REVISING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

By PHILIP SHELDRAKE

WHY SHOULD we examine history in a *Supplement* on the future of religious life? Firstly, because we have inherited certain assumptions about the nature of religious life and a particular understanding of history, each of which tends to reinforce the other. It is easy to read the present back into the past, validate it, and thus see contemporary patterns as inevitable or absolute. Secondly, in a period of change, both conservatives and innovators defend their perceptions about religious life by reference to the past. History becomes a battleground. A systematic revision of the history of religious life would be a complex and controversial task. I simply propose to outline a few general *questions* which challenge common assumptions as we look at religious life at the crossroads.

Where did religious life begin?

The assumption that the beginnings of religious life lie in the *organized* desert communities is questionable. In fact a great deal occurred before late third century Egypt. Increasingly, the emergence of *autonomous* virgins and widows in the apostolic Church as distinctive categories is seen as the origin of all later developments.[1] Chastity, associated with the voluntary renunciation of wealth and status, reacted against the worldly values prevalent in family, social and economic relationships.[2] It was particularly important for women as it made them equal participants in a common search for perfection and created a role for them other than wife, mother or courtesan.[3] By c 270, virgins and widows were described as distinct groups in the 'Apostolic Church Order'. By the time of St Ambrose in the fourth century many virgins were consecrated annually in Italy, Constantinople, Alexandria and North Africa. They lived at home or with clergy around a Church and were under the care of the local bishop. They were often well-educated and active in charity and spiritual counsel. Others travelled as pilgrims to the Holy Land as an expression of a perfect imitation of Christ.[4]

read more at www.theway.org.uk

The indications are that *community life* first emerged among virgins. Antony of the Desert sent his sister into a community before he retired as a hermit at the end of the third century. By the fourth century groups lived in community in the main cities of the Empire. These offered further security for women and it may be that the more affluent began the process by inviting impoverished virgins to join them. The growing numbers, the emergence of communities and the increasing concern of Church authorities to regulate them meant that by the fifth century the process of seclusion had begun and the eventual fate of this originally autonomous and informal way of consecrated life was to merge with the growing cenobitic-monastic movement.[5]

A Syriac movement of autonomous ascetics also predated the Egyptian desert. What is important about this tradition is that it appears to reflect (albeit subject to occasional exaggeration) the original understanding of *discipleship* as literal imitation of the poor, homeless and celibate Jesus. The general term for Syriac ascetics was *ihidaya* (in Greek *monachos*). This means the 'single one', the one who adopts 'singleness', obeys Jesus's command (Lk 9, 60) to leave the dead to bury their dead and joins Jesus the Lifegiver. So *ihidaya* seems to imply three elements: to leave family ties, to be singleminded, to become 'one' by putting on 'The One' in a special relationship with Christ. This 'way' was conceived not as a gratuitous commitment analogous to 'vows' but as simply the fulfilment of baptismal promises to the extent that sometimes only catechumens married.[6]

The Syrian wilderness was not starkly separated from villages as in Egypt. The 'single ones' remained a visible challenge near human habitation. Many of the 'monks' of Syria associated with villages. Some may even have remained at home, judging by Cassian's strictures against those who called their homes 'monasteries'. The 'single ones' emerged into leadership roles, both religious, in the absence of clergy who inhabited the towns, and secular, as a result of the growing reluctance of landowners to leave suburban villas. 'Single ones' offer a model of people whose radical lifestyle as wanderers, strangers and outsiders had a valued status *within the community*. By standing outside the normal ties of family, property and ambition, the 'single one' could be accepted as guide, arbitrator and supporter. Dissociation, strangely, made the Syrian ascetic socially significant.[7]

Has religious life a single line of development?

We need to question the assumption, not only that the foundational model for religious life was cenobitic-monastic, but that its development moved in a single line. A common 'Pachomius to Ignatius' approach suggests that the forms which religious life took were merely variations on the basic theme of monastic asceticism. This approach has recently been questioned by such scholars as Professor John O'Malley.[8] His main thesis is that a framework of 'ministry' and its development in the Church provides a fruitful alternative to 'asceticism' in order to reread the history of religious life. It is inadequate to interpret the mendicants of the thirteenth century, the Jesuits of the sixteenth and subsequent 'apostolic' life for men and women, simply as developments within a monastic framework. They were radical institutional innovations, in which ministry was not a secondary but a central feature of their identity, and created a new religious role which eclipsed the dominant model.[9]

I would suggest that, whatever the degree of innovation represented by these groups, the non-monastic form of religious life runs parallel to, rather than derives from cenobitic monasticism. Its roots lie in the regular clerical life which became known as 'canonical'. The Rule of St Augustine, for example, had considerable influence. Its emphasis on *community* and *charity* (by implication, external relationships), rather than on structures, contrasts in significant ways with monasticism and this has been underestimated. The Rule of St Benedict discusses cenobitic structures, but its spirituality is still essentially individual. The neglect of canonical life by historians or its treatment merely as a sub-species of monasticism has reinforced distortions in our understanding of religious life. While monastic and canonical life influenced each other at points in history they are, nevertheless, distinct.[10]

Originally, most canonical houses were involved directly in pastoral care. Ministry to others remained an integral part of canonical spirituality even in the High Middle Ages when, in externals, many canonical houses and Benedictine monasteries were hardly distinguishable. Spirituality from 1050 to the early thirteenth century saw a renewed emphasis on the importance of love and service of neighbour and canonical life received a new impetus. It became common to give the care of large urban churches or groups of rural churches to canons. The almost universal adoption of the Rule of St Augustine gave greater institutional coherence but also corresponds to the contemporary *vita apostolica* movement which

emphasised the community life of the apostolic Church which the Rule valued.[11]

Even if it is difficult in this period to contrast the *activities* of canonical and monastic communities, some spiritual treatises reveal significantly different emphases on the *purpose* of religious life. *Edification by word and example* is central to canonical self-understanding. The canon is teacher as well as learner. This is sometimes linked explicitly to preaching although not all canons preached and some monks did. The conduct of the canon is seen as having an effect on others. Thus silence is not merely a matter of self-discipline but is a preparation for *fruitful discourse*. Equally, the *mixed life* of action and contemplation appears in canonical writings, in contrast to monastic treatises, as *their own* responsibility. This sense of moral responsibility pointed forwards to the appearance of the mendicants and apostolic orders. For the canon, as for the friar, imitation of Christ implied ministering to others. Thus the more one became available as an instrument of conversion, the more one became a better religious.[12]

Is a common life model adequate?

It is worth emphasizing that even monasticism was not a monolithic cenobitic edifice but balanced 'solitude in community'. The fully autonomous way of discipleship, which predates the cenobitic, reminds us that purely conventual models for religious life may also be a limitation. It is possible to trace a continuing tradition of autonomous life in the West which is rarely considered in the history of religious life. There were anchorites, other kinds of 'hermits' or solitaries, wanderers and members of groups such as Third Orders or Beguines who did not necessarily live a visibly common life.

The secluded vocation continued to attract adherents. Many of those who felt called to this way were already members of religious communities. Many monasteries in England, for example, had responsibility for one or more anchorites or anchoresses. Sometimes these were close to the parent community but the cathedral priory of Durham, for example, maintained a distant hermitage on the islands of Farne off the Northumbrian coast. Even in semi-eremitical orders such as the Carthusians there may have been the opportunity for greater isolation as evidenced by the remains of an isolated hermitage on the moors above Mount Grace priory in Yorkshire.

Individual solitary life without previous monastic connections was also popular. Three of the best-known English recluses, Godric of Finchdale, Wulfric of Haselbury and Christina of Markyate had never been monastics (although Christina eventually became a Benedictine). Julian of Norwich, famous for her great mystical text, *The showings* or *Revelations of divine love*, lived in the last decades of the fourteenth century and perhaps well into the fifteenth. Maybe because her writings were rediscovered and promoted by monastic editors it has often been assumed that she was connected to a Benedictine convent. The monastic scholar, Benedicta Ward, has argued cogently against this 'monasticisation' and speculates that Julian may have been a widow.[13] Finally the best-known 'rule' for the anchoritic life, the *Ancrene wisse* of the twelfth century, was written explicitly for three women living outside traditional monastic structures.

In fact most medieval solitaries were not secluded anchorites but lived in towns or villages. Even if they were predominantly contemplative, this did not necessarily prevent close contact with the world around them. What differentiated their life from the monk or nun was personal liberty and freedom of action. The true solitary was the one who vowed obedience to God alone. This liberty meant that there was little uniformity. Some engaged in works of charity or used their cells for frugal hospitality. Others acted as bridge- or toll-keepers and a few, particularly in England, looked after coastal beacons. The main point is that many medieval solitaries were accessible rather than isolated.

Some solitaries belonged to groups. The mendicant orders, who were of their nature more in contact with ordinary people than monastic orders, founded Third Orders for those unable to take on the full life-style of the parent body. A number of these were single or 'solitary' and probably merit comparison with earlier forms of autonomous consecrated life. The Beguines (and their male counterpart, the Beghards) who emerged towards the end of the twelfth century in Germany and the Low Countries, offered another alternative to conventual religious life. Although later in their development the Beguines founded communities, they began as single women living with parents or separately in tenements.

Finally there were the wanderers. Such individuals can be dated to an early period. As I have already noted some early virgins became pilgrims to the Holy Land. The Celtic monastic tradition

seems to have produced an above average number of such wanderers. I shall return to this tradition later. Throughout the Middle Ages the tradition continued in different ways. Undoubtedly some were merely beggars or eccentrics but there were others who led a celibate wandering life for devotional and ascetical reasons. Pilgrims were, of course, a striking phenomenon in the Middle Ages. Not all were 'single ones'. However there does seem to have been a class of pilgrims who made the wandering style of autonomous Christian life a more or less permanent occupation.[14]

A woman's place is in the cloister

A revision of the history of religious life must attend to the limitations experienced by women. Initial freedom at the heart of Church life equal to men contrasts with marginalization and seclusion in later centuries. Enforced enclosure was the most effective limitation on the roles of women. Initially the motives were to safeguard 'spiritual space' and to protect against the social anarchy that attended the demise of the Roman Empire. The strict sixth century rule of Caesarius of Arles was influential in later reforms which placed convents under the authority of bishops, monasticized many houses, and resulted in gender-specific canons on enclosure which created a double standard. The ninth century *Regula monachorum* contrasted the vanity of the world (a female problem?) with convents as 'tombs'. In practice, until the twelfth century there were variations: the constant repetition of regulations argues that strict enclosure was difficult to enforce and the enclosure of canonesses remained less rigid than in monasteries. Historians agree on two things. Firstly, inflexible seclusion became normative only gradually and secondly, it was largely imposed.[15]

Although the 1298 decree of Pope Boniface VIII stated that all religious women must remain in perpetual enclosure, the rigidity which remained familiar until recently arose only in the sixteenth century. Even strictly enclosed medieval nuns left the cloister for necessary business. Cistercian nuns normally spoke through a grill but a room was provided for meeting 'honest persons' without barriers.[16] However, in general, women's houses found themselves 'hemmed in on all sides by the old traditional forms of monastic life that held sway from before the twelfth century and that became more austere, more rigid, and in all cases more uniform'.[17] Formal enclosure for women meant that convents became predominantly

contemplative and 'nun' a single category.[18] The Beguine move-
ment, from the late twelfth century, avoided this process by
remaining outside the canonical definition of 'religious' despite
attempts to control it and a certain institutionalization in its later
stages.

Stricter enclosure paralleled a decrease in women's roles in the
Church. Within monasteries prior to the thirteenth century women
preached, heard confessions, bestowed blessings and sang the ·
Gospel. The nuns of the Prouille convent, founded in 1206 by St
Dominic, initially preached *outside* with the friars. In the thirteenth
century Pope Innocent III noted the continued exercise of 'clerical'
powers by nuns with astonishment and canonists argued that
women should no longer teach, touch sacred vessels, absolve or
exercise judgement. This was part of a contemporary process
whereby clerical celibacy, combined with the greater regulation of
the sacraments, created a clergy who became 'set apart' with the
exclusive right to preach and exercise the 'cure of souls'.[19] Negative
stereotypes of women also played a role. The fourteenth century
theologian Jean Gerson wrote that women were forbidden to teach
even through writing. 'All women's teaching . . . is to be held
suspect unless it has been diligently examined, and much more
fully than men's.' Women are more easily seduced, are themselves
determined seducers and '. . . it is not proved that they are
witnesses of divine grace'.[20]

Women were severely limited for longer than men. For example,
the radical vision of the Englishwoman, Mary Ward, in the early
seventeenth century, was condemned by the Church and her
Institute was, until modern times, unable to live the mobile and
uncloistered life envisaged by the foundress. A group such as the
Daughters of Charity, founded by Louise de Marillac and Vincent
de Paul, managed to remain relatively free by avoiding permanent
vows and the legal status of 'nun'.[21]

The limitation of roles relates partly to greater separation of
male and female religious. Initially, in the early centuries, women
had an equality with men through their choice of chastity. Some
lived with male celibates as 'sisters and brothers in Christ' with
the conviction that oneness in Christ eliminated the barriers of
gender so as to allow for close and equal relationships.[22] A more
common phenomenon from an early date were 'double monas-
teries'. In the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon traditions such houses were
numerous. Three 'double' orders were founded in the Middle Ages:

Fontevrault, the Gilbertines and the Bridgettines. The members of
Fontevrault, founded in 1100, sought jointly to live like the apostolic
Church. The abbess was not merely the juridical but also the
spiritual leader of monks and nuns. One version of the Rule which
survives stipulates of all members that

> they are to revere her as their spiritual mother, and all the affairs
> of the Church, spiritual as well as secular, are to remain in her
> hands, or to be given to whomever she assigns, just as she decides.[23]

Fontevrault was unique in this respect but the phenomenon of
double houses had important features apart from female leadership.
There was a symbiotic spiritual and material relationship between
the sexes. Both were equals in a coordinated effort. Finally, double
houses mitigated the effect of enclosure by enabling women to
maintain autonomy from outside authority. Their decline in the
later Middle Ages removed something favourable to women. If
double houses had been an effective symbol of equality in the
search for perfection, their disappearance was equally symbolic of
the fact that distinction and separation had largely won the day.[24]

Are our cultural limits adequate?

Our histories and identities exist within specific cultural horizons.
Thus Western perceptions of religious life have largely ignored the
Eastern tradition and some Western cultures, such as the Celtic,
have been left to the antiquarian. Attention to unfamiliar cultural
perspectives questions our assumptions.[25] In the East divisions into
distinct 'Orders' are unknown. A variety of patterns exists within
a single, all-embracing tradition. John Climacus (died c 649) high-
lighted three basic types: solitary, a few companions and the
cenobitic. These types remain the same today.[26] On Mount Athos
the twenty ruling monasteries are cenobitic, though varying in
intensity. There are a significant number of smaller, semi-eremitic
groups called *kellia* some of which are isolated, and others grouped
in monastic 'villages' or *sketes*. Finally, there are hermits, dependent
on monasteries or in extreme and hidden solitude.[27]

Individuals may move from one style to another, usually but
not exclusively from the cenobitic to the eremitical. This flexibility
enables religious to follow a personal path within the wider monastic
journey towards God. Eastern religious life expresses 'unity in
diversity' instead of the Western 'diversity in separation' which

makes it difficult for individual religious to change lifestyles. Some
cenobitic houses are 'idiorhythmic' where each member adopts a
personal rhythm within common life. Although some do not
approve, a case can be made for viewing it as a legitimate and
archetypal spiritual way reflecting the principle of personal freedom
within Orthodox religious life.[28]

Ethiopian models of religious life uniquely retain a living connec-
tion with early forms of consecrated life because for centuries the
Church was isolated by the expansion of Islam. There are widow-
nuns and lay-nuns who mainly live at home in the midst of the
local community and do Church work such as making vestments
or the flour for the communion bread. Then there are couples who
decide to become celibate, sometimes temporarily, as 'married
religious' at home. A third category who live, to a degree, among
ordinary people are the city hermits whose life is primarily one of
prayer and asceticism on the streets.

In monasteries there may be up to 600 religious and organization
is very informal. The life of silence and prayer itself is the main
teacher apart from some assistance from a *komas* or spiritual guide.
Abbots or abbesses have only spiritual authority and there is an
antipathy to the accumulation of power in a few hands. Because
monastic commitment is to *a way of life* rather than to a place,
individuals may move freely from one monastery or convent to
another. Monasteries are semi-eremitical villages where everyone
has a hut and garden. A simple framework of common life provides
a context for an otherwise personal search for God. Other monks
and nuns go out from their monasteries to become hermits in the
forests and mountains.[29]

A similar 'village' model mingled with native Irish culture to
give Celtic religious life a character of its own. It was eventually
superseded by Benedictine monasticism and caricatured as primi-
tive and extreme. Certainly the rugged individualism of Celtic
religious life contrasted with a more organized and urbane Latin
tradition. Value was placed on the individual even within the
monastery. Monks or nuns could always move freely from one
monastery to another or go off in search of greater solitude.
Individual hermits played a major role in this tradition. Spiritual
guidance of a 'soul friend' or 'the one who shares the cell' was
considered a necessity not an option.

Celtic monasticism became interwoven with society to a remark-
able degree. Some settlements eventually became the seat of local

kings and a form of family monasticism developed. Perhaps this blending of the monastic with wider society led to the form of Church government whereby bishops were subordinated to abbots and abbesses. Celtic religious also practised *peregrinatio*, voluntary exile or 'green martyrdom'. This wandering was both a logical consequence of the search for greater solitude and a reflection of evangelizing zeal. However it also related to the ideal of imitation of the homeless Christ. The exile voluntarily left the security of home and native roots for the unknown in faith and trust.[30]

Conclusions

Historical precedent is complex and so my questions cannot simply widen the range of possible models for contemporary imitation but they do raise important issues. Firstly, a fairly undefined (if recognizable) pursuit of gospel values became a structured, separate and regulated category: 'religious life'. This process of institutionalization led both to greater definition and to three paradoxically related features: an *expansion* of normative characteristics from the original emphasis on consecrated virginity; a general *limitation* of the variety of religious life to common conventual structures; the *formalization* of particular 'charisms' into a rigid diversity-in-separation. The by-products of this process were a loss of fluidity, the subordination of the personal to the collective and, through greater definition, the increasing separation of 'religious life' from the fundamental discipleship of the baptised.

Secondly, religious life has been diverse and cannot be reduced to one fixed and universal pattern. Least of all can it be limited to what is recognized institutionally within one religious culture (for example, the West) or at a given point in history. Consecrated virgins existed long before Church order recognized them, autonomous forms of life have been formally recognized at certain times and not at others, and certain groups, such as the Beguines and others whose commitment could be temporary, existed in a kind of twilight zone. Canon law is too blunt an instrument to be the final arbiter of limits and definition.

Thirdly, the issue of development has been present implicitly. I have emphasized that to understand it as a single line, with a common normative root, is questionable. I would also add that 'development' as such is an ambiguous word. There have been many changes but we should not always assume that these have been *improvements*. Any 'Whig' view of history as the inevitable

triumph of progressive forces is dubious. Change has brought loss as well as gain. Women's status and possibilities were greater in the early centuries than in the High Middle Ages. The progressive exclusion of particular spiritual cultures (the Celtic or the whole of the East) meant the loss of certain fruitful emphases.

Arguably the very need conclusively to *define* religious life reflects the process of limitation and separation I have described. To reduce meaning to definitions is the product of a religious culture which has valued law, distinctions and the objective. The subtle discernment of 'charism' at the service of community has been progressively subordinated to an institutional model of the Church which demands free-standing structures as a precondition for recognition. Consecrated life undoubtedly began as *distinctive*. Its common feature, chastity, was a powerful symbol of dissociation from established family, social, economic and *religious* structures. However, dissociation progressed to *separation*. Structures, dress and practices changed the original 'being other' *within* the Christian community, as a provocative reminder of the 'otherness' of all discipleship, to 'ritual behaviour' as an elitist way where withdrawal implied a special and permanent context for perfection away from the common herd. Religious life ceased to be a symbol and became a substitute for what most could not achieve. The need for definition is greatest when religious life becomes *more than* gospel commitment. Once again we are in a situation of fluidity and flexibility where distinctions between religious life and other 'ways' have blurred. Is this a threat or an invitation to recognize that it is helpful to discern charisms but not to arrive at abstract definitions of religious life with universal and permanent application?

NOTES

[1] For example, Jean Leclercq, *Aspects of monasticism*, (Michigan, 1978), pp 72ff.

[2] See Rosemary Rader, 'Early Christian forms of communal spirituality: women's communities' in William Skudlarek (ed.), *The continuing quest for God*, (Collegeville, 1982), p 89 & Jo Ann McNamara, 'Muffled voices: the lives of consecrated women in the fourth century' in John Nichols & Lillian Thomas Shank (eds.), *Distant echoes: Medieval religious women, Volume 1* (Kalamazoo, 1984), p 12. Cited as *Distant echoes*.

[3] See Rader. *art. cit.*, pp 88–99.

[4] See *Egeria's travels* (London, 1971).

[5] On widows and virgins as well as early forms of communal life, see Rader *art. cit.*; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Word, Spirit and power: women in early Christian communities' in Rosemary Ruether & Eleanor McLaughlin (eds.), *Women of Spirit* (New York, 1979); McNamara, *art. cit.*, pp 11–30. I am grateful to Sister Elisabeth Rees, a contemporary consecrated virgin in London, for her reflections on these issues.

[6] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp 75 & 78.

[7] On the Syriac tradition, see Robert Murray, 'The features of the earliest Christian asceticism' in Peter Brooks (ed.), *Christian spirituality: essays in honour of Gordon Rupp* (London,

1975); Gabriel Winkler, 'The origins and idiosyncracies of the earliest form of asceticism' in Skudlarek, *op. cit.*, pp 9–43; Peter Brown, 'The rise and function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity' in his *Society and the holy in Late Antiquity* (London, 1982).

[8] John O'Malley, 'Priesthood, ministry and religious life: some historical and historiographical considerations' in *Theological Studies*, 49, 1988, pp 223–57.

[9] See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: studies in the spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), p 10 & pp 12–14.

[10] See Jean Leclercq, *Contemplative life* (Kalamazoo, 1978), chapter 1, espec. pp 4–5; Bynum *op. cit.*, chapter 1; Grover Zinn, 'The regular canons' in Bernard McGinn etc (eds.), *Christian spirituality: origins to the twelfth century* (London, 1986), pp 218–28.

[11] See David Knowles, *The monastic order in England* (Cambridge, 1950), pp 139–42.

[12] See Bynum, *op. cit.*, chapter 1.

[13] Benedicta Ward, 'Julian the solitary' in *Julian reconsidered* (Fairacres Publications, 106, Oxford, 1988). She also provides some general material on the eremitical life in England. In contrast see Edmund Colledge & James Walsh (eds.), *Julian of Norwich: Showings* (New York/London, 1978), pp 20–21.

[14] For a general survey of the solitary life, see Peter Anson, *The call of the desert* (London, 1964), espec. chapter 15. On the vocabulary of the solitary life, see Ann Warren, 'The nun as anchoress: England 1000–1500' in *Distant echoes*, pp 197–212.

[15] For enclosure up to the twelfth century see, Jane Tibbets Schulenberg, 'Strict active enclosure and its effects on the female monastic experience (500–1100)' in *Distant echoes*, pp 51–86.

[16] On enclosure from the twelfth century onwards, see Jean Leclercq, 'The spirituality of medieval feminine monasticism' in Skudlarek, *op. cit.*, espec. pp 129–31.

[17] *Ibid.*, p 122.

[18] See Barnabas Sandeman, 'Nuns and monks: a thousand years of change' in *The Way Supplement*, 40, Spring 1981.

[19] See Bynum, *op. cit.*, p 11.

[20] Quoted in Bynum, *op. cit.*, pp 135–36.

[21] For example, see Ruth P. Liebowitz, 'Virgins in the service of Christ: the dispute over an active apostolate for women during the Counter Reformation' in Ruether etc., *op. cit.*, pp 132–52.

[22] See Rosemary Rader, 'Christian pre-monastic forms of asceticism: *syneisaktism* or spiritual marriage' in Skudlarek, *op. cit.*, pp 80–85.

[23] Quoted in Penny Schine Gold, 'Male/female cooperation: the example of Fontevrault' in *Distant echoes*, p 154. See the article as a whole, pp 151–68.

[24] Schulenberg, *art. cit.*, p 76.

[25] Although I have not described monasticism in other world religions, I believe that this too may expand our perceptions of religious life.

[26] John Climacus, *The ladder of Divine ascent*, step 1, in the edition by Colm Luibheid & Norman Russell (London, 1982).

[27] For a very general overview, see David Knowles, *Christian monasticism* (London, 1989), chapters 9 & 13.

[28] See Raimundo Panikkar, 'The archetype of the monk' in his *Blessed simplicity* (New York, 1982).

[29] This information is drawn largely from 'Ethiopian Orthodox models of religious life', a document privately circulated by Fr. Ejesus Kinitebib, an Ethiopian monk working in London. I am grateful to Sister Elisabeth Rees for making this available to me.

[30] For a general introduction to Celtic spirituality and monasticism see for example, Pierre Riché, 'Spirituality in Celtic and Germanic society' in McGinn etc., *op. cit.*, pp 163–76 and Diarmuid O Laoghiare, 'Celtic spirituality' in Cheslyn Jones etc (eds.), *The study of spirituality* (London, 1986), pp 216–25.