

DAVID GOLDFRANK

Old and New Perspectives on Iosif Volotsky's Monastic Rules

Scholarly debate in the West, and to a large extent also in the Soviet Union, concerning the fifteenth and early sixteenth-century Russian monk Iosif (*né* Sanin) Volotsky (Joseph Volotsky), 1439–1515, has generally centered on his political ideas and the interpretation of his *Prosvetitel'* (*Enlightener*, or *Illuminator*). The monastic side of his activities is often played down or neglected, even though the most important aspect of his daily life for fifty-five years was his serious pursuit of the monastic and (for thirty-eight years) abbatial vocation.¹ In the provincial Volokolamsk Monastery, which he founded, he not only entered into ecclesiastical politics and composed the didactic apologetics and inquisitional invectives that comprise his sixteen-discourse (originally eleven) *Enlightener* but also wrote two monastic Rules, which are very important sources for his life and for the religious and intellectual history of his time.² No other Russian abbot of his epoch left such a vivid record of an attempt to establish an orderly coenobium, gave so many written instructions to his subordinates, or had such an effect upon subsequent monastic legislation.³ More-

1. The latest article to appear, Marc Szeftel, "Joseph Volotsky's Political Ideas in a New Historical Perspective," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, n.s., 13, no. 1 (April 1965): 19–29, reviews the development of scholarly understanding of Iosif's most important, and seemingly contradictory, political doctrines. Of the standard American textbooks of Russian history, only Michael Florinsky's *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*, 2 vols. (New York, 1953), 1:167, refers to Iosif's monastic "regulations." A. A. Zimin does not even mention the Rules in *Rossia na poroge novogo vremeni (Ocherki politicheskoi istorii Rossii pervoi treti XVI v.)* (Moscow, 1972).

2. Metropolitan Makarii (Bulgakov), *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 12 vols., 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1857–83), 4:226–41, 7:55–57, 70–72, 87–99 (vols. 13–14 of *Slavica Reprints*), and Igor Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum: Entstehung, Entwicklung, und Wesen, 988–1917* (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 254–62, for example, rely heavily on Iosif in their treatment of Muscovite monasticism.

3. Iosif had a decisive influence on the monastic rules and writings of Kornilii Komel'sky, Metropolitan Daniil, and Archbishop and Metropolitan Makarii. See "Kornilii Komel'skii, II. Ustav ili pravila," in Bishop Amvrosii, *Istoriia Rossiiskoi Ierarkhii*, 6 vols. (Moscow, 1807–15), 4:662–704; V. I. Zhmakin, *Mitropolit Daniil i ego sochineniia* (Moscow, 1881), also published in *Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (hereafter *ChOIDR*), 1881, nos. 1 and 2, esp. "Otdel prilozheniu," 2:39–44; V. G. Druzhinin, "Neskol'ko neizvestnykh literaturnykh pamiatnikov iz sbornikov XVI-go veka," *Letopis' zaniatii Arkheograficheskoi komissii*, 21 (1909): 30, 71–75; *Akty*

over, both of these Rules, unlike most other such writings, reflect and illuminate the author's associations with the world outside the monastery. Therefore, the insights of theology, Marxist historiography, and the sociology of religion, as well as the information found in other contemporary sources, all have something to contribute to the analysis of these Rules, and the recent discovery of the Brief Rule makes possible a comparison with the Extended Rule and a fuller assessment of Iosif's life and legacy.

The Rules

Iosif's Brief Rule contains eleven explanatory discourses (*slova*).⁴ Six of them treat basic aspects of coenobitic monasticism: choral prayer, refectory behavior, food, attire, nocturnal silence, and work. These discourses have both admonitions and positive instructions. The other five discourses are simple prohibitions against strong beverages, women, adolescents, private possessions, and illicit absence from the monastery. Only the discourses on prayer and work develop their ideas at length, and only these two and the ones on possessions and drunkenness contain vivid arguments evoked by actual problems, rather than the repetition of timeworn principles. This is because absolute abstinence, personal poverty, and attentiveness to prayer and work were respectively uncanonical, unhistorical, and impractical, as well as unpopular.⁵ In a form close to the extant copies, the Brief Rule was most probably written by 1504.⁶

istoricheskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoiu komissiei (hereafter *AI*), 5 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1841–42), vol. 1, no. 292, pp. 531–34; and *Stoglav, izdannyi D. E. Koshanchikova* (St. Petersburg, 1863), gl. 39, 49, 50, 52.

4. The actual title of what Ia. S. Lur'e named the "Brief Redaction" of Iosif's Rule ("Ustav") is "Abba Iosif's Discourses to His Disciples from the Divine Scriptures on the Coenobitic Life" ("Avvy Iosifa ot bozhestvennykh pisanii o zhitel'stve obshezhitel'nem slovesa k svoim emu uchenikom"), and was named by a seventeenth-century scribe, "The Old Monastery Book of Iosif Volotsky" ("Kniga Iosif Volotskii Monastyr'skaia staraia"). It was published by Lur'e in Ia. S. Lur'e and A. A. Zimin, *Poslaniia Iosifa Volotskogo* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1959), "Prilozheniia," pp. 296–319.

5. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 302–3, 309, 314, 318.

6. The earliest copy of the Brief Rule is found, along with the earliest copy of the "Brief" *Enlightener*, which Lur'e reasonably dated 1502–4, in a Solovetsky (originally Iosifov-Volokolamsky) manuscript of no later than 1514. The formulas of address of discourses rewritten in the Extended Rule correspond to the way Iosif wrote to his monks around 1504–7, which would indicate that the Brief Rule was written earlier. However, a few parts of the *extant* Brief Rule may have been written later than corresponding parts of the Extended Rule, because the latter is closer to the ultimate source, Nikon "of the Black Mountain." See Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 290, 296–97, 303–5; N. A. Kazakova and Ia. S. Lur'e, *Antifeodal'nye ereticheskie dvizheniia na Rusi XIV–nachala XVI veka* (hereafter *AfED*) (Moscow and Leningrad, 1955), pp. 438–45; N. A. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev i ego sochineniia* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1960), pp. 343–47, 355–56; *Velikie Minei-Chetii, sobrannye vserossiiskim mitropolitom Makariem* (St. Petersburg, 1868–1917), vol. 1, for September (hereafter *VMCh*), cols. 503, 520, 523–24; *Taktikon . . . Nikona Chernogortsa* (Pochaev, 1795), regular text, p. 13 ob.

Together these eleven discourses reappear, somewhat modified, as the basic nine discourses of the Extended Rule, the only Rule of Iosif known in scholarship until 1955.⁷ The sections on conduct in church and in the refectory, food, attire, and possessions and labor were all rewritten in order to fill in procedural details, introduce ranks and monasterial officials, emphasize obedience and discipline, and attack specific abuses. The Extended Rule also has a testamentary introduction, a polemical and hagiographical justification of the composition of the Rule, instructions for the successor abbot and for the monastery's council (*sobor*), a review and expansion of the regulations found in the nine basic discourses, nine special "traditions" (*predaniia*) concerning the execution of the Rule, and nine sets of "penances" (*zapreshcheniia*) for infractions. In all of the rewritten and new sections, Iosif was addressing current issues and living people in defense of his peculiar monastic structure and his attitudes in general.⁸ His no-nonsense attitude toward authority and regulations, his structural innovations, and his formalization of this in his written Rule all provoked opposition inside and outside his monastery, and he responded accordingly. The Extended Rule was composed over a period of time and not completed until 1514 or 1515, and thus was a true testament.⁹

The monasteries described by the Rules appear to be quite different. The Brief Rule envisions a community of monks who seem to be equal in status and treatment, individually under the abbot's personal authority, and required without exception to do manual labor. Individual offices (*osobyie sluzhby*) are

7. The title of what Lur'e calls the "Minea Redaction" of Iosif's Rule is "The Authentic and Detailed Last Will and Testament [literally, 'Spiritual Charter'] of the Reverend Abbot Iosif—'To the Spiritual Superior Who Shall Succeed Me and to All My Brothers in Christ, from the First Down to the Last'—Concerning the Monasterial and Monastic Institution, According to the Witness of the Divine Scriptures, from the Cloister of the Venerable and Glorious Dormition of the All-Glorious Mother-of-God, in Whom We Dwell" ("Dukhovnaia gramota prepodobnago igumena Iosifa o monastyrskom i inocheskom ustroenii, podlinno zhe i prostranno i po svidetel'stvu bozhestvennykh pisanii, dukhovnomu nastoiateliiu izhe po mne sushchemu i vsem, iazhe o Khristem, bratiam moim, ot pervago dazh' do posledniago, v Obiteli Preslavnyiia Bogoroditsa, Chestnago i Slavnago Uspeniia, v neizhe zhitel'tsvuem").

It was published in *VMCh* in 1868 (cols. 499–615). It is often called his Testament ("Dukhovnaia gramota"), as well as his Rule ("Ustav"), but should not be confused with his official testament of his monastery to Vasilii III in 1507 (see *AI*, vol. 1, no. 288). What I call Iosif's Brief Rule (from Lur'e's designation, *kratkaia redaktsiia*) should not be confused with Discourse no. 12 of the Extended Rule, which is entitled "The Second Will and Testament of the Sinful and Miserable Abbot Iosif, 'To My Fathers and Brothers Who Wish To Hear in Brief About Everything Written Here Concerning the Monasterial and Monastic Institution'" ("Dukhovnaia gramota vtoraiia . . . vkrattse"), *VMCh*, cols. 567–70.

8. *VMCh*, cols. 509, 525–27, 543, 547–63, 574–87, 602–3.

9. Discourses nos. 10 and 11, 12 and 14, and 13, as well as the introductory and some inserted sections, appear to represent various stages of Iosif's monastic legislation. The final act, the institution of the *sobor*, did not take place until 1514–15. See below, note 105.

mentioned, but not the attendant authority over other monks. The Extended Rule is written for a highly differentiated institution having both a superior and a powerful, yet vaguely defined, cogoverning *sobor*, as well as mentors for novices, a detailed penance system, a division of the brotherhood into three orders distinguished by the severity of ascetic regimen, and a number of major and minor supervisory officials for spiritual and estate affairs. Nevertheless, Iosif is recognizably the same monastic theoretician in these Rules, not merely because about one-third of the Extended Rule repeats the Brief Rule verbatim. Each one presupposes the same corpus of "Divine Scriptures and coenobitic traditions," each insists that "everything in the monastery proceed according to protocol" and "measure," and each emphasizes obedience above the other monastic virtues.¹⁰ In addition, each displays the contentiousness and the logical and bullying *ad hominem* mode of argumentation that appear in Iosif's apologetical and political writings for laymen.¹¹

In both Rules Iosif treats the issues under discussion by weaving or stringing together hagiographic legends and patristic apothegms, which he connects with his own logical discourse. His repetition of a few clearly stated principles has the effect of building up within the reader a solid notion of what is proper and what is not. The continual underlying theme is that in the monastic life all temptations and vices are interrelated and lead to perdition.¹² While each Rule is replete with proverbial and patristic wisdom, Iosif does not bother with any complex analysis or investigation of the monk's psyche, or his constant battle against temptations and struggle to achieve a prayerful disposition. For that matter, Iosif hardly touches on the long period each day after compline which the monks spent praying, reading, working, or practicing hesychasm.¹³ In analyzing the choral prayer, moreover, he takes his ideas not from a monastic theologian but from the public sermons of John Chrysostom, composed while he was still patriarch of Antioch and combating the real Judaizing inclinations of his congregation (Iosif originally used this material in his own sermons, admonishing the Orthodox Christian Russians not to be influenced by the allegedly "Judaizing" Novgorod Heretics).¹⁴ In Iosif's theorizing, then, the monk is distinguished from the layman and defined by a special vow of

10. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 297, 310; *VMCh*, cols. 504, 529.

11. See Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 145–51, 179–82, 187–228. In almost all of his works, Iosif is either imperious or combative.

12. See, for example, Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 314, 317, and *VMCh*, cols. 532, 542.

13. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 310; *VMCh*, col. 528.

14. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 297–303; *VMCh*, cols. 503–13; Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 351–56; J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca* (161 vols., Paris, 1857–66, hereafter *PG*), 48:718, 725–26, 734, 744–46, 882, 56:997–1007 (and the Old Russian translation in *VMCh*, cols. 798, 807, 809, 833, 836, 971–81).

chastity, poverty, and obedience and by his external garb and routine, but not necessarily by any internal experiences or spiritual exercises.¹⁵

The most systematic and thorough study of Iosif's monastic theology is that of Thomas Špidlík. He has demonstrated that Iosif's monastic doctrines lie almost completely within the boundaries of the Orthodox tradition and that he understood the character make-up and formation of the virtuous coenobitic monk and well-functioning community.¹⁶ Špidlík makes numerous well-considered divisions and subdivisions of Iosif's spirituality into component parts and also accepts the standard approach to his theology in Russian scholarship, which makes little distinction between his doctrines and his practices and connects them both with the religious civilization of sixteenth-century Muscovy. According to this understanding of Iosif, which dates from the 1860s, he was a "typical representative of the common majority of literate Russians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries."¹⁷ His devoutness was "primarily external, ritualistic, Pharisaic piety," which "was diffused among all layers of our society, including among those who at the same time were governed by the gravest vices and almost complete immorality."¹⁸ His (Extended) Rule "is characterized by its external rigorism and the predominance of ritualism."¹⁹ "The essential was not asceticism but the strict observance of the Rule."²⁰ "External observance will produce inner sanctification."²¹ "Significant also is the stress upon concentration and firmness as well as the interdependence of bodily and spiritual tensions. 'Press your hands together and join your feet,

15. Kazakova and Lur'e, *AJED*, pp. 414–19; *Prosvetitel', ili obličenie eresi židovstvuiushchikh, tvorenie prepodobnago otisa nashego, Iosifa, igumena Volotskago*, 3rd ed. (Kazan, 1896), pp. 253–88 (Discourse no. 11).

16. Thomas Špidlík, S.J., *Joseph de Volokolamsk: Un chapitre de la spiritualité russe*, vol. 146 of *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Rome, 1956). This was the first work to seek Iosif's monastic sources. In order to explain Iosif's monastic theology, Špidlík went beyond the Extended Rule to Iosif's *Enlightener* (pp. 66–67, 70–75, 111–12, 123, 125–26) and to the coenobiarch Basil of Caesarea (pp. 60–61, 66–67, 72–73), though not to the monastic psychologist John Climachus, who was almost as important as Basil for Iosif. Špidlík also may be inaccurate in claiming that Iosif's "semi-Pelagianism" and his failure to include "imaginative discretion" as a desired trait for the superior in his theory of clerical authority were peculiarly Eastern Christian traits, at least for the Middle Ages (pp. 33–34, 43–44, 68–69).

17. A. S. Arkhangel'sky, *Nil Sorskii i Vassian Patrikeev*, vol. 25 of *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva* (St. Petersburg, 1882), p. 224. According to Lur'e, *Ideologičeskaja bor'ba v russkoj publičestike kontsa XV–nachala XVI veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1960), pp. 14–15, 22–23, 286–87, the original scholarly presentation of these ideas is found in Zhmakin, *Mitropolit Daniil*, pp. 23–24, 91–92, 107.

18. Arkhangel'sky, *Nil Sorskii i Vassian Patrikeev*, p. 214.

19. Ivan Kologrivof [Kologriwof], *Essai sur la sainteté en Russie* (Bruges, 1953), p. 220.

20. Kologrivof, *Essai*, p. 221; George Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1946–66), 2:311.

21. Kologrivof, *Essai*, p. 220.

close your eyes and concentrate your mind.' This comprises the entire spiritual method of Josephism."²² "One cannot fail to note in an abbot of this type some purely Muscovite features—good managing ability, practical sense, great energy."²³ Accordingly, "the entire outlook of Saint Iosif is determined by the idea of the social service and calling of the Church. The ideal of Iosif is a *sui generis* movement to the people [*khozhdemie v narod*]."²⁴ Except for what might be an artificial definition of "purely Muscovite features," a rather tenuous application of "movement to the people," and an exaggeration of Iosif's distance from classical monastic theology, there is little to contest in this standard presentation of Iosif's religiosity.²⁵ Nor is there any doubt that, insofar as Irénée Hausherr's schematization is valid, Iosif's monasticism leans heavily toward the school of "witness of obedience" (μαρτύριον τῆς ὑποταγῆς).²⁶

The practical aspects of Iosif's monasticism are so manifest that any study of him must touch upon the problems considered in the sociology of religion even if the author is writing as a theologian or as a Marxist. In treating of Iosif, his contemporaries, and the social implications of their theology, students of religion have chosen not to employ a strictly comparative method (such as that of Max Weber)²⁷ or to come to grips with the dynamics of ecclesiastical landholding in fifteenth and sixteenth-century Russia.²⁸ Typical in this respect are Kologrivof's comment, "One may not accuse him of avarice, because he collects in order to give, to help his neighbor," and Georges Florovsky's explanation, "He considered and experienced monastic life itself as a social impost, a special kind of religious zemstvo service."²⁹ Similarly Fairy von

22. Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 2:312. The statement cited by Fedotov actually derives from Chrysostom's and Iosif's instructions concerning the lay congregation's choral prayer. See Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, p. 352; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 299–300; *VMCh*, cols. 506, 819, 982.

23. Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 2:283.

24. Georges Florovsky, *Puti russkago bogosloviiia* (Paris, 1937), p. 18.

25. In the final analysis, Iosif relies in both Rules chiefly upon the New Testament, Basil of Caesarea, Efreim of Syria, John Climachus, the "Apophthegmata patrum," and the Patericons—thus even more upon Semitic or Middle Eastern traditions (the wellspring of all Christian monasticism) than on any other group of literary sources.

26. Irénée Hausherr, S.J., "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1 (1935): 114–38.

27. See, for example, Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, 3 vols. (New York, 1968), 2:541–77, 3:1158–73.

28. See, for example, M. N. Tikhomirov, "Monastyr'-votchinnik XVI v.," *Istoriicheskie zapiski*, 3 (1938): 130–60; A. I. Kopanev, *Istoriia zemlevladieniia Belozerskogo kraia XV–XVI vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1951); I. U. Budovnits, *Monastyr'i na Rusi i bor'ba s nimi krest'ian v XIV–XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1966).

29. Kologrivof, *Essai*, p. 223; and Florovsky, *Puti*, p. 18. Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum*, pp. 180–246, treats the economic aspects of Muscovite monasticism, but is more interested in the colonization of lands than in the acquisition of villages and dominion over people and labor.

Lilienfeld, in her monograph on Iosif's eminent contemporary Nil Sorsky, views the overall differences between Iosif and Nil as a variation of the early Christian problem of "office" and "charisma" and refers to Iosif as "Old Testament-priestly" and "legalistic."³⁰ However, in spite of her use of the terminology of the comparative study of religions, she still explains his position on social and political issues solely in terms of his ascetic ideals. She thus follows Father Špidlík in rejecting as inconsistent with these ideals the famous argument attributed to Iosif by his disciple Dionisii Zvenigorodsky, which clearly links hierocratic power, monastic wealth, and the social structure of Muscovy: "If the monasteries did not possess villages, then how could a venerable or noble man allow himself to be tonsured? And if there were no venerable elders, where could we procure the metropolitan archbishop, bishops, and all the venerable prelates? And if there were no venerable and well-born elders, there would be waverings in the faith!"³¹

Iosif, however, did not hide the fact that he actively promoted the accumulation of wealth without any intention of giving it away. In a sermon closely connected with his Extended Rule, he insisted that the monks carefully execute the revenue-producing memorial services:

All the Divine Scriptures speak and teach what is profitable for the soul, but they hardly stir over physical comfort. Owing to these books, which are both profitable for the soul and salvatory, we shall be delivered from eternal torments and be honored with eternal blessings in the future age. In the present age these [books] give rise to the foundation of monasteries, the construction of divine churches, and their furnishing with every divine object and adornment including all sorts of icons, wall frescoes, life-creating crosses, divine Evangels, sanctified vessels, holy vestments, and all the church objects which are made from gold, silver, and pearls, and holy books. And also these [books] give rise to abundance in everything pertaining to the church and comfort for the priests, deacons, the servants of the church, and all the brothers: abundance in food and beverages, garments and boots, the construction of cells and all the necessary cell objects, and also villages, gardens, rivers, lakes, pastures, and all kinds of livestock and animals.³²

On the same subject, in a letter to an aristocratic lady in which Iosif justifies the high cost of such services, he emphasizes the monastery's charitable activi-

30. Fairy von Lilienfeld, *Nil Sorskij und seine Schriften: Die Krise der Tradition im Russland Ivans III* (Berlin, 1963), pp. 151, 170, 183.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 171; Špidlík, *Joseph de Volokolamsk*, p. 138; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 367.

32. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 355–56; A. A. Zimin, "O politicheskoi doktrine Iosifa Volotskogo," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* (hereafter *TODRL*), 9 (1953): 168–69.

ties.³³ But this may have been just a façade, since in the instruction composed for his monks (and in the Extended Rule as a whole), monastic charity is not mentioned.

Soviet Approaches: Class Interests and the Novgorod Heretics

Thus Soviet scholars in analyzing Iosif's Rules, as well as his other writings, on the basis of his "class" interests and on what Engels claimed to be the church's function in "feudal" society (to support upper-class power and property) are taking a cue from Iosif himself.³⁴ Classifying Iosif's overall socioeconomic tendencies within a Marxist framework is quite simple. With his seigniorial or "feudal" monastery, he was an active representative of the landed church. His writings served to defend his own property from his personal enemies (including an archbishop), to justify ecclesiastical landholding as a whole, to bolster the power of the church, to protect the church and other vested interests from heretical doctrines, and to sanction obedience in general to those in authority, especially to a sovereign who protects the church. On the other hand, even from a Marxist point of view, to discern how Iosif's Rules are related to his other activities and ideology is not an easy matter, and Soviet scholars have drawn several different conclusions concerning the basis and significance of these Rules.

I. U. Budovnits offered a strictly class-oriented analysis of the Extended Rule in 1947, before the discovery of the seemingly egalitarian Brief Rule. Subsequently he considered the differences in formal structure and organization between the Rules to be insignificant. Both Rules, he said, provided the necessary discipline, labor, and control over personal property to ensure sound management and growth for a "feudal" corporation. Thus the Brief Rule in its time represented nothing new, since the stringent measures concerning possessions and labor were necessary for the initial phase of any new communal monastery and are similar to what is known about the earliest years of other such prosperous and fast-growing coenobia. Based on his study of the monastery's archives, Budovnits reached the conclusion that the upper-class monks had exchanged their private property for a privileged and powerful position within the communal monastery. With less support from his sources he also decided that the Extended Rule's status gradations, allegedly based on merit, and Iosif's attacks on haughty aristocratic monks were hypocritical.³⁵

33. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 349–53; Lur'e and Zimin, *Postaniia*, pp. 179–83, 258–60.

34. The classical Marxist statement concerning the ideological role of the "feudal" church is found in Friedrich Engels, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, vol. 7 of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, 39 vols. (Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED, Berlin, 1957–68), pp. 330–41.

35. I. U. Budovnits, *Russkaia publitsistika XVI veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1947), pp. 61–82, and *Monastyri na Rusi*, pp. 239–44.

For Budovnits, then, the purported socioeconomic reality of the seigniorial monastery completely overshadowed the expressed ideals in the Rules. Well before Budovnits's first work on this problem appeared, however, B. A. Rybakov had proceeded directly from the known institutional function of Volokolamsk Monastery in the first sixty-five years of the sixteenth century.³⁶ During that period, Iosif's monastery supplied or influenced a crucially high percentage of the leading prelates and thus inspired the church's official policies on doctrine, ritual, publications, dissidents, ecclesiastical land, and state power.³⁷ Agreeing with the seminal conclusions of V. I. Zhmakin, the mid-nineteenth-century biographer of Iosif's chief disciple Metropolitan Daniil, that the basis of the monastery's institutional success is found in the Extended Rule,³⁸ Rybakov conceived that the Rule was a definite instrument in a Iosifite "counterreformation." As a Marxist, he asserted that this counterreformation was a response to the "antifeudal" heretical movements of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century. The monastery's tight organization and its compatibility with an aristocratic and seigniorial order provided Muscovy's "church militant" with the talented, forceful, and cohesive leadership that was needed to combat such heretics.

Rybakov's thesis served as the starting point for Iakov Lurie, who discovered, published, and first studied the Brief Rule.³⁹ This finding enabled him more fully to investigate the class aspects of the earliest stage of Muscovy's counterreformation. According to Lurie, each Rule when it was issued served a distinct counterreformational function. The Brief Rule, issued before the final repression of the heretics in 1504, was designed to help the church combat active, living heretics, who threatened it with their rationalism, iconoclasm, and anticlericalism. This explains Iosif's reform of monastic practice, with his insistence on monks' labor, absolute abstention from ownership, and equal treatment in the refectory. Collectively possessing a large amount of property and living an extensively ritualistic life, coenobitic monks observing Iosif's Brief Rule would nevertheless be adhering to the social ideals of the New Testament, the ultimate authority of both Orthodox and heretical Christians. The activity of the heretics also explains why Iosif included in his strictures against "murmuring" (which are normal for monastic writings) a specific and unusual attack on "certain highly intelligent people" who were "teaching the lowly" to revile their condition and to lament, "Oh, you are bitter, Mammon, for those who do not possess you."⁴⁰ This could be viewed as a matter of intellectuals

36. B. A. Rybakov, "Voinstvuiushchie tserkovniki XVI v.," *Antireligioznik*, 1934, no. 3, pp. 21–31, esp. 28; no. 4, pp. 21–30.

37. A. A. Zimin, *I. S. Peresvetov i ego sovremenniki* (Moscow, 1958), pp. 71–90.

38. Zhmakin, *Mitropolit Daniil*, pp. 19–22.

39. Ia. S. Lur'e, "Kratkaia redaktsiia 'Ustava' Iosifa Volotskogo, pamiatnik ideologii rannego iosifianstva," *TODRL*, 12 (1956): 116–38.

40. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 314.

instigating social protest. Lurie also considered Iosif's attacks against talking in church about everyday affairs, his reliance upon his antiheretical writings for his treatment of this problem in the Brief Rule, and his concern in both places for those who might react violently to reprimands as indications that Iosif was bothered by the heretics' involvement in active social unrest while he was composing the Brief Rule.⁴¹ Thus Lurie could conclude that the connection between the anticlerical doctrines of the Novgorod Heretics and the "objective strivings" of late fifteenth-century Russian plebeians is revealed and reflected in the "subjective views" expressed in the Brief Rule. The rather thorough repression of the heretics in 1504–5 removed the most vocal opponents of the church's accommodation with "feudalism" and explains why Iosif no longer needed to be egalitarian in his Rule. Instead, the Extended Rule could be more lax concerning individual possessions, allow distinctions between monks, provide explicitly for the management of villages and monasterial enterprises, and be so structured as to facilitate the training of tough-minded, able prelates, who would be prepared to defend the interests of the "feudal" church.

Lurie wants us to see the Brief Rule as an integral part of Iosif's campaign against heretics whose attacks on the church were generated by potent and threatening social discontent. However, the reformational aspects of the Brief Rule and its concern for labor discipline do not in themselves prove the existence of any socioeconomic motivation for the Novgorod Heretics. Iosif's complaint about "highly intelligent people" expresses as much anger over troublemakers, who are in no way labeled heretics, as real fear of the lower classes. Doctrinal and social analogies between the Novgorod Heretics and the radical protests against the medieval Roman Catholic Church can be found, but however much the doctrines of these Russian heretics challenged the church's economic and political power, and however much lower-class Russian society may have felt the weight of oppression, we have no solid proof that the heretics menaced the secular upper classes in general any more than did the Prague Hussites (as opposed to the Taborites) or the Lutherans (as contrasted with the Anabaptists). Nor have we any evidence that the heretical movement which originated in Novgorod and spread to Moscow had more than several hundred adherents.⁴²

41. Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 249–58.

42. The doctrinal and social analogies between the heretical and reformational movements of fourteenth to sixteenth-century Russia and twelfth to sixteenth-century Western and Central Europe are the basis for applying Engels's typology of "urban," "plebeian," and "undifferentiated urban-plebeian" movements to Russia. See Engels, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg*, pp. 244–47; Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 72–73; A. I. Klibanov, *Reformatsionnye dvizheniia v Rossii v XIV–pervoi polovine XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 93–94, 344–46; Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 127–84; and Zimin, *I. S. Peresvetov*, pp. 168–216. The application by Soviet historians of Engels's "model" to Russia has not been rigorous and has been challenged, though in no way refuted, by some Western historians.

The validity of Lurie's interpretation of the Brief Rule depends on the degree to which Iosif's homilies and invectives, composed within the framework of the ethical ideals of the New Testament and the theocratic ideals of Byzantine ceremonialism, were actually related to social and economic problems. It is clear from the sources that around the time he composed the Brief Rule Iosif was concerned with the threat of social and spiritual discontent, which he considered to be a result of heresy, and also that he was highly sensitive about his own power, property, rank-and-file monks, serving men, and peasants, favored welfare measures to ease the lot of the lower classes, and used his clerical authority and doctrinal arguments to promote his own material interests.⁴³ It is therefore not unreasonable to look for a social impetus in Iosif's monastic writings.

On the other hand, Iosif's failure to make any reference to plebeian discontent in his antiheretical writings is significant in the light of the fact that Zinovii Otensky, Iosif's mid-sixteenth-century successor as the unmasker and refuter of heresy in Novgorod, perceived an active connection between disaffection with the church and social unrest.⁴⁴ This contrast is also reflected in other sources, which reveal a popular basis for Zinovii's heretics, but only a restricted, urban, middle-class, mainly clerical origin for most of Iosif's Novgorod Heretics, even though late fifteenth-century Novgorod and Pskov had a good deal of social unrest.⁴⁵ Thus Iosif's perception of heresy and class struggle as separate issues may have been solidly grounded in reality. Similarly, Iosif treated heresy and monastic reform as distinct problems, although he directly accused the Novgorod Heretics of denying the validity of Christian monasticism.⁴⁶ Therefore, notwithstanding the potential value of a Marxist treatment of Russian religious and intellectual history, the Brief Rule can only tentatively

See J. V. A. Fine in *Kritika*, 2, no. 2 (Winter 1966): 39, and Edgar Hösch, "Sowjetische Forschungen zur Häresiengeschichte Altrusslands: Methodologische Bemerkungen," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, n.s., 18, no. 2 (June 1970): 279–312, esp. p. 292, n. 55.

43. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 144–53, 158–59, 162–63, 173, 179–83, 185–227, 232–36; Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 466–67, 474.

44. F. Kalugin, *Zinovii, inok Otenskii i ego bogoslovsko-polemicheskaia i tserkovno-uchitel'naya proizvedeniia* (St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 274–75, 281, 295, 306, and "Prilozhenie," pp. 21–22. The corpus of Iosif's apologetics is found in Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 320–73, 391–419, 466–510; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 139–44, 154–79, 229–32; and *Prosvetitel'* (any of the four editions, 1857, 1882, 1896, 1904).

45. Zimin, *I. S. Peresvetov*, pp. 206–10; L. V. Cherepnin, *Obrazovanie russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva v XIV–XV vekakh* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 462–82.

46. Iosif's defenses of monasticism are part of his apologetical corpus and are found in Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 414–19, and *Prosvetitel'* (any edition), Discourse no. 11. In his Rules he was only concerned with the accuracy of texts and ritual codes, and he treated the preservation of them as a monastic duty and virtue. See Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 295, and *VMCh*, col. 527.

be identified as a by-product or an instrument of a clerical campaign against socially radical heretics.

A Sociological Approach to the Brief Rule and Its Context

Max Weber noted the significance of the Iosifites in sixteenth-century Russia. Muscovy, like Carolingian Germany, lacked a developed urban culture, so coenobitic monks, in spite of their theocratic ideology, were among the chief bearers of "rationality" and were thus leading candidates for whatever high offices and functions might be open to them.⁴⁷ Weber's specific estimation of the Iosifites is not so different from that of many historians of Russia, and his starting point assumes the complexity of human motivation. However, his work is grounded in a comparative analysis of social structures and values, which examines ideal and material interests in themselves and also in relation to each other. From the standpoint of the sociology of religion, Iosif's two Rules, although similar in their cultural setting and emphasis on choral prayer, are in many ways quite different.

The Brief Rule only presents a set of ideals and cannot be evaluated as if it has ever been an effective regulatory code in Iosif's monastery. From the time of its foundation, Volokolamsk Monastery had villages and officials, which are mentioned only in the Extended Rule.⁴⁸ Thus the Brief Rule should be analyzed in relation to its overall tendencies and potential implications for the kind of monastery Iosif founded—the coenobitic, seigniorial "corporation." By and large, the Brief Rule expresses the needs of a new communal monastery, where (barring a large endowment) universal labor is a prerequisite for material construction, and where the founder's zeal is matched by that of his comrades. The seriousness and simplicity of the indicated daily routine of communal and solitary prayer and work, as well as the uncompromising prohibitions of personal possessions and strong beverages, are indicative of the productive asceticism which made some monasteries economically competitive in the Middle Ages.⁴⁹

Given the state of fifteenth-century Russian (and most other medieval) monasticism,⁵⁰ the Brief Rule was potentially reformatory (or, if one prefers,

47. Weber, *Economy and Society*, 3:1167–68. "The educated strata of Carolingian, Ottonian, and Salic imperialism worked toward an imperial and theocratic cultural organization, just as did the Josephite monks in sixteenth-century Russia" (2:513).

48. L. V. Cherepnin and A. A. Zimin, eds., *Akty feodal'nogo zemlevladieniia i khoziaistva XIV–XVI vv.* (hereafter *AFZKh*), 3 vols. (Moscow, 1951–61), vol. 2, nos. 1–8, and Savva Cherny, "Zhitie i prebyvanie vkrattse prepodobnago ottsa nashego igumena Iosifa, grada Volokolamskago," *VMCh*, col. 546.

49. Weber, *Economy and Society*, 3:1170. Budovnit's, *Monastyri na Rusi*, pp. 239–42, points to the similarity between the strict regime in the Brief Rule and what is known of the constructional period of other fifteenth-century Russian coenobia.

counterreformational), but to claim any deeper, extramonasterial motive for Iosif is highly speculative. It may be pure coincidence that the early years of his monastery, hence the period in which he wrote his original monastic homilies, were contemporary with his violent struggle against the heretics.⁵¹ On the other hand, it is more than likely that the eleven-discourse Brief Rule was composed after Nil Sorsky's eleven-discourse "Rule" ("Ustav"),⁵² and in part to defend Iosif and his allies from the Orthodox and canonical followers of Nil, the Nonpossessors. Since the earliest copy of the extant Brief Rule is in a manuscript donated to Iosif's monastery in 1514 by one of his two disciples who had studied with and respected Nil and yet had polemized against one of Nil's disciples around 1510,⁵³ and since by 1503, if not earlier, Iosif and his disciples were in conflict with Nil and his disciples,⁵⁴ it is fair to assume that the Brief Rule, whatever its connections with the heretics, served as a showpiece for Iosif among the Nonpossessors at a time when the Extended Rule was actually functional and, as we shall see below, opposed by some of these Nonpossessors.

The actually quite diverse collection of monks and laymen known as the Nonpossessors generally questioned the legality and propriety of monks and monasteries holding villages and living off the labors of others.⁵⁵ Nil's own "Tradition" ("Predanie") was written for a very small collective of artisan-mendicant hesychasts, and his Rule assumes that each monk is capable of mastering the techniques of "mental activity," if he intelligently follows either a worthy elder or simply the "Divine Scriptures."⁵⁶ Similarly, the Brief Rule treats the monks as equals and intelligent, even if they are required to submit to the discipline and protocol of the coenobium. Thus the demand of the Nonpossessors that monks live up to the ideals of the New Testament is, so to speak, fulfilled in the Brief Rule. One Nonpossessor (quite possibly Vassian

50. See, *inter alia*, Arkhangel'sky, *Nil Sorskii i Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 188–97, and V. S. Ikonnikov, *Maksim Grek i ego vremia*, 2nd ed. (Kiev, 1915), pp. 381–425.

51. See above, note 6.

52. The reference by Innokentii Okhlebinin (d. 1491) to Nil's *slovesa*, as well as to his *predanie*, indicates that both his "Predanie" and his "Ustav" may have been composed by 1491. See Arkhangel'sky, *Nil Sorskii i Vassian Patrikeev*, "Prilozhenie," pp. 14–16. Lur'e, however, is cautious (*Ideologicheskaiia bor'ba*, p. 300).

53. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 296–97; V. O. Zhmakin, "Nil Polev," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia*, 1881, no. 8, pp. 189–96.

54. According to the accounts of contemporaries, the synod of 1503 concerning monastic and ecclesiastical lands initiated the open conflict between Iosif and Nil's followers. See Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, p. 279, and Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 366–69.

55. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 223–49, 254–71; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 351–55.

56. M. S. Borovkova-Maikova, *Nil's Sorskago Predanie i Ustav, s vstupitel'noi sta'eii*, vol. 179 of *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva* (St. Petersburg, 1912), pp. 5, 11–15, 87–90.

Patrikeev) accused Iosif of forgetting that monastic wealth should be derived from the monks' own labors and be used only for the monastery's needs, charity, and the ransom of prisoners.⁵⁷ Accordingly, the Brief Rule, but not the Extended Rule, states that one must "work night and day in order not to burden anyone else, . . . and not only for one's own needs, but also for the sake of the poor, the stranger, the feeble and the aged."⁵⁸ The officiousness and "Old Testament-priestly" character of Iosif's spirituality, which von Lilienfeld contrasted to Nil's charismatic qualities, are far less noticeable in the Brief Rule than in the Extended Rule, while abstinence and asceticism are more pronounced, even if directed toward the interests of the landed coenobium.

Nevertheless a Marxist who is skeptical about the generalizations concerning monasticism and productive asceticism, and wants to focus on the seigniorial aspects of medieval monasticism, will find justification for his hesitation in Iosif's own testimony. In the Extended Rule, Iosif explicitly stated that during the early period of his monastery he was guided by the needs of a growing institution, and this meant that he had to "condescend to the weaknesses" of any monks and laymen who joined him.⁵⁹ Operationally, however much the laboring feats of Iosif and his closest companions were a product of their ascetic training, he took newcomers as they were and chose the easiest method to obtain their labor and cooperation. Thus the Brief Rule may have served as a guide and inspiration for the leading monks, but the others probably first enjoyed a rather mild form of personal, abbatial supervision in spiritual matters.⁶⁰ Therefore, owing to what we know of Iosif, a standard sociological generalization concerning monastic asceticism should be modified somewhat by a Marxist institutional-economic approach.

All the same, Max Weber's insight concerning the growth of institutions from loose communities united under charismatic leadership to more complex, depersonalized establishments is still applicable to the transition in Iosif's monastery from its early state to the more formalized structure of the Extended Rule.⁶¹ Certainly Weber could have found corroboration for his hypothesis in Iosif's testimony:

57. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 272–76, 351 (the anonymous missive in response to Iosif's missive to Prince I. I. Tret'iakov). Zimin makes the case for Vassian's having composed this work, while Kazakova (*Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 171–75) disagrees.

58. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 318.

59. For the early period of the monastery, peasants as well as elders took part in estate business (*AFZKh*, vol. 2, nos. 8, 22).

60. For the hagiographical accounts of Iosif's early Rule and his leading ascetics see Savva Cherny in *VMCh*, cols. 465–69, and "Zhitie prep. Iosifa Volokolamskago sostavlennoe neizvestnym," *ChOIDR*, 1903, vol. 3, pp. 23–32.

61. Max Weber, *Economy and Society*, 3:1121–23. The distinction between noneconomic, charismatic, archaic monasticism and rationalized, productive monasticism is more or less valid for the difference between Nil Sorsky's Rules and Iosif's Extended Rule,

What if someone asks, "why from the beginning, was there no tradition [*predanie*] that not only the superior but also the major and council brothers have the responsibility for church, refectory, and monasterial good order and shall impose penances upon transgressors and forgive the penitent . . . ?"

In the beginning, when I arrived here, the brothers who accompanied me and I possessed all sorts of zeal and heroism. We came here in order to act as it is written down here. . . . Then it was just the beginning, and there were neither senior nor lesser brothers. . . . There was still immense scarcity in food and beverages, garments and boots, and even cells fit for habitation. There was continuous work and all sorts of labor. Our responsibility was only to see that someone would come here to live or be tonsured, and we greatly condescended to their weaknesses. For thus the Divine Scriptures command. . . . Now, thanks to the charity and mercy of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ and of His Immaculate Mother, the Most Glorified Mother-of-God Mary, our Common Hope and Intercessor, we have abundance in all physical needs, and only must display absolute zeal and heroism regarding the spiritual: humility and obedience, chastity and fasting, and our reverence and good order in our cells, the church, the refectory, and the monastery.⁶²

The evidence from both Rules concerning the initial years of Iosif's monastery, then, is that he was lenient in spiritual matters, while he encouraged his ascetic elite and directed his energies toward material construction. In his later period, thanks in part to "divine charity and mercy," he had the wherewithal to impose strict spiritual discipline, tempered by the requirements of estate management, and to relax his insistence on individual abstinence and labor.⁶³ Since his interests were so worldly, hierocratic principles were bound to prevail over monastic individualism and inner development. In this respect, Iosif was quite different from Nil Sorsky, who specifically attempted to avoid the routinization or hierocratization of the charisma he possessed as a "great elder" (*velikii starets*). Nil demanded, albeit unsuccessfully, that his remains be thrown to the birds.⁶⁴ Iosif, on the other hand, was continually involved in building up and defending the monastery envisioned in the Extended Rule.

but not between Iosif's Brief Rule and Extended Rule. The primitive coenobitic monastery, described by the Brief Rule, is already on the way to rationalization. Rather, the Brief Rule represents the early, personally charismatic period of any institution.

62. *VMCh*, col. 586.

63. The records of the material development of Volokolamsk Monastery are found in A. A. Titov, *Rukopisi slavianskie i russkie, prinallezhashchie I. A. Vakhrameevu*, vol. 5 (Moscow, 1906), "Prilozhenie," and *AFZKh*, vol. 2, pp. 1–60. This growth is summarized in Budovnits, *Monastyri na Rusi*, pp. 235–38.

64. Borovkova-Maikova, *Nila Sorskago Predanie i Ustav*, p. 10. See Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, p. 278. Vassian claimed that Iosif allowed himself to be called a prophet in his own time.

The Extended Rule and the World: More Sociology

The Extended Rule describes a seigniorial, bureaucratic, and nonconstitutional monastery, which in many ways reflects the similarly seigniorial, bureaucratic, and nonconstitutional secular and ecclesiastical life of Muscovy.⁶⁵ There is no question that the monastery was dominated by upper-class monks, although in theory, and to some extent in practice, the top positions were open to talent.⁶⁶ The monastery's *sobor* was similar to a boyar *duma*: the conciliar elder could advise and censure the superior, but at the peril of the superior's wrath and without any formal power to check him after the initial selection.⁶⁷ The court etiquette of the Kremlin was the exemplary style for *sobor* meetings and general convocations.⁶⁸ The monks, like laymen, were classified into ranks. Monastic penalties were rationalized,⁶⁹ while Ivan III's new *Sudebnik*, the first of its kind in Muscovite history, was the basis (at half rate) for judicial and police fees from the villagers.⁷⁰

The specter of contemporary "brutal and ferocious punishments," taken from Byzantine civil law, was raised regarding crimes against the monastery's communal property.⁷¹ Individual possessions, sale of handicrafts, and even trading were now permitted, but only with the superior's "blessing," and he also had the power to confiscate.⁷² This overall correspondence between the state and the monastery is normal for ecclesiastical temporalities and contemporary secular estates, enterprises, and institutions. Indeed, the world of the Extended Rule was the "real world," since the monastery was socially as well as economically active and possessed an orphanage, a hospital, an almshouse, and provisions to administer sacraments to women, in addition to the standard memorial services.⁷³

The Extended Rule has clauses not only to ensure that this involvement

65. Georgii Plekhanov, *Istoriia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli*, "Mira" ed. (St. Petersburg, 1914), pp. 70–92, and K. A. Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power* (New Haven, 1957), pp. 201–2, 222–25, 260–62, whose sources of information are definitely dated, nonetheless applied Marxist concepts to Russian history in such manner as to account for both class developments and political structure. Politically "feudal," seigniorial medieval Europe, unlike Russia or Byzantium, produced truly constitutional seigniorial monastic orders as well as self-governing communities.

66. Iosif's top officials, *sobor* members, and monks of the first "order" almost all came from wealthy families. On the other hand, his successor, the future Metropolitan Daniil, was a "new man." See *AFZKh*, vol. 2; nos. 6, 7, 10, 36, 37, 39, 43, 61, 68, 72, 77; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 239–40, 285–86; Savva Cherny in *VMCh*, cols. 541–42.

67. *Ibid.*, cols. 550–52, 580.

68. *Ibid.*, cols. 606–9.

69. *Ibid.*, cols. 610–14.

70. *Ibid.*, col. 601.

71. *Ibid.*, col. 526.

72. *Ibid.*, cols. 523–24; Zhmakin, *Mitropolit Daniil*, "Prilozhenie," no. 19.

73. "Zhitie . . . neizvestnym," pp. 44–45; *VMCh*, col. 603.

in the world would not lead to a decay of monastic virtue but also to promote monastic and clerical (hierocratic) influence over laymen.⁷⁴ Iosif requires strict supervision over monastic enterprises and all transactions with laymen. After all, "it is the custom of laymen to deride disorderly monks," but "nothing profits a layman so much as monastic good order."⁷⁵ The involvement in the world also explains the division of the monks into three "orders," which permitted accomplished ascetics to dwell in a normal community and contribute to its "good order."⁷⁶ This was an exemplary case of "asceticism in the service of the church," and thus in the service of the church's material interests.⁷⁷ The "athletes" (*podvizhniki*) who comprised the first rank justified the monastery that nurtured and supported them.

The asceticism of the Extended Rule is quite different from that of the Brief Rule. The latter is somewhat akin to the theoretically accumulative asceticism of the hard-working "Puritan."⁷⁸ The real Iosif of the Extended Rule and of hagiographic tradition, on the other hand, was quite ready to allow his talented monks to neglect work-asceticism for the prestige-asceticism of the monastic "athlete" and to rely on "divine charity and mercy" to provide material needs. In this regard we should recall the judgment of the theologians that observance took precedence over asceticism in the Extended Rule.⁷⁹ In sixteenth-century Muscovy, "charity and mercy" materialized in the form of enterprises, which required the supervision of the elders, liturgies, requiems, and memorial services, and the surplus from the villages, donated by wealthy benefactors.⁸⁰ The Extended Rule, needless to say, is concerned with the future of this "charity and mercy," with the continuation of donations to the monastery, and with the maintenance of its enterprises.⁸¹ Iosif himself, when faced with a major famine in 1512, depleted the monastery's reserves to

74. *VMCh*, cols. 591, 594, 596, 598–99.

75. *Ibid.*, cols. 511–12.

76. Savva Cherny in *VMCh*, cols. 466–67; "Zhitie . . . neizvestnym," pp. 43–45.

77. Ernst Troelsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, 2 vols. (New York, 1960), 1:239–45. Without any evidence from Iosifov sources to justify their position, Soviet historians assume that the three orders masked the material privileges enjoyed by the upper-class monks. See B. A. Rybakov, *Remeslo drevnei Rusi* (Moscow, 1948), p. 587; Budovnits, *Monastyri na Rusi*, pp. 244–45; and Lur'e, *Idelogicheskaiia bor'ba*, pp. 454–55. The prestige that Iosifov asceticism had under Vasilii III, however, indicates that fidelity to rigorism was useful and important for the Iosifites. See *Dopolneniia k Aktam istoricheskim*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1842), no. 218, p. 365.

78. Weber, *Economy and Society*, 3:1198–1200.

79. See above, note 20.

80. Iosif was conscious of the need for "the superior and all the brothers to be zealously responsible that the divine liturgy be performed in the holy church. Similarly, the one who reads the Synodicon shall be responsible for total accuracy." See Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, p. 356.

81. *VMCh*, cols. 587–606.

feed the local poor and was rewarded with gifts he solicited from eminent noblemen to cover the costs.⁸² One of Iosif's relatives reported that Iosif left a promise that if the monks continued faithfully to administer charity according to the stipulations of donations, then "God" would continue to provide for the monastery. Such calculations are not explicitly found in the Extended Rule. They are, however, consistent with his theological understanding of the economics of coenobia, and he followed the Old Testament in repeating the promise, "If you walk in My statutes and keep My commandments, . . . you will eat your bread to the full."⁸³

Ideology, Politics, and Iosif's Legacy

As a piece of writing, the Extended Rule was far more than monastic theory and legislation. Its manifest concern for the monastery's material interests meant that it could not help presenting a scandalous picture of monastic life to a serious Nonpossessor; and unlike the Brief Rule, the Extended Rule in no way conceals the overall structural differences between Iosif's and Nil's communities. Rather, Iosif used the Extended Rule to continue his ideological and political struggle against Nil's disciple Vassian Patrikeev and other Nonpossessors. Iosif proclaimed that the wealthy coenobium is the best place to practice the virtue of "nonacquisition" and poverty, since the communal monk has no individual material worries.⁸⁴ He glorified "living in obedience with one's elder" as the "most sublime" type of monastic life and thus followed an extreme position of ancient desert monasticism, but deviated from classical coenobitic theory, which saw the communal form merely as the safest and most successful for the average human being.⁸⁵ His drive for discipline within the monastery and for acceptance of the authority of his *sobor* was similar in spirit and argumentation to his campaign for acquiescence on the part of dissident monks (mainly or at least partly Nonpossessors) to the synodal decision of 1504 to persecute the heretics.⁸⁶ Here he took pains to

82. Dosifei Toporkov, "Nadgrobnoe slovo prepodobnomy Iosifu Volokolamskomu," in Archimandrite Gerontii Kurganovsky, *Volokolamskii Iosifov muzhskii monastyr' i ego sovremennoe sostoianie* (St. Petersburg, 1903), p. 134; "Zhitie . . . neizvestnym," pp. 32–33; and Savva Cherny in *VMCh*, cols. 482–84.

83. Toporkov, "Nadgrobnoe slovo," p. 135; *VMCh*, cols. 562–63; Lev. 26:3–5.

84. *VMCh*, cols. 522, 562, 610. Compare to Nil Sorsky in Borovkova-Maikova, *Nil Sorskago Predanie i Ustav*, pp. 13–14, 87–90, and also to the Brief Rule, Lur'e and Zimin, *Postlaniia*, p. 314.

85. *VMCh*, col. 535. Compare to John Climachus, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* (London, 1959), p. 56 (also in *PG*, 88:641–43), and Basil of Caesarea, "Long Rules," *Saint Basil, Ascetical Works* (New York, 1950), pp. 247–52 (also in *PG*, 31:927–34).

86. Compare *VMCh*, cols. 564, 575–80, 611; Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 482–92; Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 251–52, 274; Zhmakin, "Nil Polev," pp. 192–93; and also *Pandekty . . . Nikona Chernogortsa* (Spaso-Prilutskii pod Vologdoi, 1670), pp. 285–98.

emphasize those aspects of Christian scripture which justified the prelates' and the church's authority.⁸⁷ Furthermore, the tone of his apologies for having written his Rule and for establishing his governing *sobor* indicates how important and crucial the struggle over the Rule was for him and that his alleged monastic innovations became serious ecclesiastical-political issues.

Iosif's delicate political situation after 1511 explains the importance of his apologies within the Extended Rule. Following his triumphs in 1503 and 1504 at synods which decided in favor of the church's retention of all of its lands and the confinement or execution of the leading heretics, Iosif quarreled with his local territorial prince, Fedor, at least partly over material goods, and then willed his monastery to the Grand Prince Vasili III in 1507.⁸⁸ This meant that Vasili III legally had personal as well as sovereign power over the monastery and could appoint Iosif's successor.⁸⁹ Two years later Iosif's suffragan archbishop, Serapion of Novgorod, excommunicated Iosif, allegedly for having acted without his bishop's benediction, but the grand prince and Metropolitan Simon protected Iosif by deposing and imprisoning Serapion.⁹⁰ However, in 1511 Vasili III removed Simon, replaced him with Vassian Patrikeev's ally Varlaam, released Serapion from confinement, allowed Vassian to advise the government and to publish, and forbade Iosif directly to defend himself and to attack Vassian in writing.⁹¹ Under such circumstances, Iosif had reason to fear that not only his monastery and style of monasticism were in danger but also the victories of the landed church over both the heretics and the Nonpossessors.

One of Iosif's responses to these adverse circumstances was to append to his *Enlightener, or Book Against the Novgorod Heretics* a theory that Orthodox Christian empires which had prospered under quasi-divine tsars and their pious counselors and subordinates had fallen because of heresy or apostasy.⁹² According to such a doctrine, everyone should be on constant guard against potential heretics, including persons (such as Vassian, presumably)

87. *VMCh*, cols. 523, 563–65, 575–79; Matt. 5:13–14, 18:8, 15–18, 25:21; Luke 10:16; Rom. 13:1–2; 1 Cor. 5:6, 13; Col. 5:9; 1. Tim. 4:14, 5:20; Heb. 13:17; 1 Pet. 5:2–3; Jude 22–23.

88. Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 407–28.

89. *AI*, vol. 1, no. 288.

90. See the account of Zimin in Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 262–67, and *Rossia na poroge novogo vremeni*, pp. 100–109, 124–38.

91. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 56–61, and Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 468–69.

92. This is carefully analyzed in Szeftel, "Joseph Volotsky's Political Ideas" (see note 1 above). Compare Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 229–32, and *Prosvetitel'*, 1896 ed., pp. 318–43 (Discourses nos. 15–16), with Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 503–10. Iosif also included in his Extended *Enlightener* his position concerning the impotence of the anathema of a "heretic" bishop, as if to emphasize that obedience to metropolitans and archbishops (such as Varlaam and Serapion) is conditional upon their canonical behavior.

who were lenient toward heretics.⁹³ Iosif's other response to this reversal of fortune was to put together the Extended Rule in its final form, with the institution of the *sobor* and a deceptively clever defense of his Rule.

The apology for the Rule was allegedly evoked by an attack by an unnamed person who was "overweening, very boastful, stiff-necked, presumptuous, querulous, and censorious" and accused Iosif of breaking with Russian and canonic traditions by writing such a Rule, after the monastic traditions had been set down by the "Holy Fathers."⁹⁴ To defend his Rule, Iosif falsified patristic sources, mystified the concept of "tradition" (*predanie*), and gave a tendentious account of Russian monastic history.⁹⁵ Where the eleventh-century Greco-Syrian encyclopedist Nikon "of the Black Mountain" had written, "An abbot should teach with words," Iosif had that "father" say, "An abbot should teach with words and writings."⁹⁶ Where Chrysostom had interpreted Saint Matthew, "'Thou oughtest to have put my money to the exchangers,' that is to say you should have admonished and counseled," Iosif added, "with teachings and writings."⁹⁷ Iosif also confused "traditions" in a general sense with an abbot's specific "traditions," and he confused a specific elder's oral "traditions," which were simply his disciplinary emphasis, with detailed written statements of principles and lists of directions, such as the Extended Rule, with its many "traditions."⁹⁸

Iosif thus avoided the major stated issue at hand, which was the legitimacy of composing a Rule. This, however, was not the real bone of contention. Evfrosin of Pskov (d. 1479) and Innokentii Okhlebinin (d. 1491) left strict coenobitic Rules, the latter's based on Nil Sorsky's "traditions." Nil himself (d. 1508) left a regulatory written "Tradition" ("Predanie") for his small monastery and a detailed, didactic, theoretical "Ustav" or statute for the inner monastic life.⁹⁹ No Nonpossessor could honestly oppose a written Rule, which

93. For Vassian's somewhat less severe inquisitional program see Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 272–74.

94. *VMCh*, cols. 546–47. The source of Iosif's colorful introduction and characterization is Philippus Solitarius's *Dioptra* (the old Russian *Zertsalo*). See 'Ο 'Αθός, 'Αγορεύτικον περιοδικόν, vol. 1 (1920), pp. 224–25.

95. Iosif also wrote falsified histories of the Novgorod Heretics and of the "conspiracy" of Prince Fedor, Aleksei Pil'mev of the rival Vozmitsky Monastery in Volokolamsk, Archbishop Serapion, and his servitor Krivoborsky. On the first see Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaiia bor'ba*, pp. 95–127, and for the second see the hardly credible rendition in Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 220–22.

96. *VMCh*, cols. 547–48, and *Pandekty . . . Nikona Chernogortsa*, p. 63 ob.

97. *VMCh*, col. 548; Matt. 25:27; *PG*, 58:714.

98. For example, the "traditions" of Varsonofii of Tver-Savvin Monastery were prohibitions against "eating in secret," women, boys, and leaving without permission. Should this indicate that he allowed inebriation, inattentiveness to prayer, and idle chatter in the refectory? See *VMCh*, cols. 554–55.

99. Arkhangel'sky, *Nil Sorskii i Vassian Patrikeev*, "Prilozhenie," pp. 14–16; Borovkova-Maikova, *Nila Sorskago Predanie i Ustav*, pp. 1–91; and Lilienfeld, *Nil Sorskij*, pp. 195–256, 295–313.

was consistent with "Divine Scripture," yet Vassian Patrikeev is the most likely author of the attack on Iosif.¹⁰⁰ The real matter at issue was that Iosif had created a great monastery which was maneuvering for influence, if not political dominance, over the seigniorial church.¹⁰¹ That is why his Rule was threatening.

The purpose of his slanted monastic history necessarily was to show that his Rule was consistent with the traditions of Russia's great monastic figures and institutions. He attributed the presence of over thirty "wonder-workers" at Kievo-Pechersky Monastery to strict adherence to "coenobitic traditions," although the *Paterik Pecherskii*, a popular book in Old Russia, indicates that such fidelity lasted a generation at most, if at all.¹⁰² Similarly, Iosif rendered a series of conflicts within Kirillov-Belozersky Monastery in the fifteenth century as struggles over Kirill's "traditions," although contemporary documents reveal that one or two of the fights were over the Rostov archbishopric's claim to jurisdiction over the monastery.¹⁰³ In this manner Iosif wrote as if he were the spokesman for all of Russian monasticism and linked his Rule to some of the shining lights of Russian coenobitism (Feodosii of Pechersky, Sergii of Radonezh, Fedor of Simonov, Kirill of Belozero, Makarii of Kaliazin, Pafnutii of Borovsk, Sava of Savvin in Tver, and Chudov and Andronnikov Monasteries in Moscow), anchoritism (Antonii of Pechersky, Savva Vishersky, Varsonofii of Savvin, Evfrosin of Savvateev in Tver), the Moscow Metropolitanate (Aleksii, Fotii, and Iona), and even iconography (Andrei Rublev and Daniil Cherny).¹⁰⁴

Iosif's chief hagiographic theme is that the heroic and saintly elder

100. Lur'e's grounds for suspecting Vassian as the opponent were that in addition to his being Iosif's most vocal enemy Vassian definitely accused Iosif of introducing new principles to justify the persecution of heretics. See "Kratkaia redaktsiia," pp. 133–36; *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 452–54; and also Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev*, pp. 272–74, 277. Furthermore, the structure of this discourse (no. 10) does not require the postscript on the need to avoid avarice and attachment when attending to the monastery's material needs and affairs. See *VMCh*, cols. 560–63.

101. By the end of 1509 the Novgorod archbishopric was vacant, and Iosif's allies held at least the sees of Moscow, Sarai-Krutitsky (auxiliary to the Metropolitan of Moscow), Rostov-Iaroslavl, Tver, and Kolomna. At that time there were only three others in the Muscovite realm: Suzdal-Vladimir-Nizhny Novgorod, Vologda-Perm, and Riazan. See P. M. Stroevev, *Spiski ierarkhov i nastoiatelei monastyrei Rossiiskiiia tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1877), cols. 332, 441, 1030, 1034, et al.

102. *VMCh*, cols. 549–50; L. K. Goetz, *Das Kiever Höhlenkloster als Kulturzentrum des vormongolischen Russlands* (Passau, 1904), pp. 124–29.

103. L. V. Cherepnin, I. A. Golubtsov, S. V. Veselovsky, et al., eds., *Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV–nachala XVI v.*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1952–64), vol. 2, nos. 215, 311, 315; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 4:185–87, 23:153, 157–58; L. V. Cherepnin and S. V. Bakhrushin, eds., *Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i udel'nykh kniazei XIV–XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1950), no. 157, p. 162; and *VMCh*, cols. 550–52.

104. *VMCh*, cols. 549–59.

adamantly and selflessly follows the strictest monastic and fasting life and resolutely defends the founder's traditions against internal decay or outside corrupting influences. A specific group of such elders mentioned in the Rule was explicitly analogous to Iosif's *sobor*, which, according to my calculations, was introduced as an effective coruling body within the monastery only in 1514.¹⁰⁵ In a semilegal sense, the institution of the *sobor*, with its potential control over the successor abbot, was an attempted restrictive amendment by Iosif to his earlier testament of his monastery in 1507 to Vasilii III, who was then recognized as having the right to nominate the successor abbot.¹⁰⁶ Now a serious and potentially stubborn council of elders was to be placed between the abbot and the brothers as the coprotector of Iosif's overall legacy along with the sovereign. By means of this formal arrangement and his exhortations, Iosif was actually trying to employ the classical ethos or mystique of the monk as "witness" or "martyr" in defense of his own understanding of Muscovy's ritualistic traditions—which makes sense chiefly in light of Vassian Patrikeev's real influence in the Kremlin.¹⁰⁷

The appeal to the "martyr" ethos or mystique in the Extended Rule is consistent with Iosif's earlier actions. During his war against the heretics, he had presented to his colleagues the example of the "ancient confessors and martyrs."¹⁰⁸ He wanted the public to understand the campaign against heresy as if "monks and pious laymen" had engaged in heroic combat against powerful, diabolical forces.¹⁰⁹ Piety for him, moreover, was an all-or-nothing issue. Without correct belief, proper rituals, and unquestioning acceptance of traditions, there could be no truth, justice, brotherly love, love of the poor, chastity, or purity.¹¹⁰ Such uncompromising dogmatism explains the ultimately conditional nature of his support of royal power: heretical, impious, or even negligent tsars would necessarily bring down Muscovy. That is why Iosif instructed the powerful of the realm as if they were his monks: "Thus it is

105. During the crisis period of 1507 a large group of elders (nine to thirteen) represented the monastery along with Iosif for estate affairs. A similar situation prevailed in 1516 and 1517, right after the death of Iosif and the accession of Daniil. For spiritual affairs, however, the *sobor* did not take over, according to the monastery's scant records, until the last year of Iosif's life. See *AFZKh*, vol. 2, nos. 36, 37, 72, 77; Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 239–40; *AI*, vol. 1, no. 288; and Ieromonakh Iosif, *Opis' rukopisei pereznesennykh iz biblioteki Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (Moscow, 1882) (also in *ChOIDR*, 1881, vol. 3), nos. 20/39, 146/507.

106. *AI*, vol. 1, no. 288; *VMCh*, cols. 570–87, esp. col. 580.

107. According to one of Iosif's disciples, "Vassian really hated Iosif and wanted to raze his monastery." According to another, Iosif's "enemies" almost succeeded in a campaign to have all of his writings burned after his death. See Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, p. 369, and Toporkov, "Nadgrobnoe slovo," p. 135.

108. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 161–63, 173–75.

109. Kazakova and Lur'e, *AfED*, pp. 468–75.

110. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 158–69, 162–63, 173; *Prosvetitel'*, 3rd ed., p. 329.

proper for Orthodox tsars, princes, and civil judges, the high priest, all the bishops, and the priests, and all who have Christian wisdom, to display great zeal and effort concerning how the Lord may enlighten [us], grant wisdom, and instruct [us] how to test and indict the secret heretics and how to receive the repentance of those who when indicted repented unwillingly."¹¹¹

Iosif's overall legacy was complex. He was a confessor, practicing champion of the seigniorial coenobium, a politician, and one of the founding ideologists of the ritualistic or liturgical aspects of the Muscovite tsardom.¹¹² His defense of the "feudal" church was integral, because it was related to his entire way of life, which is most clearly reflected in his Extended Rule. This explains why the seventeenth-century copyist, who undoubtedly knew of the Extended Rule as the "Authentic and Detailed Last Will and Testament of the Reverend Abbot Iosif," referred to the Brief Rule merely as the "Old Monastery Book of Iosif Volotsky."¹¹³ The future revealed the paradoxes of his legacy. Tsar Aleksii and *protopop* Avvakum could each claim a share, and so could even Patriarch Nikon, clearly a "combatant for the privileges of the feudal church," but who in the tradition of Archbishop Serapion called the coenobiarch-politician Iosif "that informer!"¹¹⁴ This, however, is altogether another story. Indeed, the fate of Iosif's legacy, so entangled in subsequent Muscovite developments, deserves a special study of the sources which makes use of the disciplines of theology and the sociology of religion, as well as Marxist sociohistorical approaches and a precise understanding of political theories.

111. Iosif was no trained scholastic in the Western medieval sense, but he did believe syllogistically in "necessary causes which result in the salvation of souls" (*viny muzhnye s'kliuchaiushchie k spaseniiu dusham*). These "causes" are both the acts which make up "good order" and "good reverence" and also the absence of vices and transgressions of rules. See *VMCh*, cols. 501–2, 544–46, 570. *Viny muzhnye* is found throughout Nikon's works, but not the *s'kliuchaiushchie k spaseniiu dusham*.

112. Florovsky, *Puti*, p. 18.

113. See above, notes 4 and 7.

114. Lur'e and Zimin, *Poslaniia*, pp. 97, 99, 381; Špidlík, *Joseph de Volokolamsk*, p. 144.