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The career of Shenoute of Atripe (d. 465), one-time leader of Upper Egypt’s White Monastery, is notable in part for the abbot’s corpus of occasional sermons that were delivered during the course of a long monastic career. While the texts are valuable for the many historical anecdotes related to the centrality of the monastery community to the town of Atripe and the Panopolitan region at large, they also reveal Shenoute’s preoccupation with the practices and doctrinal inclinations of both his subjects and individuals outside of his immediate authority. In contrast to much of the extant volumes of Canons written by him, this paper will discuss selections from Discourses 7 and 8 that contain striking portrayals of Shenoute’s self-assigned role within the Egyptian clerical hierarchy, his rhetorical promotion of wide ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the promotion of specific guidelines of Shenoutian orthopraxy, and derision against irregularities in Christian pedagogy, clerical marriage, and ascetic discipline.

Shenoute of Atripe’s (d. 465) literary corpus provides many challenges on both the codicological and interpretative fronts. This is certainly true of the section of the corpus known as the Canons, discussed in some detail by other contributors to this volume, and manuscripts of which have steadily appeared in published editions. The Canons will remain a subject of analysis and debate into the foreseeable future. My concern, however, with Shenoute’s writings lies elsewhere, primarily in the abbot’s Discourses. They are texts (found in eight volumes now partially extant), mainly in the form of homilies or public addresses, and at times expository pieces, that illustrate interesting and multi-varied preoccupations on the part of Shenoute. While the Canons more often than not were intended to be read and adhered to as guidelines or rules for the male and female monks of Shenoute’s three communities, the Discourses in the main address issues external to the White Monastery. I Am Amazed, a lengthy work appearing in the seventh volume of the Discourses and which I have discussed elsewhere, provides a literary mosaic of heretical groups, heretical practices, and examples of deviation from orthodox scriptural interpretation.
De Iudicio⁶ and The Lord Thundered⁶ are examples of works which focus on other matters, including Jews and pagans. Another sermon that illustrates the complex fixations of our abbot is entitled I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels,⁷ a work of some length as well, containing a fascinating investigation of Christian groups and their deviant practice around the White Monastery, to which I now turn.

That Shenoute delivered this particular sermon with the intent of discussing a number of issues, ranging from spiritual admonitions to graphic characterizations of irregular Christian practice, was not in itself an anomaly. As I have mentioned, there is ample evidence of his interest in heresy and its suppression in a number of other works, including for instance We Will Speak in the Fear of God (Discourses 8, Work 23),⁸ a striking discussion of Melitians.⁹ What I intend to discuss here is the specific objections Shenoute voiced against certain deviant practices by individuals near his community, and the peculiar determination to do so immediately in two concurrent contexts – the aftermath of a momentous period in the history of the Christian East and the presence of a distinguished audience.

At the beginning of the sermon Shenoute does not state his motives explicitly. His language does become increasingly pointed over the course of his discourse,¹⁰ and his efficient use of rhetorical observations and argumentation, often painted against a background of scriptural allusions and imagery, may have been especially effective when heard by an informed audience such as the one he had that day. But the text deals with motifs and themes that lay heavy on the minds of his audience, and Shenoute addresses them in a deliberate manner. Problems which I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels focuses on include the final judgment,¹¹ contempt for sin persisting among monks,¹² pagan practices among Christians,¹³ illicit marriages for priests or ascetic virgins,¹⁴ and communal striving for spiritual growth.¹⁵ As a whole, the text presents a collective discussion of his views on the integrity of his own monastic institution in the face of diversity and dissent, instances of which quite likely were known to his listeners.

The dramatic opening of I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels is well-known, especially since it is a first-hand source of the chronology of Shenoute’s life.¹⁶ From it we know the elderly abbot was an octogenarian by the time he delivered this sermon in 431/432 CE, had been the leader of the White Monastery for over 45 years, and that he had just returned from the city of Ephesus, where in some capacity he accompanied Cyril of Alexandria during their time there to attend the ecumenical council. Though Shenoute does mention his important trip to Ephesus, he chooses not to discuss its results or what events he may have witnessed during his stay (or at any rate not explicitly).¹⁷ Most evidence indicates that he did not preach very often.¹⁸ His return, then, was a grand enough occasion to prompt him to speak before a large and expectedly excited gathering waiting to hear the abbot’s personal recollections and report of an historic event. Shenoute does not fulfill their likely expectations, however, but takes the opportunity to present his own polemic against Christian individuals whose behavior is entirely unacceptable to the church.
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He embarks on a meditation on Mt 25:31-32, a short passage that would remain the basis for his thoughts throughout the treatise. It is worth noting here:

“When the Son of Man comes” – Son of Man according to divine dispensation, God and Son of God according to divinity – “then He will sit on the throne of His glory, and all the nations will be assembled by His angels. They will be gathered before Him, and He will separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats.” It is this saying which I have been investigating and concerning which I have been inquiring.  

Shenoute continues by asserting the impossibility of those whose character is malicious (that is, wolves) to mix with sheep. Both species may have been in the same sheepfold, even grazing in the same fields and drinking from the same troughs. But referring to deeds his community and others committed (and which he would discuss later), the two groups do not mix and are to be divided according to their works. Let the sheep attain their righteous rewards and may calamity befall the merciless. He concludes:

Was it not the case that through the parable of the Lord the wise already understood that it is to separate the merciless from the merciful, the defiled from the pure, the adulterers from the good, and the godless unbelievers from the faithful men of God that He comes? So then, after the separation, will not each one (of us) cry out, weeping, with no one to hear him, when we observe those who have completed their life, pleasing God and shining through their good works?

Shenoute’s call for doctrinal correctness and uprightness in practice echoed in many of his works. His demand to do so was based in part on paying strict allegiance to the hierarchy of the church. He utilized his views on the church’s hierarchy, and especially his pronounced loyalty to its leaders, to buttress his own authority and leadership, to ratify avenues of biblical interpretation and doctrinal promulgation that he would utilize in this sermon, and to garner further support for the Alexandrians he so zealously followed. His views would have been known to an audience of local clerics, and at times he singled them out. On several occasions it is clear that Shenoute was addressing an audience of clerics – priests, monks, and possibly bishops. The speaker leaves little doubt that respect for a defined and rigid hierarchy is the basis and source of orthodox doctrinal teaching. But at a later point in the treatise Shenoute also becomes occupied with irregular practice among some of these very clerics or their associates – unmarried priests and ascetics who abandoned their vows for marriage.

In Egyptian ascetic circles marriage was not consistently condemned or deemed unsuitable. In fact, Shenoute himself saw value in its spiritual benefit for some, seeing it as divinely granted to those “who are suited for it without shame.” But he denies this possibility to those who “brought shame upon themselves and clothed themselves with utter contempt, and took a wife or husband.” Judgment no longer is placed upon them for “they have judged themselves.” He extends this argument to a priest who compromises his own ordination by having accepted it without marrying first.
Priests’ ordinations may not have been invalidated in practice since they appear to still be active in their ministry. Rather, Shenoute’s emphasis lies in the idea that marriage must precede ordination because vows essentially change one’s inner and outer condition. In his view, a real marriage is accursed if it came to pass after a vow had previously been taken by the man: “So also a priest who has no wife, what will he do now that hands have been laid on him? Know, O priests, that we judge ourselves alone.” Shenoute is adamant that clerics are more accountable for their actions as a result of their prior commitment to a particular religious life and especially due to their position as leaders. By quoting a familiar Pauline argument (Rom 2:1) on divine judgment, he places the blame on his subjects for failing to uphold their duty and life-long commitment. His rhetorical pursuit of the “truth,” as he puts it, may even indicate that his views were opposed by members of those present.

Shenoute’s admonitions about irregular marriages in the text are among several criticisms of ascetic practice with which he dealt in the vicinity of the White Monastery. In this particular case, he argued against these marriages using an unknown Athanasian work on virginity which effectively addresses the matter. He states:

Who will be able to say that this is not the truth, except he who fights against the truth? If there is one who does not accept these remarks, let him not dare reject fearlessly the words of the richest of men in Christ, the archbishop Abba Athanasius...He said, “For the virgin who falls away, it is not to marriage that she is brought down. Rather, it is to the ultimate or worst rank that she is brought. For, having been exalted above what is good and leapt upward to what is perfect, then being found, God forbid, going down to worse evils, and thinking that it is good to have taken a husband, she is found last. For the fall from virginity is not a marriage. Even though it is a marriage, it is altogether fraudulent, shameful, and regressive from what is good. And it is in shame that her life will exist, for she was taken from the community, she who had strength to complete her life with boldness and would have received great honor.”

In addition to utilizing the weight of an Athanasian work to present his argument, Shenoute appeals to scriptural authority here to further prove his point. His citing of Lev 21:9 (the fornication of priests’ daughters) is particularly poignant for a clerical audience, and further demonstrates Shenoute’s tendency to use scripture and patristic sources to stress a critical point to his monks.

Transgressions against ascetic vows appear to have become somewhat commonplace near or within Shenoute’s community. Their occurrence prompts him to address the perpetrators at several points during his sermon. Early on he counts those who perform “acts of fornication, and those contrary to nature and other wicked deeds” along with idolaters. He further condemns them in other parts of the text, attempting to convince his listeners of God’s impending judgement. It is one thing if the speaker rejects such acts, but completely another.
when “holy prophets reveal their contempt, likening them to menstrual rags and a menstruating woman. For those who undertake such pollution of this sort are worse than the shamelessness of a whore.” But Shenoute does not stop here. Again he validates his views by further graphic characterizations, likening individual’s hedonistic character not only to whores, but also to the flesh of asses and horses. It is their perseverance in sensuality that has become their peril. Upon their entry into Gehenna, they along with those who follow them will hear: “Depart from me, O you who are cursed, to the eternal fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels” (Mt 25:41).

In *I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels*, the abominable acts of certain Christian leaders were condemned, causing them to no longer be able to seek rest in prayer or meditation, and Shenoute invokes additional scriptural commands to measure their conduct. He asks, “If I say that the scripture sets the measure for the purity of the body, about what it can and cannot do, what further will we say concerning wickedness?” He continues, “Why did we not understand that it is something important for us to keep our body holy since it was said of the one who is unable to keep (this rule), ‘Let him marry?’ (1 Cor 7:9).” Shenoute’s conclusions may be predictable, but resonant with an attentive audience such as the one he had that day. He finally asks the transgressors “not to emulate those who are wicked or those who commit lawless acts. ‘For they will soon fade like the grass, and wither like the green herb’ (Ps 36:2 [LXX]).” He holds that their end is nothing but destruction (Phil 3:19), but “blessed are those who await the Lord and keep his way (cf. Acts 18:25), for it is they whom He will exalt to inherit the earth (cf. Mt 5:5; Ps 36:34).”

His skill in presenting scripture as fact and ultimate authority, “warnings of this sort” as he refers to them at one point, was enhanced by his use of the prophetic books, and especially Ezekiel. The placement of his teachings within the tradition of Old Testament warnings and condemnations of lapses by one-time believers, and especially his veiled claim to foresight and future peril of disobedient Christians, adds to what we already know of the abbot’s prophetic aura. To place himself in Ezekiel’s position, and align Christian enemies with such evil figures as Elam, Assur, Mosoch, Thobel, and others “in the place in which there is weeping and gnashing of teeth, in the darkness and the pits of Amente,” is illustrative of his vision as a quasi-prophetic teacher of authority.

Shenoute’s discussion of deviations from regular ascetic routines provided an opportunity for him also to pursue positive and reinforcing themes. I cite two here – the spiritual unity of his own community in the face of such external plurality in Christian discipline, and his own position as teacher standing before such dignitaries. Towards the former objective Shenoute used three illustrations of co-operative spiritual striving to emphasize the mutual benefit of a common goal among a community of monks. If individuals struggle onwards, each according to his own measure, they as a group will not be divided from other greater saints who have already completed their lives.
In the first parable Shenoute relates the story of a man and his sons, hired as fruit pickers, who chose not to compete in the amount of product they produced, but rather relied on each other’s strength and combined what they had gathered, thus earning their reward as one. Both their hearts and their hands were united, relying on each other’s capacities while respecting their weaknesses. In another story, inhabitants of a certain town gathered for a local wedding. Again, they all participated in the preparations for the celebration, each one according to his ability – those occupied with the sheep, those occupied with the goat(s), and those who availed themselves in that which they had and that which they were able to prepare – they joined each other [at the wedding] as though [they were] one people. Shenoute’s fostering of unity was also portrayed in a third and final parable of spiritual ascent. In this example, men are required to climb up ladders, though each one climbs at his own pace – some three rungs at a time, some two, and another just one. Then there is the slowest among them, one who “raises one foot upon a rung and draws his other foot to its place, or perhaps even struggles to climb.” Shenoute then poses the question, “Do they not deserve to be praised?” His answer is predictable. Each man took risks until he was able to ascend, and thus will be rewarded for having exerted such effort without allowing their own weaknesses or inability to hinder them. Each will receive mercy as compensation for their efforts.

In these three and other illustrations in *I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels* the theme of unity of purpose is prevalent. While any number of workers may utilize different methods towards achieving the same goal, the goal itself is noble, and more importantly their methods do not hinder one another. Shenoute’s approach is in fact refreshing. In a context of spiritual athletes, as the Egyptian desert certainly was, it was easy to conclude that some monks simply could not compete. Shenoute maintains that this is the wrong approach to understanding the message of the Gospels. Each one is in fact measured according to his own ability, each can work within a group towards fulfillment for himself and the community as a whole, and each will receive his just reward. While the interior life is a major concern in many monastic works in late antique Egypt, Shenoute’s main interest lies in the welfare of the community as a whole, despite its individual strengths and weaknesses, and its willingness to remain upright relative to other Christian practice in the region of the White Monastery. The abbot thus provides a radical revision of an elitism that is otherwise often encountered in Egyptian monastic circles.

What is also essential to this idea of unity is Shenoute’s role within his community. Any willingness to leave the community, or to criticize it as an outsider is absent in this and other homilies. Contrary to recent conclusions, the primary evidence clearly indicates that Shenoute does not place a boundary between his own purity as a leader, and the righteousness of the White Monastery’s inhabitants. Our text is but one example of Shenoute’s desire to designate himself as one edifying monk among many:
I confess to you that I speak the truth when I say that it did not enter my heart at all that I am teaching or that I am scolding those who are listening to a word from me. Rather, I am speaking to those in front of me about the salvation of us all.\(^{37}\)

Shenoute returns to the importance of scripture when addressing and correcting improper behavior. He asserts that scripture gives authority to the tongue of the teacher, and Shenoute is one such teacher.\(^{38}\) His argument also assumes some contention regarding who can or cannot teach. The question of who can teach correctly was addressed in several sermons, including *I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels*. Thus the emphatic statement, “It is the Lord, who is over the whole earth, who will give the instructing tongue to the upright teacher, and the ear to him who listens correctly”\(^{39}\) is a clear indication of the command that Shenoute wields, but also the duty he sees in his leadership. His frankness with an audience that is being told what to do and what to say may have been a heavy-handed tactic, but it was a necessity: “If I have other things or words and I did not say them, I will owe you a debt. But if I did not hide what is clear to me, not speaking of it, then you are in debt to me!”\(^{40}\) The obvious result of such a claim is Shenoute’s self-placement among a select group of ecclesiastical authorities who had the privilege to expound on scripture and set limits on Christian practice. In fact, he places himself squarely among the privileged episcopal and clerical dignitaries who visited him that day.

A number of works from Shenoute’s Discourses, including *I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels*, serve as windows into the abbot’s world, and especially his weight and involvement in the Egyptian church’s affairs. These texts have certainly illuminated for us a few of his views on the desired limits of Christian practice and orthodoxy in his region. Shenoute’s use of a patristic source, the wide breadth of scriptural knowledge he displayed, as well as his pointed concern with irregular ascetic and liturgical practice, all underlie his main achievement as a Christian leader of the Panopolitan region in the mid-fifth century. The promulgation and maintenance of a Christian tradition wholly loyal to Alexandrian authority and doctrinal policy, and the teachings he brought forth, were germane in his view to the life of the monastery and the local church. Unity, loyalty, and above all, a concern with one’s salvation as achieved through his prescribed approach were the flagship issues in this particular text. *I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels* is but one important example of Shenoute’s active rhetoric in combating deviant behavior. His attempts at constructing a theological and practical framework for his monastery was a mandatory by-product of the White Monastery’s diverse Christian environment.
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