

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

or even look upon the Holy Eucharist in the ordinary way with the rest of the initiated was necessarily denied her. Like the Canaanitish woman she may have bethought herself that the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table.

In any case—and that is the only point for which I am contending—this story of the miraculous cure of Gorgonia offers too many points of ambiguity to allow us to appeal to it for proof that the Christians of the fourth century were accustomed to visit the churches in order to pray before the Blessed Eucharist reserved there. I should be glad enough to meet with evidence which would establish satisfactorily the high antiquity of such a practice; but I do not think that we can find it in the passage before us.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

## THE RULE OF ST BENEDICT.

### I

#### THE BENEVENTO MS.

IN a review of the Monte Cassino edition of the *Regula S. Benedicti*, 1900, in *J. T. S.* of April 1902,<sup>1</sup> I sketched in outline the broad facts of the MS tradition of St Benedict's Rule, and indicated the chief problems that an editor has to face. As I now have in hand myself, not a scientific edition (for this is in course of preparation by Dr. H. Plenkers for the Vienna Corpus), but an 'editio critico-practica', aiming at providing a good text in a form suitable for everyday use in Benedictine houses, I wish to clear up a point of great critical importance left open on the former occasion; in order that I may be able in my edition to use the result without more discussion than a reference to this Note.

The point at issue is one raised by the late Prof. Traube in his admirable *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti*.<sup>2</sup> Not to repeat what was said in the former article, it will suffice to state that at Monte Cassino in the eighth century was a copy of the Rule believed to be St Benedict's autograph. Whether really the autograph or not (and eminent critics, as Traube, hold that it was), it certainly contained the best text of the Rule known to us, and an editor's duty is to get back to it as closely as the extant materials will allow. A copy of it was made for Charles the Great, and of the offspring of this copy several members still exist. A Cassinese MS (Cassinese by origin) of the early part of the tenth century contains a text of the Rule manifestly derived from the 'autograph'; and the question at issue is: Is it one of

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iii p. 458.

<sup>2</sup> München, 1898, pp. 107-109.

the 'Carolingian group', i.e. of the group derived from Charles's copy; or does it go back to the 'autograph' by an independent line of descent?—a question manifestly of primary importance for the textual criticism of the Rule. The presumption would be that this MS represents an independent Monte Cassino tradition; but in my previous article the reasons were summarized which induced Traube to surmise that it also is a member of the Carolingian group, and so of no independent critical value.<sup>1</sup> It was explained also that the verification of Traube's surmise depends on the textual relationship between the copy of the Rule contained in this Cassinese MS, and that contained in a Benevento-MS of the same date ('Saec. ix-x'), now Barberini xi 64, in the Vatican Library.

I have obtained photographs of cc. 7, 8, 9 of the Rule in the Barberini MS, material amply sufficient for the investigation in hand. I find that, as might be expected from the other contents of the volume, the Barberini MS presents a Carolingian text of the Rule, but in a very contaminated form, having in a high degree undergone that process of correction whereby the later scribes eliminated the Low Latin element and other irregularities of the text as St Benedict wrote it, thus producing the 'Textus Receptus' now in use.<sup>2</sup> This process is discernible also in the Cassinese MS, but in a far less degree. But the process of correction appears to be quite different in the two MSS, so as not to suggest any near relationship—indeed so as to suggest quite the opposite. To shew that this is so, is the object of the present Note. The following symbols will be employed:—

*Carl* = reconstructed text of Charles the Great's copy of the 'autograph'; and so presumably the text of the 'autograph' itself.

*Cass* = Cassinese MS 175.

*Barb* = Barberini MS xi 64, now numbered 421.

T. R. = Textus Receptus, which had been formed by the ninth century, and even earlier.

(1) In c. 7 (towards beginning of First Degree of Humility) we read:

*Carl* et custodiens se omni hora a peccatis et vitiis, id est cogitationum, linguae, manuum, pedum, vel voluntatis propriae, sed et desideria carnis.

Here the grammar is at fault,<sup>3</sup> and T. R. corrects it by adding at the end *amputare festinet*. *Barb* has this correction, but not *Cass*.

(2) In c. 8 (fin.):

<sup>1</sup> Art. *ut supra* pp. 462, 463.

<sup>2</sup> See my article, 'The Text of St Benedict's Rule', *Downside Review*, Dec. 1899.

<sup>3</sup> Traube's suggestion, to read *sedet* (from *sedare*), is unconvincing and inadmissible.

*Carl* sic temperetur hora, ut Vigiliarum Agenda parvissimo intervallo, quo fratres ad necessaria naturae exeant, mox Matutini . . . subsequantur.

Here *Agenda* is a noun (= a canonical office, v. Du Cange) and is governed by *subsequantur*: 'let the hour be so regulated that Matins (i. e. Lauds) may follow the office of Vigils after a short interval.'

T. R. corrects as follows:—sic temperetur hora Vigiliarum agenda, ut parvissimo intervallo, quo . . . exeant, custodito, mox Matutini . . . subsequantur.

Here *agenda* is turned into a sort of gerundive agreeing with *hora*, translated usually 'the hour for saying the Vigils'. This is in reality by no means an improvement grammatically.

*Barb* agrees with T. R.; *Cass* with *Carl*.

(3) In c. 9 (init.):

*Carl* Hiemis tempore suprascripto inprimis versu tertio dicendum: Domine, labia mea aperies . . . ; cui subiungendus est tertius psalmus.

T. R. brings the passage into conformity with later usage, whereby the Vigils, like all the other offices, began with *Deus in adiutorium*, thus:—

Hiemis tempore, praemisso inprimis versu: Deus in adiutorium meum intende . . . in secundo dicendum: Domine, labia mea, &c.

Here again *Cass* agrees with *Carl* (but has *versum* and *dicendum est*); *Barb* agrees with T. R.

More significant are the cases in which the process of correction is discernible in both *Cass* and *Barb*, but has been carried out not on quite the same lines.

(4) In c. 7 (First Degree of Humility, init.):

*Carl* Semper sit memor omnia quae praecepit Deus, ut qualiter et contemnentes Deum gehenna de peccatis incendat, et vita aeterna, quae timentibus Deum praeparata est, animo suo semper evolvat.

T. R. reads: in gehennam de (*al* pro) peccatis incedunt (*al* incidunt), and corrects *omnia* into *omnium* and *vita aeterna* into *vitam aeternam*.

*Cass* tallies exactly with *Carl*, except that it has *omnium*. *Barb* retains *omnia*, but has *vitam aeternam*; and it reads: *in gehenna in peccatis incedat*.

(5) At beginning of c. 7 St Benedict quotes Ps. cxxx 2:

*Carl* Si non humiliter sentiebam, si exaltavi animam meam. Sicut ablactatum super matrem suam, ita retribuïs in anima mea.

The Clementine Vulgate is: Si non humiliter sentiebam, sed exaltavi animam meam: sicut ablactatus est super matre sua, ita retributio in anima mea.

There has always been a tendency to assimilate the text to this form, and *Cass* and *Barb* both exhibit traces of this tendency. They both

read *ablactatus* (and they both have *in animam meam*, with many other MSS). But *Cass* has *sed* and *matre sua*; whereas *Barb* retains *si* and *matrem suam*, but reads *retribues* (with many other MSS, and probably the T. R. reading).

(6) In c. 7 (at middle of First Degree of Humility) St Benedict uses a combination of Prov. xvi 25 and xiv 12, as follows:—

*Carl* Sunt viae quae videntur ab hominibus rectae, where *ab* represents LXX παρά, O. L. *apud* (see Traube *op. cit.* 13).

This passage has been corrected in the later MSS in a twofold manner: either *ab* has been omitted; or *videntur* has been turned into *putantur*. *Cass* adopts the first correction, *Barb* the second. As the two MSS are of about the same date ( $\pm 900$ ), this seems to afford positive evidence of their independence of each other.

It is the case that *Cass* and *Barb* are members of the same family of MSS, that which has descended from the Cassinese 'autograph'; but the evidence here recited all points to the conclusion that they are not closely akin—not brothers, but only distant cousins. In the section of *Barb* at my disposal, covering 300 lines of the text in the Monte Cassino edition, I have detected nothing that points the other way; and, did a close relation exist between the two MSS, it would surely reveal itself in so considerable a portion of the text.

Traube's surmise as to the origin of *Cass*, that it is one of the MSS derived from *Carl*, was based on the expectation that the copies of the Rule in *Cass* and *Barb* would prove to be closely related, even twin texts. This expectation was based, not on any examination of the text, for Traube had not seen *Barb*, but on the similarity of the other contents of the two MSS. It was only a surmise awaiting verification; and now that the case has been tested, it is found not to be justified by the facts.

It hardly need be pointed out that the close resemblance of *Cass* to *Carl* affords no reason whatever for supposing that *Cass* is derived from *Carl*; it means no more than that they both faithfully reproduced the text of the 'autograph'. Of course what has been brought forward does not precisely *prove* that *Cass* is not derived from *Carl*: it only removes the one specific reason that has been alleged for suspecting that it was. Thus we must fall back on the general likelihood of the case. In my former contribution (already referred to) I shewed that all the circumstantial evidence favours the presumption that the Cassinese monk who wrote *Cass* used a MS of the Rule embodying the domestic tradition of the text.

Thus it may be taken that the 'autograph' is now represented not only by the Carolingian group of MSS derived from *Carl*, but also by a Cassinese group, the protagonist of which is *Cass*, that goes back to

the 'autograph' independently of *Carl*. Consequently the editor of the Rule will be justified in regarding *Cass* as a witness to the Cassinese tradition of the text of the 'autograph', independent of, and collateral with, *Carl*.

## II

ST BENEDICT AND THE *DUAE VIAE*.

The fourth chapter of St Benedict's Rule, entitled 'Quae sunt instrumenta bonorum operum', is a list of seventy-three moral precepts, or fundamental maxims of Christian conduct. It has been maintained that they are in large measure based on the early document the *Duae Viae*, which forms the first half of the *Didache*. As one of the features of my edition of the Rule will be an attempt to indicate St Benedict's sources, I wish to investigate the question thus raised, and to ascertain whether, and how far, St Benedict was indebted to this work. From the nature of the case attention may be confined to the Latin evidence.

The chief definite tangible reason for supposing that St Benedict was indebted to the *Duae Viae* is the form in which, in three places, he cites the 'Golden Rule'. His ninth Instrument in c. iv is:

'Et quod sibi quis fieri non vult, alio ne faciat.'

Similarly cc. lxi and lxx end with the words:

'Quia scriptum est: Quod tibi non vis fieri, alio<sup>1</sup> ne feceris.'

The latter is manifestly the more formal citation. In Matt. vii 12 (and the parallel passage, Luke vi 31) the Golden Rule is given in the positive form:

'Omnia ergo quaecunque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, et vos facite illis.'

But in the *Didache* (i 2) it is found in St Benedict's negative form:

'Omne autem quod tibi fieri non vis, alio non feceris' (Latin version, ed. Schlecht).

Also in the *Didascalía* (ii):

'Quod tibi fieri ab alio non vis, tu alio ne feceris' (Latin version, ed. Hauler).

It has been supposed that here there is a definite instance of St Benedict's dependence on the *Didache*. But the negative form of the Golden Rule may be traced back ultimately to one of two Biblical sources.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Alio* is a well-recognized dative form (see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*).

<sup>2</sup> The instances cited in the ensuing investigation are taken from Sabatier, Wordsworth and White, and Funk's long note on p. 4 of his edition of the *Didache: Doctrina XII Apostolorum*, 1887.

(1) Tobias iv 16 (15):

O. L. 'Et quod oderis, alio ne feceris': or 'quod oderis fieri tibi, non facias alio'.

Vg. 'Quod ab alio oderis fieri tibi, vide ne tu aliquando alteri facias.'

(2) A 'Western' addition to the Apostolic Decree, Acts xv 20 and 29. For 20 Wordsworth and White cite of Latin authorities only Cod. Bezae and the Armagh MS, and Irenaeus. But in 29 they cite a number of Latin authorities. The MSS, except Cod. Bezae, agree in the following text:

'Et (ea) quae vobis fieri non vultis, aliis ne feceritis.'

Cod. Bezae reads:

'Et quaecumque non vultis vobis fieri, alii ne feceritis.'

Verse 29 is quoted by Iren. (iii 12): 'quaecumque non vultis fieri vobis, aliis ne faciatis'; by Cyprian (Test. iii 119): 'quaecumque vobis fieri non vultis, alio (*al.* alii, aliis) ne feceritis'; and by Caspari's 'Auctor pelagianus' in the same form as Cyprian.

Moreover the negative Golden Rule occurs in various places as a maxim not referred to any source. The following Latin instances are prior to St Benedict:

Lampridius in *Vita Alexandri Severi*, c. 51: '. . . a quibusdam sive Iudaeis sive Christianis audisset . . . : Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris. Quam sententiam usque adeo dilexit ut et in palatio et in publicis operibus perscribi iuberet.'

Augustine *Serm. de Symbolo* ii 6:

'Lex ista est generalis: Quod tibi non fieri vis, alii ne feceris.'

Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* xxxii 9:

'. . . illa regula qua praescribitur quod tibi (*al.* tu) nolueris, alii ne feceris.'

Valerianus of Cemele *Hom.* xiii 7:

'. . . respicientes ante omnia ad illam sententiam quae dicit: Quod tibi non vis, alio ne facias.'

A Christian epitaph in Iulia Concordia (Porto Gruaro, in Venetia) cited by De Rossi (*Bollettino*, 1874, p. 137) concludes:

'Scriptum est: Quod tibi fieri non vis alio ne feceris.'

Lastly, in the *Clementine Recognitions* viii 58 we find:

'Omnis propemodum actuum nostrorum in eo colligitur observantia, ut quod ipsi pati nolumus, ne hoc aliis inferamus.'

These instances shew that the saying under discussion was widely current and well known as a maxim or proverb of Christian conduct. St Benedict may have cited it from some Biblical text either of Tobias or of the Acts; or he may merely have repeated a proverbial saying in common use. The fact that he introduces it in c. lxi, with the formula 'Scriptum est', is no proof that he took it from the Bible; because

in c. vii he introduces with the same formula, 'scriptum est', and even with the formula 'dicit Scriptura', sayings which are in no sense whatever biblical. St Benedict knew the Bible very well; but in days when there were no Concordances, it must have been natural to attribute to the Bible anything that seemed to have a Scriptural ring.<sup>1</sup>

However, in the light of the evidence here adduced, it may safely be concluded that the presence in St Benedict's Rule of the words 'Quod tibi non vis fieri, alio non feceris' affords no ground whatever for the supposition that St Benedict was acquainted with the *Didache* or the *Didascalía* in any of their forms.

Dr Joseph Schlecht, the discoverer and editor of the early Latin version of the first part of the *Didache*, or the *Duae Viae*,<sup>2</sup> in his subsequent tractate *Die Apostellehre in der Liturgie der Katholischen Kirche*,<sup>3</sup> puts forward the view that St Benedict's fourth chapter, 'Quae sunt instrumenta bonorum operum', as a whole is derived from the *Didache* (pp. 86-90). These instruments (as has been said) are a collection of some seventy-three fundamental precepts of Christian, or indeed of natural, ethics. That there should be a considerable resemblance in subject-matter between it and the *Duae Viae*, also a collection of ethical precepts, of things to be done or avoided, largely based on Scripture, is from the nature of the case inevitable: indeed, in the circumstances the actual parallels are surprisingly few—out of St Benedict's seventy instruments, to hardly a dozen can any kind of even seeming parallel be adduced from the *Didache*. Schlecht prints out in parallel columns St Benedict's Instruments and the passages of the Greek *Didachè* which he suggests were their ultimate source.<sup>4</sup> Both documents commence with the Two Great Commandments, as was surely but natural in any epitome of Christian morality; and here (so far as I can see) the resemblance begins and ends. It is necessary to give a few samples of the parallelisms:

Saeculi actibus se facere alienum; nihil amoris Christi praepone; iram non perficere; iracundiae tempus non reservare; dolum in corde non tenere; pacem falsam non dare; caritatem non derelinquere.

Ἄπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, i 4.

Μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος, μηδὲ ζηλωτῆς μηδὲ ἐριστικὸς μηδὲ θυμικός, iii 2.

Ὅτι λήψῃ βουλὴν πονηρὰν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου, ii 6.

<sup>1</sup> Other instances are cited from Augustine, Gregory the Great, and even Bernard.

<sup>2</sup> *Doctrina XII Apostolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1900).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 1901.

<sup>4</sup> He gives the Greek, not the Latin, because several occur in the portions of the Greek text not found in the Latin version.



This is a fair specimen of the parallelisms relied upon by Schlecht in support of his theory: another is given below. In my judgement they afford no ground for suspecting any relation between St Benedict and the *Didache*. After carefully going through the whole, I do not perceive a single case that calls for special mention, now that the negative form of the Golden Rule (Instrument 9) has been eliminated from the discussion. Nor is there any structural parallelism in the order in which the precepts occur; for, as may be seen in the above piece, those in the right-hand column are taken from the *Didache* up and down, and are pieced together in utter disorder. It is true that Schlecht postulates as St Benedict's source a recension of the *Didache* different from any of those known to us: but this is to place the matter outside the range of scientific investigation.

Another issue raised by Schlecht should be dealt with here. Traube prints from a Vatican MS a document entitled 'Instrumentum magnum bonorum operum'.<sup>1</sup> It stands in a miscellaneous collection of sermons made by a priest, Agimundus, in the seventh or eighth century. Traube regards it as chapter iv of St Benedict's Rule, generalized by the modification of a few specifically monastic passages. Schlecht, on the other hand, sees in it an independent earlier document used by St Benedict. He holds that this is the document directly derived from the *Didache*, and the reasons he assigns for its priority to St Benedict's text are that 'many sentences from the *Didache* are found in it, but not in St Benedict; while others are in a more original form'. We must examine the instances he gives in support of this contention.

(1) In St Benedict we read:

'Non esse superbum; non vinolentum; non multum edacem; non somnolentum; non pigrum; non murmuriosum; non detractorem.'

In Agimund the passage is the same, except that it has 'non violentum; non multum mendacem'.

The following piece from the *Didache* is cited as the source:

Τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου ψεύστης . . . μηδὲ φιλάργυρος, μηδὲ κενόδοξος . . .  
μὴ γίνου γόγγυσος . . . μηδὲ ἀσθάδης μηδὲ πονηρόφρων (iii 5, 6).

The only correspondences with St Benedict's text are γόγγυσος and ἀσθάδης (translated *superbus* in Tit. i 7). With Agimund's text there is the additional correspondence of ψεύστης with *mendacem*, and it is on this that Schlecht relies. But, apart from the theory that the Latin piece is derived from the *Didache*, would it be supposed that 'non multum mendacem' is a more primitive reading than 'non multum edacem', especially when in c. xxxiii of St Benedict's Rule we find 'non multum edax'. Again, when we recollect that in Tit. i 7 is read 'non superbum, non iracundum, non vinolentum', we shall probably

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 691; cf. p. 636.

be disposed to regard St Benedict's 'non esse superbum, non violentum' as the primitive reading, and Agimund's 'non violentum' as a corruption of it. Indeed the three, 'non violentum, non multum edacem, non somnolentum' hang so well together, that they are manifestly the true reading.

(2) St Benedict has as the first Instrument 'Dominum Deum diligere ex toto corde, tota anima, tota virtute'; Agimund 'Dominum Deum tuum dilige'. Schlecht regards the presence of *tuum* as an indication that Agimund's text is nearer to the *Didache* than is St Benedict's. But the *tuum* has been supplied from the familiar text, Mark xii 30, and its parallels, which was St Benedict's source. This view of the case is removed from the realm of mere probability when we observe (1) that Agimund inserts the pronoun also after *corde, anima, virtute*, as in these Gospel passages: and (2) that in the *Didache* the personal pronoun is not found at all, the Greek being ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε—and nothing more—for which the reference Ecclus. vii 32 is given, and which has no relation to the Gospel texts or to St Benedict's.

(3) St Benedict has 'non adulterari': Agimund 'non adulterare; non moechare'. But *moechari* is such a common word in the Latin Bible that it cannot be taken as an indication of a Greek source.

This exhausts the evidence adduced by Schlecht in support of the theory that Agimund's 'Magnum Instrumentum' was the source of St Benedict's fourth chapter. For the rest, I have examined the few remaining places where Agimund's text differs from St Benedict's, and I can declare with confidence that they lend no countenance to Schlecht's thesis. Thus the internal evidence shews that Traube was right in treating Agimund's 'Magnum Instrumentum' as an extract from St Benedict's Rule.

And quite apart from such considerations of internal criticism, another broader reason militates against Schlecht's view. Agimund's text contains two of the characteristic readings wherein the Oxford MS and its allies differ from the MSS derived from the Cassinese 'autograph'.<sup>1</sup> Though in these particular cases it would be difficult to pass judgement, when the whole series of these readings, extending through the entire Rule, is considered, there can be no doubt that the readings of the 'autograph' are the correct and original readings. On the former occasions on which I have written on this subject I expressed the opinion that the view is tenable which regards the text of the Oxford MS as representing a first redaction and the 'autograph' a second, both by St Benedict himself. But now, after spending a great deal of time in working at the text of the Rule, I unreservedly accept

<sup>1</sup> See my two articles referred to in the previous Note.

Traube's position, viz. that the text of which the Oxford MS is the chief representative, is secondary and corrupt, interpolated, as Traube calls it. On the other hand, in regard to the question whether the Monte Cassino 'autograph' really was St Benedict's autograph, I find myself compelled to maintain the slightly sceptical attitude of 'not proven' which I took up against Traube and the eminent critics who follow him. The matter is not one of great practical importance; for I am satisfied that the text of this 'autograph' was so much the best of those known to us, that my endeavour as an editor will be to reproduce it.

E. CUTHBERT BUTLER.

## NOTES ON APOCRYPHA.

### I

#### REVELATIO THOMAE.

IN a recent number of the *Zeitschrift f. Neutestamentl. Wissenschaft* (1908, p. 172) Dr C. Frick calls attention to an interesting note in the Berlin-Phillipps MS of Jerome's Chronicle. The MS is of cent. viii-ix, and contains a series of additions to the text, which are printed (from a collation by Rühl) in Appendix V to Schoene's edition.

At the eighteenth year of Tiberius the MS has this note:

In libro quodam apocrifo qui dicitur Thomae apostoli scriptum est dominum Iesum ad eum dixisse ab ascensu suo ad celum usque in secundum aduentum eius nouem iobeleos contineri.

Frick identifies this as a quotation from the lost 'Revelatio Thomae Apostoli', which is named in the 'Gelasian' list of books condemned as heretical.

This passage, embodying the first trace which has ever been thought to have been discovered of the Revelation of Thomas, recalled to my memory a statement of Scipio Maffei's (*Opera*, Venice, 1790, tom. x p. 92) who, in describing the famous Graeco-Latin ancient Psalter of cent. vi in the Chapter Library at Verona, says, that after the apocryphal Psalm cli (*Pusillus eram*), 'In pagella quam librarius vacuum reliquerat, celeri scriptione, papyrusque veteres apprime referente, *Epistola Domini ad Thomam* subnotatur, quae inter apocrypha monumenta nondum est visa'. I accordingly wrote to the Rev. D. Antonio Spagnolo, the Chapter Librarian at Verona, who with great kindness supplied me with a transcript of the *Epistola*, and also informed me that it had in fact been