

THE RULE OF ST BENEDICT.

III

THE INSTRUMENTS OF GOOD WORKS.

THE fourth chapter of St Benedict's Rule is a list of 72 (73) moral and spiritual precepts or aphorisms which he calls 'Instrumenta bonorum operum'. The question of possible sources for this collection has long exercised, and still exercises, those interested in the literary history of the Rule. It was recently proclaimed that the source has been discovered in the *Didache*. This theory I examined in a Note in these pages in January 1910 (xi 283); I shewed that it cannot be admitted, and that there is no reason for supposing St Benedict was acquainted with the *Didache* in any of its forms. It has since been pointed out to me that Dom Leclercq maintains that St Benedict's fourth chapter does depend on the *Didache*, not directly indeed, but mediately, through a document which (so he considers) contains a series of monastic canons drawn up at the Council of Alexandria in 362.¹ This document exists in three closely allied forms:—(1) the Greek ps.-Athanasian 'Synagma Doctrinae ad Monachos' (inter Athan. Op., Migne *P. G.* 28, 835); (2) another Greek redaction entitled 'The Faith of the Holy 318 Fathers at Nicaea' (Migne *P. G.* 28, 1637); (3) a Coptic redaction, allied to (2), published, with translation, by M. Revillout in *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textes coptes* ii 474.

(3) stands in what claims to be a Coptic version of the Acts of the Council held at Alexandria in 362 under St Athanasius, and Revillout accepts the attribution. Leclercq also accepts it in the aforesaid article; but in his Notes to the Farnborough edition of Hefele's *Councils*, he makes no use of all the important fresh material thus supplied, though he does refer to Revillout and to his own article. In this silence he is probably well advised; for nothing can be more precarious than the redactions of Councils found only in Coptic or other Oriental sources.

In the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*, however, Leclercq sees in this Coptic document a code of monastic legislation issuing from the Council of 362, and presenting 'l'intérêt le plus vif. On y trouve un nombre considérable de textes qui sont passés mot pour mot dans les règles occidentales et dans la plus célèbre de toutes, celle de S. Benoît'

¹ *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, art. 'Alexandrie: Archéologie IV' (col. 1163-1166).

(col. 1164). This is the point I wish to investigate, in view of the collection of sources of St Benedict's Rule I am making for the edition that I have in preparation. It has been recognized since the fact was pointed out by Mr Rendel Harris in 1885, that the *Syntagma* is in great measure derived from the *Didache*. Leclercq prints in four parallel columns passages from the opening of the *Didache*, of the *Syntagma* both in its Greek and Coptic forms, and of c. iv of St Benedict's Rule; and certainly, as presented by him, the resemblances are so striking as to seem quite convincing. But an examination of the documents themselves reveals the fact that they have been subjected to a process of selection and of pruning that distorts the actual facts.

There is no need to reproduce the piece from the *Didache*; nor the double form of the *Syntagma*, because Mgr Batiffol, the scholar who has investigated the subject, shews that the three extant forms go back to a primitive form x^1 ; and in the portion under consideration it is possible to reconstruct Batiffol's x with certainty. Accordingly I print the beginning of the relevant portion of the *Syntagma* and of St Benedict's fourth chapter. It is to be understood that both texts are given in their entirety:—by omitting from the Coptic form (the one with which he directly confronts St Benedict's text) the clauses marked with a †, Leclercq unduly enhances the similarity.

Syntagma.

Πρῶτον, κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἀγαπή-
σεις ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ
ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου,
καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

οὐ φονεύσεις
οὐ μοιχεύσεις
† οὐ πορνεύσεις
† οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις
† οὐ φαρμακεύσεις
οὐ κλέψεις

οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις
† οὐ μαγεύσεις
† οὐ διχοστατήσεις
† Ἀπέχου πνικτοῦ καὶ εἰδωλοθύτου
καὶ αἵματος

Instrumenta.

In primis, Dominum Deum dili-
gere ex toto corde, tota anima,
tota virtute :
deinde proximum tamquam seip-
sum

Deinde non occidere
non adulterari

non facere furtum
† non concupiscere
non falsum testimonium dicere

honorare omnes homines

¹ *Studia Patristica* Fasc. 2, 1890.

It seems strange that it should be supposed that the *Syntagma* could have been St Benedict's source in this place ; as a matter of fact his sources are perfectly obvious : they were, for the Two Great Commandments, Mark xii 30, 31 ; for the rest, the Decalogue as found in Exod. xx or Deut. v, or perhaps more probably the summaries in Lk. xviii (Matth. xix) and Rom. xiii. The truth of this is evident at a glance.

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Exod. xx 13-17 (Deut. v 17-21) | Lk. xviii 20 (Matth. xix 18) | Rom. xiii 9 |
| non occides | non occides | non adulterabis |
| non moechaberis | non moechaberis (non adulterabis) | non occides |
| non furtum facies | non furtum facies | non furaberis |
| non loqueris contra proximum tuum fal- sum testimonium | non falsum testimo- nium dices | non falsum testimo- nium dices |
| non concupisces do- mum (uxorem) pro- ximi tui | | non concupisces |
| | honora patrem tuum et matrem | |

There is no room for the surmise that St Benedict omitted οὐ παιδο-
φθορήσεις 'par délicatesse'; nor is any countenance given to the idea
that he knew Greek, for which there is no evidence that I know of.

Dom Leclercq gives some further instances of parallelisms between
the *Syntagma* and St Benedict's Instruments, again using the Coptic
document as the standard of comparison. In the following Table the
numbers prefixed to each of the Instruments is the place it occupies in
St Benedict's list. It will appear that whether we consider order or
matter, the notion that the *Syntagma* was St Benedict's source cannot
be maintained.

Φυλάττεσθαι μὴ εἶναι

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| δύλογον (Copt. parole mauvaise) | 54. Verba vana aut risui apta non loqui |
| μὴ δέγνωμον | 28. Veritatem ex corde et ore proferre |
| μὴ ψεύστην | 52. Os suum a malo vel pravo eloquio custodire |
| μὴ κατάλαλον | 40. Non (esse) detractorem |

* μὴ ἀκαιροπεριπάτητος αἰ ἀκαιρο-
περίσπαστον

*(Copt. translates two of these
members :

ne point marcher avec effron- 34. Non esse superbum
terie
ni d'un air évaporé)

34. Non esse superbum

67. Elationem fugere

μὴ ἀναίσχυντον

* μὴ ῥέμβον

* μὴ ἀναίσθητον

μὴ αὐθάδη

μὴ σαπρὸν λόγον ἐκ χειλέων προ-
φέροντα

(Copt. inserts: ne maudissez
jamais de votre bouche)

32. Maledicentes se non remale-
dicere, sed magis benedicere

μήτε ὄρκον ὄλως τὸ παράπαν

27. Non iurare, ne forte periuret

Dom Leclercq proceeds to give parallelisms to various passages in other chapters of the Rule. It must be conceded that in some of these he is happier; especially is there a resemblance in the regulations concerning the use of baths:—

Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ νόσῳ ἀναγκασθῆς, λουτρῶ
χρῆσαι ἕως ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς· ὑγιαίνων
δὲ βαλανείου οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχεις.

Balneorum usus infirmis, quoties
expedit, offeratur. Sanis autem
et maxime iuvenibus tardius
concedatur (c. xxxvi).

But I do not think that it affords warrant for the supposition that St Benedict knew the *Syntagma* in any of its shapes. In another place (*Rev. Bén.*, 1901, p. 77) Leclercq points out resemblances even more striking between St Benedict's chapter on the Cellarer and the corresponding chapter of a Coptic rule, perhaps that of Schenute; but it is altogether incredible that St Benedict had any knowledge, direct or indirect, of this rule which exists only in Coptic. It is a useful reminder that such resemblances may indicate nothing more than similarity in the ground ideas of different monastic legislators.

It seems ungenerous thus to pursue on a single point a worker so indefatigable and of such astounding knowledge and such prodigious productiveness as Dom Leclercq. But any subject to which nearly four columns of the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie* are given up must be worth probing, especially as the intention is announced of treating the subject more fully in a future article. And the question of St Benedict's sources is just now one of practical concern to me.

And so I take the opportunity of dealing with the general question of the sources of this chapter of the Rule: 'Quae sunt Instrumenta

bonorum operum.' There seems to be a widespread consensus of opinion that St Benedict probably did not himself form the list of Instruments, but incorporated some earlier code of moral precepts. In former times it used to be supposed that this source was the spurious Epistle of Clement to James, prefixed to the False Decretals of Isidore Mercator, towards the end of which are found the Instruments in a different order (Migne *P. L.* 130, 35). The first portion of this letter was translated by Rufinus, but the latter portion was made up by Isidore from various sources, as has been held from Mabillon to Hinschius, the latest editor of the Decretals. Dom Edmund Schmidt has put in a plea for the old view¹; he urges that the Letter cannot have been composed by Isidore, as no forger would have put at the head of his collection a piece taken from a work so widely circulated and so well known as was St Benedict's Rule at that date. He admits that even if this argument be valid, it need not follow that the Letter in its present shape is as old as St Benedict's time—indeed it contains passages taken from writers of a later date. The point he raises, however, is sufficiently met by the fact that this chapter had a wide circulation as a separate piece. Agimund's 'Magnum Instrumentum', spoken of in the previous Note (*J. T. S.* xi 286), is one such instance; Dr Plenkers gives a list of a dozen MSS wherein the 'Instrumenta' are found thus separated from the Rule.² They were incorporated by Pirminius in his *Scarapsus* (Migne *P. L.* 89, 1047), by Theodulph of Orleans in his Capitulary (*P. L.* 105, 197), and elsewhere. So that there is no need to suppose that Isidore took them directly from St Benedict's Rule.

To come to recent views: in a highly interesting review of Wölfflin's edition of the Rule,³ Dr Weyman cited sayings from Greek gnostic collections that resemble certain of St Benedict's Instruments (see below); and he expressed the view that the whole chapter was in large measure derived from some such source. Traube pronounced Weyman's presentation of the case to be convincing,⁴ and Plenkers⁵ and Wilmart⁶ hold it to be very probable.

But it remains a fact that up to the present no such source has been produced. The Greek collections cited by Weyman afford parallels only to a couple of the Instruments; the *Doctrina Hosii* (Pitra *Analecta Sacra* v p. 117), to which Weyman refers, affords no parallel at all; nor does the *Doctrina Severini* (*P. L.* 74, 845); nor do two collections of monastic aphorisms recently published by Dom Wilmart in the *Revue*

¹ *Studien und Mittheilungen*, 1883, ii 16.

² *Zeitschrift für die österr. Gymnasien*, 1902, Heft ii.

³ *Wochenschrift für klass. Philologie*, 1896, p. 209.

⁴ *Textgeschichte der Regula S. B.* 705.

⁵ *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Rev. Bén.*, 1910, p. 232.

Benedictine—the *Monita Porcarii* (Oct. 1909) and an old translation of St Basil's *Admonitio ad Monachos* (Apr. 1910): these, I believe, are the only known collections of the kind prior to St Benedict. In two Latin Rules known to St Benedict are found a string of moral precepts: viz. in § 149 of the translation of the *Regula Pachonii*, and in §§ 1-9 of the *Regula Macarii* (Holsten *Codex Regularum*). But St Benedict has borrowed nothing from them. And I have shewn in these pages that the *Didache* was not a source, either itself or through the *Syntagma*.

It was pointed out to me that in No. xxiv of the 'Sermones S. Ambrosio hactenus ascripti', among the Spuria of S. Ambrose (*P. L.* 17, 651 or 673), there stands in § 11 a passage containing several of the Instrumenta. The opening of the Sermon is identical with one of those now attributed to Caesarius of Arles, and the Benedictine editor tentatively suggests that this Sermon of ps.-Ambrose may be by Caesarius. Were this the case we should at last have obtained definite reason for believing in the existence of the Instrumenta before St Benedict. But Dom Morin, who has made the Caesarian literature his special study, has kindly given me evidence abundantly justifying his verdict, that the Sermon is 'un centon d'époque relativement basse'.

The following are the only cases, apart from biblical texts, in which I have up to the present found passages that can with any show of reason be regarded as the source of any of the Instruments:—

| <i>Instrument.</i> | <i>Source.</i> |
|--|---|
| 21. Nihilamori Christi praeponere. | Nihil amori Christi anteponeendum (<i>Vita S. Antonii</i> , versio antiqua, 13, al. 14). |
| (This suggests also Cyprian <i>De dom. orat.</i> 15: Christo nihil omnino praeponere; but this latter is reproduced by St Benedict in c. lxxii.) | |
| 30. Iniuriam non facere, sed et factas patienter sufferre. | Iniuriam facere non nosse, factam posse tolerare (Cyprian <i>De dom. orat.</i> 15; but without doubt St B. derived this from the <i>Regula Macarii</i> 21). |
| 42, 43. Bonum aliquod in se cum viderit, Deo adplicet, non sibi. Malum vero semper a se factum sciat, et sibi reputet. | Πάντων ὧν πράττομεν ἀγαθὸν τὸν θεὸν αἴτιον ἡγώμεθα· τῶν δὲ κακῶν αἴτιοι ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ ἐλόμενοι. (Porphyrius <i>Ad Marcell.</i> xii p. 282: cited by Weyman.) Quidquid boni habet, illi retribuatur, a quo factus est: quidquid mali habet, ipse sibi fecit (Augustin. <i>Serm.</i> xcvi 2). |

47. Mortem quotidie ante oculos suspectam habere. Omni hora ponat sibi (monachus) mortem ante oculos suos (*Verba Seniorum*, apud Rosweyd *Vitae Patrum* iii 196).
- 50, 51. Cogitationes malas cordi suo advenientes mox ad Christum adlidere, et seniori spiritali patefacere. Nullas penitus cogitationes prurientes in corde perniciose confusione celare, sed confestim ut exortae fuerint, eas suo patefacere seniori (Cassian. *Inst.* iv 9).

(The idea 'ad Christum adlidere' is the traditional exegesis of Psalm. cxxxvi 9; e. g. Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine.)

- 68, 69. Seniores venerari; iuniores diligere. Πρεσβύτερον αἰδοῦ· νεώτερον δίδασκε. Early Latin version: Maiorem vereri, minorem emendare *al* regere. (Sosiades in Stobaeus *Florileg.* III i 173, cited by Weyman.)

Weyman proposes *dirigere* as an obvious emendation in the text of the Regula, and the proposal has found favour in some quarters. Traube, however, while accepting the view that St Benedict derived his Instruments in this place from the alleged parallel, holds that in his immediate source he must have found *diligere*: in this Traube is surely right, for in c. lxiii we find 'iuniores priores suos honorent, priores minores suos diligent,' and in neither place is there any variant for *diligere* in the MS tradition of the text.

To sum up: there is as yet no evidence to give countenance to the suspicion that St Benedict incorporated an earlier document in his chapter iv; and I know of no reason that should cause us to hesitate in believing that he compiled the list of Instruments of Good Works himself.

One point more: Dom Morin has directed my attention to the fact that Martin of Braga seems to have known the 42nd Instrument, cited above; for he says of humility 'quae totum quod boni est obtinet, Deo hoc semper applicando, non sibi.' The Opuscle in which these words occur was written between 570 and 580.¹ A decade earlier we find in the Regula of Ferreolus,² bishop of Uzès (Dep. Gard), clear signs of an acquaintance with St Benedict's Rule.³ So far as I know this is the

¹ Migne *P. L.* 72, 42; cf. Bardenhewer *Patrology*.

² Holsten *Codex Regularum* (*P. L.* 66, 959).

³ Here I find myself in disagreement with Dom Besse (*Moines de l'ancienne France* p. 57). The points on which I rely are as follows:—

(1) F. 6: Monachum omnino sive clericum alterius loci vel monasterii recipi sub qualibet causa nolumus, interdicimus, prohibemus: prospicientes talia studio

earliest evidence we possess of a literary use of St Benedict's Rule.¹ The probable date of the composition of the Rule lies between 520 and 540; it is interesting to find that by 560 and 570 copies had penetrated to southern Gaul and north-western Spain. But it is not until a considerably later date that there is evidence of its being in use in either country as the rule of life of any monastery.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

A SIDE-LIGHT ON THE METHODS OF TATIAN.

IN St Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron (Moesinger, pp. 140-147) the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman (Jn. iv) is followed by the cleansing of the leper in Galilee (Mt. viii 2-4; Mk. i 40-45; Lk. v 12-16). Then comes the healing of the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem (Jn. v). This order is also found

caritatis, ne novum aliquod forte scandalum surgentes inducant. Dicit enim Scriptura: *Quicquid tibi non vis, alii non feceris.*

Cf. B. 61: Caveat abbas ne aliquando iam de alio noto monasterio monachum ad habitandum suscipiat sine consensu abbatis eius aut literis commendatitiis; quia scriptum est: *Quod tibi non vis fieri, alio non feceris.*

On this text see Note in *J. T. S.*, Jan. 1910, p. 283; the significant point here is its use in the two Rules in illustration of the same context.

(2) F. 37, of the abbot: *faciens se ab omnibus, eo quod vitia oderit, plus amari.*

This seems to be made up of the two pieces of advice which St Benedict gives to the abbot in c. 64 'Oderit vitia, diligat fratres'; and 'studeat plus amari quam timeri';—which are themselves taken verbally from different places in St Augustine.

(3) In the chapter on silence (F. 29) the same two texts are used as by St Benedict in the Ninth Degree of Humility.

The Rule of Ferreolus is fundamentally one of the Lerins series, being based on those of Caesarius and Aurelian; but it is considerably enlarged, and the above points of contact with St Benedict were introduced by him. I think they prove that he knew St Benedict's Rule.

¹ Here again I have to differ from Dom Besse, and even from Mabillon (*op. cit.* p. 56): I see nothing in the Rule of Aurelian c. 550 (*Cod. Regularum*) that suggests an acquaintance with that of St Benedict. On the other hand (once more against Besse, p. 55), I believe that St Benedict knew, and in places used, the Rules of Caesarius; but any discussion must stand over till my edition of the *Regula*, with the Sources, is published.

Dom Chapman has directed my attention to c. xxvii of the *Vita Fulgentii Ruspensis* (*P. L.* 65, 143), written, perhaps by Ferrandus the Deacon, at any rate within a few years of Fulgentius's death, 533. He raises the question whether certain turns of expression in this passage, describing St Fulgentius as abbot of his monastery, do not bespeak an acquaintance with St Benedict's Rule. The words 'ut neminem puro nomine clamitaret' do recall St Benedict's 'puro appellare nomine' (c. 63); but they hardly justify any definite conclusion. The other resemblances are vague and doubtful.