose to bring together some of the more important facts in the history of three of these monasteries¹ separately, but at this point it may be well to show their general importance.

It will be noticed at once that they seem intended to manage the different districts of the country.

The Greek part of the Norman kingdom may be roughly said to have consisted of four districts: (1) the Aspromonte; (2) the Sila; (3) the district to the north and west of the Sila, which runs up into the Basilicata; (4) the heel of Italy.

To each of these districts a great convent is allotted. S. John

¹ I would have added the story of the fourth, S. John the Reaper, but for the fact that, except for a late and untrustworthy life in the *A. SS.* and four deeds referring to lawsuits in Montfaucon's *Palaeog. Graeca*, there seems to be no material for its history. Rodota dismisses it in a few lines, though he says that it was acknowledged as the chief of the Basilian monasteries in Calabria.

the Reaper dominates the Aspromonte, though it must be noted that the little monasteries in the south of the Aspromonte¹ are placed under the great Sicilian monastery of S. Salvator, at Messina, which was so much nearer to them. S. Mary of Patira dominates the Sila and the adjacent valley. S. Elias dominates the Basilicata and, roughly speaking, the land north of the Sila, a huge district stretching away to the East as far as Bari. S. Nicholas of Casola dominates the heel of Italy.

One is therefore justified in regarding these four monasteries as the great Basilian houses of the Norman period, and in seeing in their position the result of the Norman policy.

It is also possible to some extent to see who, among the monks, were the instruments of the Norman policy, though the sources of information often fail us.

The most important was Bartholomew of Simeri. At least it is of him that we have the fullest knowledge, so that we must be content to take him as a specimen of the little group of Greek monks who carried out the Norman policy.

Bartholomew² was a Calabrian, who came from Simeri³, a small town near Catanzaro, and lived on the banks of a torrent called Melitinum, which has not been identified, though, if one may judge from the census list of Rossano⁴ in the fifteenth century, there was a monastery⁵ there down to a comparatively late date. After a time he moved, quite in the spirit of Elias Junior, to a more desolate district, in pursuit of quiet, but attracted other monks to him by the fame of his virtue. He wished to leave them⁶, as Cosmas and Vitalis left Melicuccà, but a vision of S. Mary changed his purpose, and he determined to found a monastery. This was the turning-point of his career. In order to raise an endowment for his foundation he went in 1102-3 to Christodulus⁷, an official of the court of Queen Adelaide and her young sons. It was a critical moment in the history of the Normans, whose power was weakened by the death of Roger I. They probably felt the need of conciliating the large Greek population, and so Christodulus introduced Bartholomew to the

¹ e.g. S. Pancratius of Scilla and S. Philaretus of Aulinae.

² His life is published in the *A. SS.* Sept. viii p. 794 ff.

³ *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 811 B.

⁵ Sometimes also called Trigona.

⁷ *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 817 c.

⁴ *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 117 f.

⁶ *A. SS.* tom. cit. p. 817 A.

court. The Royal family received him warmly, endowed him liberally, and insisted that he should be made the abbot of the monastery. He was ordained by the Bishop of Gunaecopolis¹, which is said to be Belcastro, and the King (or rather, I suppose, Queen Adelaide) obtained a bull from the Pope², granting 'immediacy' to the monastery³.

In this way, Bartholomew was the agent of the Norman policy in founding S. Mary's of Patira, but according to his Life this does not exhaust the record of his work.

About the year 1126, Bartholomew was accused by the Benedictine monks of heresy⁴. He was acquitted, and Roger, in order to show his confidence, or perhaps because his attention had again been drawn to the capable character of the monk, at once invited him to found a monastery at Messina⁵, to dominate Sicily, just as S. Mary's at Rossano dominated the Sila. Bartholomew of course assented, and dedicated his new monastery to S. Salvator; but it is remarkable that in order to fill his monastery he did not draw upon Sicily, but brought a dozen monks from Rossano, one of whom, Luke by name, he appointed abbot. He obtained from Roger a charter, which gave him not merely the supremacy over all the Greek houses in Sicily then existing, but also over all which should be founded at any future time.

These two foundations, S. Mary's of Patira and S. Salvator of Messina, are the only two monasteries which Mgr. Batiffol will allow to be Bartholomew's foundations; but his Life tells the story of his reorganization of another on Mount Athos⁶, which was given him by a rich Byzantine named Kalimeris, and was known in consequence of his work as 'the monastery of the Calabrian.' Mgr. Batiffol rejects this story as apocryphal, chiefly on the ground that no such monastery is now to be found on Mount Athos. 'Aucune trace,' he says, 'de Saint-Barthélemy, ni de B. Kalimeris, ni du couvent de Saint-Basile dans l'histoire de l'Athos⁷.' But Mgr. Batiffol has been misled by Langlois, for

¹ A. SS. tom. cit. p. 818 E.

² A. SS. tom. cit. p. 819 C.

³ I shall presently give the outlines of the story of this foundation. Here it is enough to notice that this privilege of immediacy shows that the Normans were working on the Benedictine model, which they knew best.

⁴ A. SS. tom. cit. 823 C.

⁵ A. SS. tom. cit. p. 824 F.

⁶ A. SS. op. cit. p. 821 C.

⁷ *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 7, n.

the ruins of the deserted convent of S. Basil are still visible on Mount Athos, and it was founded (according to *Cod. Panteleem.* 282, in a marginal note to a paraphrase of the life of Euthymius of Thessalonica¹) by Basil of Thessalonica, the biographer and pupil of Euthymius.

This seems to make it very rash to reject entirely the story of Bartholomew's visit to Mount Athos.

Bartholomew stands out as the capable agent of the Normans in reforming and revivifying the Basilian monasteries of South Italy. He has left behind him no record in the form of literature; but indirectly every MS in the library at Messina, and a great number of those in the Vatican, ought to remind us of the really great work which he did in organizing the Greek monasteries in the twelfth century. To his work in collecting manuscripts I shall refer later.

Mgr. Batiffol is inclined to regard Bartholomew not merely as a representative and prominent member of the band of monks who carried out the policy of the Normans, but as pre-eminent among the others. Perhaps he is right; but surely he does not make sufficient allowance for the paucity of the evidence, and the favoured position which Bartholomew occupies in this respect. He is the only one whose Life is extant, for we can hardly count the miserable document² which concerns John the Reaper. If it were not for this Life what should we know of Bartholomew? Only that he is mentioned in a few charters relating to S. Mary of Patira, and in a few others relating to S. Salvator of Messina: his constant intercourse and direct dealings with the Court would be quite unknown. But this scanty evidence from charters is all that is known of Nilus of Rossano and Carbo (and possibly of Blasius of Carbo), of Joseph of Casola, or of John the Reaper of Stilo. A few charters (in the case of Joseph and John not even that) are all that we possess.

I do not think it is fair to conclude that these men were not the equals of Bartholomew. Their monasteries became great

¹ This life is not yet published, though Dr. P. Uspenski gave a few extracts from it in 1877 in his book on Mount Athos. Euthymius lived in the ninth century, and founded the convent of 'S. Andrew at the Doves,' in or near Thessalonica. I hope that his life may soon be published from a MS which I was fortunate enough to see this year at the Laura.

² *A. SS.* Feb. iii p. 479 ff.

just as his did; and this fact alone is enough to suggest that they would prove, if the evidence could be found, to belong to the same class as Bartholomew—the class of wise statesmanlike monks who carried out the policy of the Norman Court.

THE OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF THREE
TYPICAL MONASTERIES.

(i) *S. Elias of Carbo*¹. The history of this great monastery, which was first called S. Anastasius and afterwards S. Elias of Carbo, is to be found in the *Historia Monasterii Carbonensis* of Paulus Aemilius Sanctorius², a book full of information, but quite uncritical. To produce an adequate history Sanctorius's work must be compared with the *Chronicon Carbonense* in the Vatican archives, and the papers in the *Dossier Basiliani*, in the same place.

The foundation of the monastery is obscure. Sanctorius, following tradition, attributes it to Lucas of Demena. There is no evidence for this in the Life of Lucas, and I think that it is a purely mythical story. Lucas was the great monastic hero of the Basilicata, and Carbo was, in the twelfth century and later, the great monastery of the district, therefore it was natural that tradition should join Lucas and Carbo together. Further investigations tend to confirm this view. Sanctorius gives the following list of abbots, down to Nilus the second founder of the monastery:—

Lucas I.	Lucas III.
Blasius I.	Clemens.
Menas.	Nilus (of Grotta Ferrata).
Stephanus Theodulus.	Bartholomaeus (of Grotta Ferrata).
Lucas II.	Climius.
Blasius II.	Nilus of Rossano.

This list is very suspicious. Nilus and Bartholomaeus are clearly insertions: we can show an *alibi* for both of them. They were either at Tusculum or already dead³, at the time when

¹ I believe that Carbo is the correct form, but on modern maps it is Carbone.

² All the deeds quoted in this section are taken from this book.

³ If the deed referred to below be genuine Blasius II lived in 1077, when Nilus had been dead more than seventy years!

they are supposed to have been at Carbo. Further evidence, which does not support the list, is to be found in a deed, the earliest of those which refer to the monastery, given in 1077 to the venerable Blasius by Ugo de Claromonte. According to this, Blasius was abbot in 1077, which is hardly conceivable if the list is right. Lucas of Demena probably died in 993, and there are only five names between him and Blasius II; Nilus of Rossano was abbot at least before 1100, if the deed of Richard the Seneschal be genuine¹, and the list gives five (including the two inserted) abbots (and Sanctorius hints at two more) for this period. I should not be surprised to find that Blasius II is the true founder of the monastery, and that the names preceding him are apocryphal.

Mgr. Batiffol goes even further, and regards Nilus of Rossano as the first abbot. He thinks that Nilus was a monk of S. Mary's of Patira, who was sent to Carbo by Bartholomew in pursuance of the Norman policy. I have no doubt that Nilus was imbued with the Norman spirit, but I can see no reason for making him a kind of agent of Bartholomew; his life is not extant, but he seems to have been Abbot of Carbo by the year 1100, unless the deed of Richard the Seneschal be a forgery, and this is too early to allow us to regard him as an emissary of Bartholomew. Moreover, was not the Norman policy in action at Carbo at 1077? Unless Mgr. Batiffol rejects the deed of Ugo de Claromonte as a forgery (I admit that the indiction is wrong), I do not understand how he can refuse to recognize Blasius II as a genuine Abbot of Carbo.

Leaving the uncertain subject of the foundation of the convent and coming to the documentary evidence of its history, it would seem that the monastery began to flourish under the patronage of the family of de Claromonte², and other Norman families who lived in the Basilicata. Their donations soon made the monastery the most important in the district, and gave it large estates and many churches.

The first estate which was given to it seems to be the one mentioned in the deed of Ugo in 1077. This makes no reference

¹ See p. 31 *infra*.

² Who gave their name to the little town, close to Carbo, of Claromonte, or, as it is now spelt, Chiaromonte.

to any previous benefactors; it allows the claim of Blasius to the 'tenimentum' of the monastery, and adds to it another 'tenimentum' in order that the house may be adequately endowed.

It is difficult to trace accurately the boundary of this district, but it seems to mean, roughly speaking, the valley of the river Sirmi from Calavra (or Calabria) in the east up to its source in the west, with the high ground on each side to the north and south.

The next great donation to the monastery was made in 1100 by Richard the Seneschal, who gave Nilus the fields of Scanzana. This is the district which lies between the valleys of the Sirmi and the Capone, and includes part of the coast; it is the second great estate of the monastery of Carbo.

It will be noticed that there is thus left an intervening district between these two great estates, and in 1135 this district was also acquired by the monastery, not however as a free gift, but as a purchase which Nilus made for 500 ducats from Richard de Claromonte, and Alexander de Claromonte confirmed.

This purchase completed the great estates of Carbo, which now stretched right across the Basilicata, from the mountains in the west to the sea on the east; but besides them Nilus had been busy in amassing property far and near. The following is the list of his chief acquisitions: I suspect that it is derived from the *Chronicon Carbonense*, which awaits investigation and publication in the Archives of the Vatican.

(1) In 1092, the Church of S. Zacharias, in the Castrum Silicense, given to S. Anastasius of Carbo by Gulielmus Marchesius, the lord of the place, and Cecilia his wife.

(2) In 1105, the Church of S. Lawrence, at Cracum, given by Arnoldus, son of Isebard.

(3) In 1105, the Church of S. Elias, at Bari, by Elias and Regnaldus, archbishop.

(4) In 1105, the Church of S. Barbara, in the town of Mons Albanus, by Robert Fortemannus, the lord of the place.

(5) In 1112, the Church of S. Peter, at Castrum Pollicori, and of S. Nicholas of Pestusa, by Alureda, the lady of the place.

(6) In 1125, the Church of S. Stephen of Azupa, by Luke, Abbot of Rapora.

(7) In 1129, the fields of Scanzana, with the Church of S. Mary.

(8) In 1129, S. Nicholas of Trypa, given by Trotta, the daughter of Alureda (the same as the lady in (5) ?), the lady of the town of Myramanna (?).

(9) In 1134, a church at 'Castro Novo seu Battabarani.'

I have not been able to identify all these places, but it is obvious that some of them are far outside the limits of the great estates of the monastery. Bari, for instance, is a little to the north of Brindisi, and Castro Novo¹ is in Sicily. These acquisitions in distant parts are not to be traced to mere love of property. The custom of the monasteries was then probably much what it is now on Mount Athos, and one object of having these little dependencies is to provide hospitality for those travelling to and from the monastery, and also to use them as collecting-places for letters or presents. It was then, as it is still in Turkey, necessary to have some such helps to communication; so that any one who wished to send a present to Carbo from, for instance, S. Nicolas of Casola would have taken it to Bari, just as now the only safe way of communicating with Mount Athos is through the representatives of the various convents in Constantinople.

It will be noticed that in the list of possessions set out above mention is made of the gift of the fields of Scanzana in 1129. I think the date is probably wrong², and that this is a reference to the deed given by Boemund II in the third indiction (i.e. 1110 or 1125), confirming this estate and adding to it. The fields of Scanzana themselves were the gift of Richard the Seneschal, which was confirmed by the Claromonti, also in 1125.

In this way the monastery became rich. It is unnecessary to reproduce all the facts given by Sanctorius; they are of the same character as those given above; but there are certain points which are worth noticing. The monastery was not merely helped by the local Lords of Claromonte and their like, it also was patronized by the Royal house itself. Boemund II, as mentioned above, enriched and protected it; Roger II gave Nilus a charter in 1132, confirming the privileges given by Robert Guiscard and Boemund I (what were these?), by Richard the Seneschal, and by Boemund II.

¹ Unless it be Castro Novo di S. Andreas, which is close to Carbo.

² Unless the indiction is wrong. This seems a very common error in the Italian Charters.

This deed was confirmed by William II, and it is important to notice that this monarch appointed the Abbot of Carbo the chief of all the Basilian monasteries in the district. It was also confirmed by Tancred in 1191, and was apparently the great charter of the monastery.

All through the twelfth century the house flourished, and in the thirteenth century it does not visibly lose ground, but there is an absence of any further great bequests, and a period of litigation and expensive compromise begins.

Sanctorius gives many stories of this period; but the fact which seems to dominate everything is the enmity of the family of San Severina of Besignano, who coveted especially the fields of Scanzana.

Ultimately in 1477 they were successful. The monastery lost its suit, its abbot was imprisoned as 'litigious and possessed of a devil,' and one of the San Severina family became the first commendatory. Sanctorius continues its history further; but as Mgr. Batiffol says, from this point it is the history of a farm, rather than a monastery. Some of the commendatories neglected their property, others took care of it and developed it, but it is quite unimportant for our purpose which they did. The sole point of interest is now the history of the library, to which I shall return later.

(ii) *S. Nicholas of Casola*. Although this monastery in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was the most important home of Greek monks in the land of Otranto, very much less is known about its history than about S. Elias of Carbo. It was, of course, always subject to Rome; but its affections were nevertheless fixed on the Church of the East, and (if Rodota may be trusted) at least down to the end of the twelfth century it received fresh immigrations of monks from the East.

The scanty evidence which we have of its foundation and history comes from a MS at Turin (217 b, iii 27), of which an account was published by M. Ch. Diehl in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* of the French school at Rome, in April, 1886.

The contents of this manuscript are as follows:—

(1) ff. 1-5, a summary of the chief events which concern the history of the monastery from 1125 to 1267. There are also various fragments of accounts.

(2) ff. 6-15, some fragments of the rule of the monastery.

(3) ff. 15-172, a *Typicon* of the ordinary kind, written in 1174 by Nicholas, Abbot of the monastery. This must have had a separate existence at one time, as it is earlier than the previous leaves. It is valuable for marginal notes dealing with the history of the monastery.

(4) ff. 173-181, another work of Nicholas, dealing with the food of the monks.

(5) Some liturgical prayers.

From the scanty information contained in these pages we find that the monastery was founded in 1099 by a Greek monk named Joseph, of whom all that is known is that he died in 1125, and that his monastery was placed under the protection of Boemund I of Tarentum and Antioch, of his wife Constantia, and of Boemund II, who succeeded them.

This is shown by the fact that in the thirteenth century the names of these three princes appear in the list of benefactors for whose souls prayers were made in the monastery.

In 1130, with the death of Boemund II, the principality of Tarentum passed into the hands of the Kings of Sicily. M. Diehl says that there was a charter of the year 1130 given by Roger to the monastery of S. Nicholas (he refers to M. Aar's¹ work in the *Archivio Storico Italiano*, but I cannot find that the charter is given there); and Roger, his son William with his wife Margaret, whom the MS calls Elvira, and King William II are all commemorated as benefactors. Their deeds, which no doubt were similar to those given to S. Elias of Carbo, are not extant, but we can form some idea of their probable contents by observing that we are told in one of the notes to the *Typicon*, that its rules were observed not only at S. Nicholas, but also in its dependencies at Vasta, Pollicastro, Trulazzo, Melendugno, Alessano, Castro, and Minervino—all small towns or villages in the Otrantine district. If we could find the deeds of the Boemunds and of the Kings of Sicily, no doubt we should find the donations of all these dependencies, but at present these deeds are not available.

Joseph, the founder of the monastery, died in 1125, and was succeeded by Victor, of whom nothing is known, except that he died in 1153. Nicholas, the third abbot, is a more prominent

¹ A pseudonym; really M. Simone.

person. According to the Turin MS he was an abbot from 1153-90, but Rodota says that he flourished in 1201¹. He wrote works on the questions at issue between the Greek and Roman Churches, such as the use of azymes in the Eucharist, and the double procession, the Sabbath fast, and the celibacy of the clergy, always taking the side of the Greeks; and to these must be added the unpublished *Typicon* and *Hypotyposis* in the Turin MS.

According to De Ferrariis² (Galateus) he founded the great library of Casola, sparing no expense, and collecting MSS from every part of Greece. I shall return to the history of this library later.

In 1179 Pope Alexander III convened the Lateran Council, and Nectarios (the future abbot?) attended it from S. Nicholas of Casola. He made himself the champion of the Greek Church, and vigorously supported their customs and doctrines. The Greeks were delighted, and George of Corfu wrote him a congratulatory letter³.

Nicholas was succeeded in 1190 by Callinicos, who only ruled for five years; he was followed by Hilarion, of whom nothing is known, except that he was canonised. Hilarion died in 1201, and then for nineteen years Nicodemos ruled the convent. His successor Nectarios seems to have been a learned man and a poet, but except for some verses which he wrote about Nicholas nothing is known of him. The remaining abbots are unknown to fame. Their names are given by M. Diehl in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, sixth year (1886), p. 180.

The monastery, like all the Greek foundations, began to decline in the thirteenth century. In the days of Nectarios (1220-35) it became dependent on the Archbishop of Otranto, Tancred (v. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra* IX, col. 77 B), and paid to Rome a fixed tribute. In 1267 Charles of Anjou increased the rigour of this dependent state; he evicted Basil (1259-67) and sent him to the monastery of San Vito del Pizzo near Tarentum, appointing the monk James to S. Nicholas of Casola in the name of the Pope, and increasing the tribute to five ounces of gold and five *tars* yearly. It is noticeable that it seems to have been only in the

¹ Probably Rodota has confused him with another monk whose name really is Nicetas.

² *De situ Iapygiae*, p. 45.

³ Labbe, *Concilia*, x 1527 (Paris, 1671).

case of the tribute money that the monks used the Italian currency; in the ordinary transactions of business they used the money of Michael Palaeologos; this is shown by the accounts which are found in the first part of the Turin MS.

Later still there can be no doubt that the monastery passed into 'commenda,' but I can find no evidence of the fact. It was destroyed by the Turks in 1481, and although it was rebuilt it never regained any importance.

(iii) *S. Mary Hodegitria, or Patira, at Rossano*. The only trustworthy account which we have of the foundation of this monastery is contained in the Life of Bartholomew of Simeri.

This Life is published in the *Acta Sanctorum* for September, vol. viii, p. 792 ff., from Cod. Gr. 29 at Messina, which was written in 1308. How much earlier the Life itself was composed is difficult to say. Mgr. Batiffol suggests the end of the twelfth century.

An alternative account is given by Ughelli¹, which attributes the foundation to a certain Nilus, who is otherwise unknown, about the year 1080. Both the Bollandists and Mgr. Batiffol reject this as worthless. The former think that it is a kind of epitome of the Life of Bartholomew, with the substitution of the name Nilus. If this be so, I should be disposed to compare it with the insertion of the name of Nilus of Grotta Ferrata into the list of the Abbots of Elias of Carbo, and regard both as evidence of a tendency to try and claim some kind of connexion with the saints of the earlier period.

I have given a sketch of the history of Bartholomew in the preceding chapter; and it is only necessary here to repeat that he was introduced by Christodulus, a Norman official, to the king and queen, and founded S. Mary's under their patronage and in the furtherance of their policy.

His foundation passed through the three usual stages: (1) Endowment, (2) Litigation, (3) Decay.

(1) *The Period of Endowment* begins in 1104 with a deed of Roger. This is given by Ughelli from the *Cartularium* of the monastery, which was then in existence but is now lost, or at least unknown. I should have thought that this deed would have

¹ *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 382 D f.

been in Greek, but Ughelli only gives Latin¹. It is such remarkably bad Latin that it is worth transcribing a few sentences:—

‘Bonum et optimum ante Deum est omnes beneficientes et quoniam ipse mediabimini, quae midiam habuerunt nos autem victantem vir religiosi et sancto pronominato Bartholomaeus venerabili abbati desideravimus partem habere in beneficiis Ecclesiae Sanctae Dei Genitrix Mariae novam odigitriam, etc.’¹

It is quite impossible to construe this deed, but the general meaning is plain. A certain Framundus had given Roger an estate in the neighbourhood of Rossano, and Roger gives this to Bartholomew. This estate includes the land of S. Peter's at Corigliano and S. Maur of Rossano.

I doubt the authenticity of this deed. The Roger referred to must be Roger II, as Roger I died in 1101. He was in 1103 quite a child, and one would have expected in the deed some reference either to Queen Adelaide or to his brother, who was associated with him. I suppose, however, that the gift of Framundus, or rather of Gulielmus de Losdum, was to Roger personally.

Deeds adding to this estate were given to Bartholomew in 1111² by Bertha of Loritello through Christodulus; and in 1122³ by Mabilia, the daughter of Robert Guiscard, and her husband William de Grantmeuil, who granted a rich estate between the rivers Crati and Coscili; and there are several other deeds, a list of which is printed by Batiffol⁴: the general result of them was to give the monastery control over the valleys of the Crati and Coscili, and much property on the other side of the Sila, especially in the valley of the Neto, and even as far south as Isola.

(2) *The Period of Litigation* began seriously in 1222, when there was a lawsuit⁵ between the monastery of Patira, as S. Mary's had been called since 1130, by a corruption, it is said, of *παρρός*, and the monastery of S. Julian at Isola, who quarrelled about the possession of an estate at Isola. It was tried before the Archbishop of Cosenza, who could not decide, and referred the litigants to Rome or Messina.

It is significant that Isola is one of the outlying parts of the

¹ *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 385 D.

³ *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 387 D.

⁵ *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 507.

² Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca*, p. 396.

⁴ *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, pp. 15-25.

district dominated by the monastery of Rossano, and it is natural that its weakness should begin at that point.

I do not know the result of the lawsuit.

In 1223 a long struggle¹ began between the Basilians of Rossano and monks of the order of Florus, whose head quarters were at S. Giovanni di Fiore, in the heart of the Sila, and was only settled by compromise twenty years later. The same kind of story is repeated, in deed after deed; either some piece of property is ceded, or a compromise of an expensive nature is made.

(3) In this way the period of litigation passed gradually into the period of decay. The resources of the monastery grew smaller, its estates were sold or leased, and the number of the monks decreased.

At what date it passed into 'commenda' I do not know, but Rodota² complains that it does not yield the commendatory in his time more than 2,500 crowns.

THE DECADENCE OF THE BASILIAN MONASTERIES.

The Greek monasteries began to decline in the thirteenth century. It would be a needless and uninteresting task to trace the history of their decadence in any detail, but certain chief points in the process may be pointed out.

The primary cause of their decay was the fact that the general course of history necessitated the Latinizing or Italianizing of the south of Italy and of Sicily. As I have tried to point out, the Hellenizing of South Italy was due to special circumstances which interrupted the Latin life of the locality. When the Normans had finally driven out the army of the Byzantines, the natural tendency was again in the direction of Latinization, in speech, in customs, and in religion. As has been already shown, the Normans were quite conscious of this fact, although they did not attempt to hasten the process unnaturally. Indeed the history of their dealings with the Greek population, and especially with the Greek ecclesiastics and monks, is an excellent object-lesson in the quiet conversion of a conquered nation to loyalty. Consciously or unconsciously they proceeded on the theory, paradoxical yet

¹ *Italia Sacra*, IX, p. 290.

² *Il Rito Greco*, II, p. 195.

often profoundly true, that it is easier to change essentials than appearances. They made no attempt to alter the things which appealed to the senses—language, ritual, and names of officials; but they introduced their own system of organization under the names of familiar Greek officials.

For a time this added new vigour to the Greeks, but gradually it had the inevitable effect of making them less and less like other Greeks. They still used the Greek service and language, and a Greek coming from Greece would at first feel that he was among fellow countrymen, but before long he would find that he was really living under conditions which were new. The appearance was Greek, but the reality had become Latin. An almost exact parallel would, I believe, be the experience of a Frenchman of to-day going to live in the French part of Canada.

Inevitably, then, the Greek monasteries declined. The process of their decay was somewhat hastened by the constant and expensive litigation which went on in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. We have seen how this process gradually sapped the vitality of S. Mary's of Patira and S. Elias of Carbo, and their cases are no doubt only typical. The only instance of any friction between the Greeks and Romans in which the Romans began the quarrel is the accusation of heresy brought against Bartholomew in the twelfth century, and this was at once quashed by Roger. Of the opposite case, in which the Greeks definitely set themselves against the Romans, and did not suffer for it, two instances are especially striking.

(1) Nectarios of Casola, at the Lateran Council of 1179, supported the Greeks on every point, and was regarded as their champion. That he was allowed to take this course without harm to himself or to his convent is a remarkable testimony to the latitude given to the Greeks of South Italy by the Roman Church of the twelfth century.

(2) An interesting little tract on the order and limits of the Patriarchates, which is bound up with three¹ MSS of the 'Ferrar group' (all of which belong to the twelfth century, and come from South Italy), places the Patriarchates as follows: (1) Jerusalem,

¹ *Codd. Evan.* 346, 543, 788; also in *Cod.* 211 and at least one other, both of them South Italian MSS. The tract is published in facsimile from *Cod.* 346 in Dr. Harris's *Further Researches into the Origin of the Ferrar Group*.

founded by James the Lord's brother. (2) Rome, 'the Apostolic throne.' (3) Constantinople, founded by Andrew, the 'first-called.' (4) Alexandria, founded by Mark the Evangelist, the son of Peter the Apostle, who became a *Norápios*. (5) Antioch, founded by the *κορυφαίος* Peter. It is obvious that there is no desire in this list to exalt the see of Rome. Moreover, in the list of countries which are placed under the control of Rome, only parts of Sicily and Calabria are included. The meaning of this limitation, which is clearly not geographical, becomes plain when one notices that this tract was written by Nilus Doxapatrius¹ about 1143 for the use of Roger II. Clearly what Nilus meant was to admit the control of the Pope over the Latin churches and monasteries, but not over the Greek. One can imagine what an inquisitor would have thought of this in the fourteenth century, and of the treatment which Nilus would have received; but in the twelfth century it passed unnoticed, or at least unresented by the Papal and Latin authorities.

But at the end of the thirteenth century, under the Angevin rule, all this was changed. The Royal house was devoted to the Papacy, and exerted all their power to force the Greeks into closer conformity.

In 1270 Charles of Anjou² gave authority to a Dominican monk named Matteo di Castellamare, 'inquisitori haeretice pravitatis in justitiariatu Calabriae . . . a S. R. E. constituto'; and the Greeks had (as Mgr. Batiffol puts it) the choice of becoming a sect or passing over to Romanism.

This process of vigorous treatment went on throughout the fourteenth century, but in the fifteenth century a change of policy was made by the Papacy. It was the time when there was much intercourse with the Eastern Church, and the reunion of the East and West was greatly hoped for. For this purpose it was clearly advantageous to have a living testimony to the catholic and extra-occidental character of the Church of Rome. What was more fitted for the purpose than the Basilian monasteries?

Policy, therefore, suggested a reorganization of the Greek monks of South Italy, and the preservation of all their distinctive features,

¹ v. Harris, *op. cit.* It has been attributed by others to Leo the Wise, but Dr. Harris has shown that this is probably wrong.

² *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. xxxvi.

while the dictates of policy were supported by the genuine love of Hellenism which animated Cardinal Bessarion.

The result was that in 1446 a General Council of the Order of S. Basil was convoked, Bessarion was appointed General of the Order, and a school of Greek learning was established in Messina.

By this means the Greek monasteries, and Greek life generally in South Italy, were resuscitated for a short time.

It was only just in time: 'The Greek monks,' said Bessarion¹, 'are as ignorant of Greek as Italians are. Most of them do not know the Greek letters; a few can read, but without understanding; a mere handful can make out the sense with difficulty.'

For a time the revival was vigorous. Lascaris, whom Bessarion brought to Messina, controlled for thirty years a popular and successful school. But there was no real life in the movement. South Italy was Italian and not Greek, and the revival of its Hellenism was artificial. The monasteries rapidly degenerated, and when in 1551 Julius III ordered Marcellus Terracina² to report on the Basilian monasteries of Calabria, the latter had a miserable tale to relate. Only S. John the Reaper was in any state approaching to prosperity, and even there the library had been neglected; most of the convents were nearly empty; some of them were the head quarters of bandits.

For all serious purposes this is the end of the history of the Basilian monasteries of South Italy, except so far as their libraries are concerned. With this part of the subject I hope to deal in the concluding portion of these articles.

K. LAKE.

¹ In a letter to Eugenius IV, quoted by Mgr. Batiffol, *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. xxxviii.

² *L'Abbaye de Rossano*, p. 109 ff.

(To be continued.)