English Historical Review

0013-8266/90/2108/0567/$03.00

The English Historical Review

No. CCCCXVI – July 1990

*Mastering Benedict: monastic rules and their authors in the early medieval West**

JUST over fifty years ago, Dom Augustin Genestout startled first his fellow-monks of the monastery of Solesmes and then a general chapter of Benedictine abbots in Rome by announcing 'one of the greatest surprises in the history of medieval scholarship'.[1] He declared that the *Rule* of St Benedict was not an original work but to a considerable extent an adaptation of the so-called *Rule of the Master*, itself traditionally regarded as a later rule containing some material taken from Benedict. This sensational claim generated the most extensive and fiercely-fought controversy ever known in the history of monastic studies: but while Genestout would encounter considerable resistance (not all created by diehard traditionalism) to his views, he also found many supporters.[2] His theories gradually gained more and more acceptance and by 1963 the English Benedictine Dom David Knowles could declare, in an article summing up the debate, that

> In our present state of knowledge, the case for the priority of the Master seems stronger by far than the case for the priority of St Benedict as defended

* I am very grateful to Dr Jeremy Smith for his advice on stylometry, to Dr Richard Rose for his discussion of and criticism of the issues raised here and to Mr Michael Baron for his advice and for the statistical work presented in Appendix 1.

1. Quotation from R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1979), p. 221. For the chronology of Genestout's initial announcement, see B. Jaspert, *Die Regula Benedicti-Regula Magistri Kontroverse* (2nd edn, Hildesheim, 1977), pp. 8–17. Although he declared his views in 1937, Genestout only finally published his theories in 'La Règle du Maître et la Règle de S Benoît', R[*evue d'*] *A*[*scétique et de*] *M*[*ystique*], xxi (1940), 51–112. Others had already rushed into print to discuss them: J. McCann, 'The Rule of the Master', *Downside Review*, lvii (1939), 3–22, and 'The Master's Rule again', *ibid.*, lviii (1940), 150–9; M. del Alamo, 'La Règle de Saint Benoît éclairée par sa source, la Règle du Maître, R[*evue d'*] *H*[*istoire*] *E*[*cclésiastique*], xxxiv (1938), 740–55; B. Capelle, 'Cassien, le Maître et saint Benoît', *Récherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, xi (1939) 110–18, and at 357–88 in the same volume 'Aux origines de la règle de saint Benoît'; J. Pérez de Urbel, 'La Règle du Maître', *RHE*, xxxiv (1938), 707–39, and 'Le Maître et Saint Benoît', *RHE*, xxxiv (1938), 756–64.

2. Jaspert lists hundreds of relevant items, including over seventy articles which deal directly with the problem. The debate has also generated two editions of the *Rule of the Master*: H. Vanderhoven, F. Masai and P. B. Corbett, *La Règle du Maître. Edition diplomatique des manuscrits latins 12205 and 12634 de Paris (Les Publications de Scriptorium III: Aux sources du monachisme bénédictin, i)* (Brussels/Paris/Antwerp/Amsterdam, 1953), and de Vogüé's (*infra*, p. 568, n.2). Corbett also produced a study of *The Latin of the Regula Magistri with particular reference to its colloquial aspects. A Guide to the Establishment of the Text* (*Université de Louvain, Receuil de travaux d' histoire et de philologie* iv[e] Série, fasc. 17, Louvain, 1958).

by the conservatives. The thesis of the Master's priority may never be proved to demonstration, but it is hard to see that its opponents can ever regain the ground that they have lost in the past twenty-five years and, unless some wholly unforeseeable discovery is made, the hypothesis that St Benedict made extensive use of the previously existing *Rule of the Master* must remain as one enjoying a very high degree of probability.[1]

Any opposition to the newer view was finally silenced when Dom Adalbert de Vogüé published first in 1964 a three-volume edition of the *Rule of the Master* with Latin and French parallel texts and full critical apparatus and then in 1971 a six-volume edition of the *Rule* of St Benedict in the same format. The first of these dated the *Rule of the Master*, hereafter RM, to the period 500–525 and located its composition in Campania, south-east of Rome. The second (which places the *Regula Magistri*'s author somewhat nearer Rome itself) is not so much a critical and historical edition of the Benedictine *Rule*, hereafter RB, as de Vogüé's extended justification for the idea that the Master preceded and was a source for Benedict.[2]

Yet despite the universally favourable reviews which greeted de Vogüé's work and the incorporation of his conclusions into all recent histories of monasticism and editions or translations of RB, there exist considerable grounds for unease.[3] What are we to make, for instance, of the fact that while he has carried out vocabulary studies by which he believes that he has established different vocabulary patterns for the authors of the two rules, de Vogüé also discusses and refuses to exclude entirely the possibility that both might have been written by Benedict himself at different stages in his career?[4] On a more fundamental level, de Vogüé maintains that in composing his own *Rule*, Benedict used an earlier version of RM, now lost, which did not contain a number of passages which exist in the surviving version of RM. One of these texts might otherwise provide evidence that Benedict predated RM.[5] Thus, by postulating the existence of a 'primitive' version of

1. D. Knowles, 'The "Regula Magistri" and the "Rule" of S Benedict' in *Great Historical Enterprises – Problems in Monastic History* (London, 1963), p. 195.

2. A. de Vogüé, *La Règle du Maître* (*Sources Chrétiennes*, 105–7) (Paris, 1964), and *La Règle de Saint Benoît* (*Sources Chrétiennes* 181–6) (Paris, 1971–2) (Vol. 3 by J. Neufville, vol. 7 added 1977.)

3. Reviews by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill in *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., xxiv (1973), 559–60; B. de Gaiffier, *Analecta Bollandiana*, xci (1973), 449–51; E. Manning, *RHE*, lxviii (1973), 456–64. Rudolf Hanslik's edition of *Benedicti Regula* (*CSEL* 75, Vienna, 1960) originally supported the 'traditional' view of the relationship between RB and RM; but in 1977, he issued an *Editio Altera Emendata* in the same series.

4. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 308–12.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 275–7. The most important of these passages is the creed contained in RM's *Ars sancta* (RM 3, 1): it is not present in the otherwise virtually identical RB 4, 1 ('The Instruments of Good Works'). It is scarcely conceivable that Benedict would have omitted a creed altogether had he found one there – and de Vogüé is therefore forced to argue, in support of his thesis of RM's priority that this is a later interpolation, unknown to Benedict. Other texts allegedly absent from the 'primitive' RM include the catalogue of vices at RM 5; RM 61, 15–23 (cf. RB 51).

RM, de Vogüé effectively jettisons a piece of evidence which suggests a conclusion diametrically opposed to his own – but simultaneously claims that Benedict also used an altered or 'secondary' version of RM![1] None of these odd and contradictory statements inspires confidence; and nor does the overall view of monastic history and legislation to which first Genestout's and then de Vogüé's theories have contributed. With their picture of Benedict as adapter and improver, they have reinforced what might unkindly be called the Whig view of monasticism – the assumption that the monastic history of the early medieval west can be written in terms of steady progress towards a supposed 'civilisation', equated here with the eventual predominance of the 'moderate' and 'balanced' RB throughout Europe.[2] Such a view owes more to the fact that RB has now survived for nearly a millennium and a half as a living monastic code than to the reality of its first widespread use and diffusion. This frequently involved not its adoption as a whole but the use of some of its provisions in conjunction with those of other rules, in the so-called *regulae mixtae* or mixed rules. And compared with these, it is not instantly obvious that RM is pre-Benedictine either in structure or even in its ascesis.

Charter evidence demonstrates that in early seventh-century Gaul – where we can most easily trace its spread and diffusion – RB was almost inevitably excerpted and used with other rules and forms of life: those of Lérins, Agaune, St Marcel, Châlon, or the legislation attributed to Basil or Macarius. But it was also frequently combined with extracts from the *Rules* of the great Irish ascetic Columbanus who arrived on the Continent *c.*590–1 and founded monasteries in Gaul and Italy in the late sixth and early seventh century.[3] The practice of selecting parts of RB and using them in conjunction with parts of the Columbanian *Rules* and perhaps with other works appears to have been the norm rather than the exception in Gaul: between the 620s and the 660s/70s, there is only one recorded instance of RB's being used *alone* in a religious house – this was at *Altaripa* near Albi, where it was prescribed by the founder Venerandus in the 620s.[4] Few actual

1. *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 277–8.

2. For instance, Southern, *Western Society and the Church*, p. 223.

3. Agaune, Lérins and Luxeuil are all mentioned in the first formula in the collection of Marculf, *Marculfi Formulae* i, 1, ed. K. Zeumer *MGH Formulae*, p. 39. Other French charters allude to other combinations: Rebais, St Marcel, Châlon, Luxeuil; Lérins, Luxeuil, St Marcel; *Basilii sancti charismata, Macharii regula, Benedicti decreta, Columbani instituta*; Agaune, Luxeuil, Lérins and St Marcel. See F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich–Vienna, 1965), pp. 121–293. For Columbanus, see G. S. M. Walker, *Sancti Columbani Opera, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae*, ii (Dublin, 1957); K. Schäferdiek, 'Columbans Wirken im Frankenreich (591–612)', in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, i (Stuttgart 1982), 171–201; E. H. B. Clarke and M. Brennan, *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford, 1981); *San Colombano e la sua opera in Italia* (Bobbio, 1953); *Mélanges colombaniens: actes du Congrès internationale de Luxeuil 20–23 juillet 1950* (Paris, 1951).

4. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 267–8.

texts of combined usages survive, but two which do, Bishop Donatus of Besançon's *Rule for Nuns* and the anonymous *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines*, both demonstrate a Benedictine content not dissimilar to that of RM.[1] The *Cuiusdam Patris Regula* (based largely on Benedict and Columbanus) incorporates Benedict's teaching on the office of abbot (merely substituting 'abbess' for 'abbot') and other monastic officials, while Donatus, who had been educated at Luxeuil, uses Columbanus, Benedict and Cæsarius of Arles' *Rule for Nuns*, deriving his structure of monastic officials from both Benedict and Cæsarius and incorporating not only Benedict's teaching on the twelve steps of humility to be ascended by the aspiring ascetic but also Benedict's 'Instruments of Good Works'.[2] The Master's much longer rule contains in its opening chapters a great deal of material virtually identical to parts of RB: general ascetic and spiritual principles (including the steps of humility and, under a different title and with some variants, the 'Instruments of Good Works') and teachings on the abbot's duties and the qualities which the abbot should possess. (Elsewhere there are similarities in chapter headings and in, for instance, the quantities of food prescribed for the monks.)[3] At first glance, therefore, RM bears a certain resemblance to those *regulae mixtae* which were based partly on Benedict. Even the fact that its ascesis is held to be harsher than Benedict's might also argue for a post-Benedictine date, as Columbanus' still harsher penitential system seems to have found a degree of acceptance in parts of Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries (as Donatus and the *Cuiusdam Patris Regula* both demonstrate).[4] There is certainly enough evidence to suggest that, both in terms of de Vogüé's methods and of his conclusions, there is a prima facie case for re-examining the arguments for the priority of RM.

De Vogüé's arguments in favour of a pre-Benedictine date for RM are distributed across the several volumes of his editions of Benedict and the Master. The foundations of his case were laid in the 1964 edition of RM. There he rejected the date of *c.*400 AD originally proposed

1. *Sancti Donati Vesontionensis Episcopi Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 87, cols. 273–93; *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 88, cols. 1051–70.

2. *Cuiusdam Patris Regula*, chapters i (abbess); ii (prioress); iii (portress); iv (cellaress); *Donati Regula* depends on Benedict for chapters i (abbess); ii *De adhibendis ad consilium sororibus* (=RB 3); iii ('What are the Instruments of Good Works' = RB 4); iv (abbess); v (prioress); lx (portress); lxi (cellaress); lxii (guardians of the monastery's goods and utensils); lxvii (weekly kitcheners) and xxxvii–xlviii (the steps of humility), and for some further details and aspects of the monastic life. It follows Cæsarius most notably in having a *formaria*, spiritual directrix, or perhaps novice-mistress and a *primiceria* or choir-mistress (see xii) and for part of his instructions on the election of the abbess (lxxvii, cf. Cæsarius, *Recapitulatio*, xii, *PL* 67, col. 1118).

3. See Appendix 3.

4. Donatus, chapters 25–35, *PL* 87, cols. 283–5 and *Cuiusdam Patris Regula*, chapter 12, *PL* 88, cols. 1063–4.

for the work by Genestout and settled instead on the period 500–525.[1] His conclusions are based in part on a consideration of the apocryphal literature from which RM quotes: the *Acts of Andrew and John*, the *Passio* of St Anastasia, the *Sentences of Sextus*, the *Passio Eugeniae*, the *Visio Pauli*, the *Passio Sebastiani* and the *Vita Silvestri*. This rich and heady mixture of apocrypha, legend and saint's life lends large sections of RM their characteristic flavour: the description of the paradise awaiting those who successfully climb the twelve steps of humility (*infra* pp. 589–90) is drawn directly from the *Passio Sebastiani*. Sometimes quotations from such sources are even dignified by the Master as 'scripture'. De Vogüé indicates that a number of the apocrypha used by the Master were proscribed by the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum*, supposedly a semi-official work circulated among the Roman clergy with the aim of preventing the dissemination and use of a long list of 'unsuitable' texts. He assigns the *Decretum* (not without some hesitation) to the 520s. This is the keystone of his dating of both RM and RB: he argues that RM must have been composed before the proscriptions of the *Decretum* were laid down or generally known and therefore places it in the period 500–525. Benedict, by contrast, eschews the dubious works listed in the *Decretum* and was therefore writing in a slightly later period, between 530 and the 550s, when its full impact had been felt.[2]

For de Vogüé, this dating of RM is confirmed by the contents of the earliest manuscript in which any of the the *Rule* appears.[3] This exceptionally significant document contains not only a rule made up of extracts from Basil, Cassian, Pachomius, Jerome, Novatian and RM but also the earliest surviving MS of the *Ordo Monasterii* and *Regula Tertia* attributed to St Augustine. De Vogüé suggests that it is of southern Italian origin and that its compiler was Eugippius (*c.*460–535), abbot of the monastery of Lucullanum, Naples, best known to historians as the author of the *Life* of St Severinus of Noricum, the 'apostle of Austria'. According to the *De viris illustribus* of Isidore of Seville, Eugippius

1. Genestout's belief that RM antedates RB is set out in 'La Règle du Maître et la Règle de S Benoît' and is based on a comparison of the passages where the two rules coincide; on the absence in the RM of any parallels to chapters 68–73 of RB; on the absence of a novice-master in RM; and on references in RM to the Empire as an existing political institution; on the 'archaic' nature of the Master's office which makes no use of hymns. According to Genestout, the *Versus Simplicii* which accompanied the Benedictine *Rule* in certain (comparatively late) manuscripts indicates that Benedict simplified and propagated the work of an earlier writer. His dating of the RM to the era 397/8–402 is based largely on his belief that there are virtually no citations of works composed after the year AD 400 and he assigns the RM to the circle of Nicetas of Remesiana: see Jaspert, *Die RB – RM Kontroverse*, p. 130. De Vogüé appears to have abandoned all but the fundamentals of Genestout's literary observations and his views on the structures of the two communities, with which he appears to be (very broadly) in agreement (*Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 52–3).

2. *Règle du Maître*, i. 206–20, 221–5, *Règle de S Benoît*, i. 169–72.

3. See Appendix 2.

> . . . also wrote a rule for the monks residing in the monastery of St Severinus which on his death he left to them as a testament.[1]

If the compilation which includes extracts from RM is the *Rule* of Eugippius, it would indeed demonstrate that RM predates Benedict.

On closer examination, however, these apparently impressive demonstrations are much less convincing. The *Decretum Gelasianum* is, to say the least, a singularly blunt instrument to apply to the delicate task of dating the two rules. Its own date and authenticity are widely contested: it has been attributed to two popes other than Gelasius, whose name it bears, and assigned to periods ranging from the fifth to the eighth century. It seems to have first become widely known in the ninth century in the period of the False Decretals and there are no early MSS of the work. It is likely that it is a later forgery: even those who believe that it was composed in the fifth or early sixth century acknowledge that no one seems to have paid any attention to it at this time![2] The futility of attempting to draw conclusions from its contents in any case is illustrated by the case of the *Sentences of Sextus*, which the *Decretum* seeks to ban (presumably on the grounds of its pagan, Pythagorean background) but which went on to become a 'medieval best seller', quoted not only in RM but also by Benedict himself.[3] Benedict also makes use of one of the many other authors condemned in the *Decretum*, the Marseilles Abbot John Cassian (*c.* 360–435) who was and would remain, despite his 'semi-Pelagian' doctrine of grace, one of the major and fundamental influences on western monastic life.[4]

The attribution of the rule composed of extracts from RM, Basil and others to Eugippius is also far from secure. Its manuscript, *Paris Lat* 12634, has been assigned by a number of authorities to a variety of dates, none earlier than the late sixth century (see *infra*, p. 585, and Appendix 2) and all well after both the death of Eugippius and the composition of RB. While *Paris Lat* 12634 is probably of Italian origin there are no obvious links with Eugippius' monastery of Lucullanum – nor are there any positive grounds for arguing that the compilation

1. De Vogüé, 'La Règle d' Eugippe retrouvée?', *RAM*, xlvii (1971), 233–66; 235 for the quotation from Isidore, *De viris illustribus*. See also J. Villegas–A. de Vogüé, *Eugippii Regula* (*CSEL* 87, 1976).

2. For the *Decretum Gelasianum* see H. Leclercq in the *Dictionnaire d' Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, vol. vi (1924), cols. 722–47. Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian* (2nd edn., Cambridge 1968), p. 151 accepts the authenticity of the *Decretum* but comments, 'How individual was the document is proved by the circumstance that for a long time no one in authority took the least notice of it'!

3. H. Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus* (Cambridge, 1959), p. ix. RB, 7, 61: *sicut scriptum est*: *sapiens verbis innotescit paucis* = Sextus, 145.

4. It is well known that the final chapter (c. 73) of the RB recommends the 'conferences and institutes' of the Fathers: for the two important sections of Benedict which obviously derive from Cassian in the early chapters of the RB, see Appendix 3. Cassiodorus also recommended his monks to use Cassian but with caution, *'sed sub cautela quia de libero arbitrio a beato Prospero jure culpatus est'* (*DACL* vi, col. 725). But there is no reference to any prohibition, nor to the *Decretum*.

of extracts is a copy of an earlier text. De Vogüé's belief that it originated with Eugippius appears to be based only on the fact that it contains two monastic rules attributed to Augustine and the knowledge that Eugippius compiled a *florilegium* of Augustinian extracts which would become very popular in the medieval period. But the Augustinian content of *Paris Lat* 12634 does not prove that it was written by Eugippius; and although de Vogüé attempts to do so, it is hard to draw a parallel between the brief series of excerpts from Basil and the Master and the massive 388 chapters of Eugippius' selections from Augustine (which do not, in any case, include the two monastic *Rules*). Some of de Vogüé's arguments – that both compilations begin with a 'whole work' (this is, in any case, debatable) and that both have lacunae in their citations – appear extremely forced.[1] Until he suggested the connection, Eugippius' rule was universally regarded as lost: discussing this manuscript in 1967, Verheijen indicated clearly that there is no direct evidence to link it with Eugippius (and therefore with the period before the composition of RB).[2] The best verdict which can be delivered on this part of de Vogüé's case for placing the composition of RM in the period 500–525 is the Scottish one of 'not proven'.

However, de Vogüé's case for the dependence of RB on RM does not rest solely on this chronology. In his edition of RB, he tackled the complex problem of the literary relationship between the rules, concluding that the dependence of RB on RM was clearly demonstrable.[3] Before de Vogüé, other historians had also spent much time considering the textual problems associated with the two rules, usually focusing their attention on the first ten chapters of RM and the prologue and first seven chapters of RB where there is a considerable community of material. (After this point, where more general ascetic doctrine gives way to specifics in both rules, the similarities between the two, though sometimes striking, are rarely sustained.) But despite this community of material, even the opening sections of the rules frequently diverge from each other, sometimes by several hundred words, sometimes by a single phrase or word and in the earlier stages of the controversy over the two rules scholars examined these divergences closely in an attempt to establish on literary or manuscript grounds which rule was composed first.[4]

1. De Vogüé, 'Eugippe', pp. 238–42, 244–9.

2. L. Verheijen, *Règle de saint Augustin*, i (Paris, 1967), 116–7 concedes that 'nous ne pourrions pas fournir une seule preuve formelle pour arguer que la législation monastique du *Parisinus* 12634 remonte à Eugippius. S' il y en avait une, on l' aurait su depuis longtemps.'

3. *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, i, part ii. 173–314.

4. See Appendix 3 for some correspondences and divergences. This approach has been followed by Genestout, 'La Règle du Maître et la Règle de S Benoît' pp. 53–92; E. Manning, 'Recherches sur les manuscrits et les états de la "Regula Monasteriorum" (I)', *Scriptorium*, xx (1966), 193–214; F. Masai and E. Manning, 'Recherches sur les manuscrits et les états de la "Regula Monasteriorum" (II)', *ibid.*, xxi (1967), 205–26: F. Masai and E. Manning, 'Recherches sur les manuscrits et les états de la "Regula Monasteriorum" (III)', *ibid.*, xxii (1968), 3–19; and 'Les états du chapitre I^er^ du Maître et la fin du Prologue de la Règle bénédictine', *ibid.*, xxiii (1969), 393–433.

De Vogüé, however, believed that the priority of RM could also be proved from a study of the vocabulary of the two rules. He postulated the existence of a section common to both rules and attempted to compare its vocabulary with the remaining sections of the two rules, arguing that if the vocabulary patterns of his 'common section' resembled those of RM, the priority of that rule would be established, and conversely, if they matched more closely those of Benedict, his *Rule* was the earlier of the two. His investigations confirmed his view that RM was the earlier work.[1]

Although this part of his work was hailed by many as convincing proof of RM's priority, many objections could be raised to de Vogüé's methods. His samples of vocabulary fail to meet any modern critical standard as he does not employ any test of statistical significance;[2] and his 'common section' is itself an elusive, if not illusory, phenomenon. While there is much material which is *almost* identical in the opening chapters of both rules and more scattered resemblances elsewhere, there are comparatively few sentences in both rules which are absolutely identical. This is to some extent made apparent in the text of de Vogüé's edition of RB:[3] but his section of the Introduction devoted to vocabulary analysis does not make plain that there are often two versions of the 'common section' and he proceeds as if there were only one to be compared with the remainder of the two rules. Clearly, the results of the comparison will be dictated by whichever version of the 'common section' – RM's or RB's – is used as the starting point. De Vogüé appears to have used RM's version – with predictable results.[4] A more conventional and methodologically acceptable approach to the problem of disputed authorship, the statistical analysis of sentence length, yields rather different results, which suggest that it is difficult to establish priority of composition on stylistic grounds alone.[5] This certainly confirms the impression created by a parallel

1. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i, part ii. 245–78. This is followed by a section (pp. 279–314) which claims to demonstrate the 'redactional method' employed by Benedict *vis-à-vis* the Master's text.

2. The reaction of E. Manning, *RHE*, lxviii (1973), 459 is typical. But for modern stylometric methods see G. U. Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary* (Cambridge, 1944); A. Kenny, *The Computation of Style* (London, 1982); and A. Q. Morton, *Literary Detection* (London, 1978).

3. See *Règle de Saint Benoît*, vol. i, where the sections of RB chapters 1–7 which are exactly the same as the RM chapters 1–10 are set in upper-case type while the variants are left in lower case. There are, however, no indications of further insertions/deletions.

4. E.g., p. 258 of vol. i of de Vogüé's *Règle de Saint Benoît* where he lists *autem* amongst the words frequently used by Benedict but absent from the 'common section'. But this depends on which version of the 'common section' is used, as a glance at RB chapter 2, 25 and RM chapter 2, 25 indicates.

5. For this method see Kenny, *Computation*, and Morton, *Literary Detection*, *passim*. A statistically significant difference in mean sentence-length between the earlier sections of one rule (where there are long sections which are similar to parts of the other rule) and its later sections (where similarities to the other rule are limited) would indicate that the two sections should be attributed to different authors. Thus, if the mean sentence-length of the early section of the RB were significantly different in statistical terms from that of its later chapters and fell within the range of the RM's mean sentence-length, there would be a convincing case for the Master's priority. Actual results of this exercise (see Appendix 1) yield no clear conclusion either way.

reading of the early chapters of the two rules: it is often impossible to say for certain whether a word or phrase has been added or deleted by one or the other author.[1]

Although de Vogüé has failed to prove his case for the priority of RM either on chronological grounds or by his vocabulary analyses, these failures do not in themselves disprove the thesis that RM predates RB. Far outweighing these considerations is the question of whether RM represents a demonstrably more primitive stage of monastic development, in either organizational or liturgical terms than RB. How, then, does it fit into the general pattern of western monastic history between the fifth and seventh centuries?

De Vogüé asserts that the monastic institutions described in RB are more developed than those of RM, with a 'much greater number of brethren invested with a personal responsibility'.[2] In fact, the structures of RM and RB are – when compared to those of a much earlier era, such as the *Ordo Monasterii* or *Regula Tertia* which describe very rudimentary administrations[3] – highly developed and use similar terminology, though sometimes investing the same word with different meanings. The systems outlined in both are comparable in elaboration not only to each other, but to those of Cæsarius of Arles' *Rule for Nuns* completed in 534, which lists an abbess, prioress, *formaria*, *primiceria*, keeper of the wine-cellar, doorkeeper, keeper of the wool which the nuns were to spin, and mistress of the communal wardrobe.[4] Both RB and RM appoint cellarers, guardians of monastic property (tools, clothing etc.), weekly kitchen-servers, weekly readers for the refectory and door keepers. While de Vogüé stresses that RM does not have a prior (*praepositus*), a novice-master or a 'servitor' for the sick, the rule does not neglect provision for either of the two latter categories and in general places much responsibility on the shoulders of *two praepositi*. As heads of the two 'decades' or groups of ten into which the monks are to be divided, they emerge as key officials in a monastery which seems, ideally, to contain between twenty and thirty monks. RB has a single prior, and only considers the possibility of dividing the community into groups of ten (under *decani*) if it should become large; yet Benedict is at the same time very concerned about the possible abuse of power by the prior and advises that the abbot

1. Though at times it looks as if RM is returning to RB after an excursus. De Vogüé (*Règle du Maître*, i. 191–5) chooses to discount the idea that *RM* chapter 1, 75 '*Unde ergo magnum existimantes primum genus coenobitarum ... ad ipsorum regula revertamur* indicates a return by the Master to the text of RB. It could be argued that the author is about to end a digression on the gyrovagues but changes his mind and proceeds first to the passage beginning '*Fratres clamat nobis cottidie Dominus dicens*: *Convertemini ad me et ego convertar ad vos* before finally taking up Benedict's text – or a slightly adapted version of it – in chapter 2, *Qualis debeat esse abbas*.

2. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 300.

3. De Bruyne, 'La première règle de saint Benoît', *Rev*[*ue*] *Bén*[*édictine*], xlii (1930), 316–42.

4. L. de Seilhac. *L' Utilisation par S Césaire d' Arles de la Règle de S Augustin*, pp. 59–124.

should organize his monastery through the *decani* wherever possible.[1] Rather than accepting de Vogüé's view that the absence of a prior is evidence of a primitive organization, it could well be argued that RM has taken RB's advice in order to avoid the problem of a potentially over-mighty official.[2] De Vogüé's further claim that RM's priority is demonstrated by the contrasting approach displayed to the priesthood in the two rules is also unhelpful. While RM only appears to consider the reception of visiting priests rather than the ordination of priests and deacons from within the community, RB is unusual in devoting attention to the latter question; and RM suggests that the Eucharist was taken daily – certainly not an indication of an early date.[3]

A comparison of RB's administrative structures with those of RM does not, in fact, provide clear evidence that the latter antedates the former: the evidence is equivocal and there are even some indications that the reverse might possibly be the case. For a more definitive answer to the question of the relationship between the two rules, we need to turn to liturgy, the very core and *raison d'être* of monastic life. Evidence for the development of the liturgical day over the first few centuries of Christianity is often sporadic: yet there is certainly enough to enable us to see the gradual increase in the number of offices which were accepted as a part of Christian worship. In neither of his editions does de Vogüé attempt a comprehensive survey of monastic liturgy – indeed in *La Règle du Maître*, he explicitly draws back from this. Yet it is only by reconstructing the history of monastic liturgical development both before and after RM and RB and by placing them in context that we can begin to reach any firm conclusion about the chronological relationship between the two rules.

De Vogüé dealt with RM's liturgical day in his editions of both rules, concluding originally that it should be compared both with RB and with the Roman office of the sixth century.[4] Later he produced a much more developed statement of his grounds for regarding RM as the earlier of the two. He argued that the framework of its liturgical day derived from John Cassian's description of the offices of the monks of Palestine in the late fourth and early fifth centuries.[5] RM celebrates

1. RB, chapters 31–35, 38, 65, 66: RM, chapters 16–19, 23, 24 and 95, RM, chapters 69 and 70 for the sick; 89 and 90 on novitiate and profession; and 11 for the two *praepositi*. RB, chapter 21 for *decani*. R. Kay's argument, 'Benedict, Justinian, and donations "Mortis Causa" in the *Regula Magistri*', *Rev. Bén.*, xc (1980), 168–93, that RM's provisions for disposal of goods on entry to the monastery show that it was written at an earlier stage of legal development than RB is unconvincing – see O. Porcel, *San Gregorio Magno y el Monacato, Cuestiones Controvertidas* (*Monastica, Scripta et Documenta* 12, Montserrat, 1960), p. 63.

2. A. Angenendt, *Monachi Peregrini* (Munich, 1972), pp. 208–11.

3. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 302; but see Otto Nussbaum, *Kloster, Priestermönch und Privatmesse* (*Theophaneia* 14, Bonn, 1961), pp. 65–74, which demonstrates that there were, in any case, no great numbers of priests in any monastery before the mid-seventh century, and *ibid.*, pp. 152–7 for the growth in devotion to the Eucharist and concern for personal salvation.

4. *Règle du Maître*, i. 49–86, 63.

5. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 101–33; v. 383–643, especially 491, 511–25, 516, 536, 545–54.

eight offices in every twenty-four hours: Matins, Prime, Terce, Sext, Nones; an evening office to which it gives three names, Vespers, *Duodecima* or *Lucernaria*, Compline; and the night office, Nocturns.[1] To justify or describe this regime, RM cites two verses from Psalm 118 (119), *Septies in die laudem dixi tibi* ('Seven time a day I have spoken thy praise') and *Media nocte surgebam ad confitendam tibi* ('In the middle of the night I arose to confess thee').[2] The link between RM and Cassian, according to de Vogüé, is proved by the former's comment that the 'Seven times a day' is 'old custom' and sanctioned by *the institutes of the fathers*, which he interprets as a direct reference to Cassian's *Institutes*, Book III, 4–6. This describes the daily *ordo* of the monks of Palestine and sets it in the context of the *Septies in die* of Psalm 118.[3]

This supposed link with Cassian is a red herring. The assumption that the phrase 'the institutes of the fathers have sanctioned' (*sanctorum patrum instituta sancxerunt*) can refer only to Cassian is highly dubious, especially as other rules use the same expression in a more general context.[4] As for chapters 4–6 of *Institutes*, Book III, they must surely be amongst the most problematic texts ever to confront the historian of monasticism. They describe the introduction of a new monastic office at Bethlehem in the late fourth century; but historians have debated whether the new office was Lauds or Prime. Most now come down in favour of the former, recognizing Prime as a much later development:[5] but even so neither solution brings the total number of offices listed up to the 'seven times a day' of Psalm 118 quoted in *Institutes*, III, 4.[6] Moreover, *Institutes*, III, 1–3 and 7–12 describe a day with only five offices.[7] The most convincing suggestion to have been made regarding *Institutes*, III, 4–6 is that these chapters are a later interpolation designed to lend the appearance of venerable tradition to more

1. RM, chapters 33–37.

2. *Idem*, chapter 33, 1, chapter 34, 3. RM qualifies the former as a description or 'proof' of winter psalmody, adding for summer a quotation from *Isaiah* 26, 9, *De nocte vigilat spiritus meus ad te Deus*.

3. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, v. 511–25. Johannis Cassiani, *De Institutis Coenobiorum et de Octo Principalium Vitiorum Remediis Libri XII*, ed. M. Petschenig (Vienna, 1888, *CSEL* vol. xvii), 38–41.

4. Suggested tentatively, *Règle du Maître*, ii. 188, nn. 2–3, with certainty *Règle de Saint Benoît*, v. 511–25. Chapter xxii of the *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines* uses the same phrase in a general context (*PL* 88, col. 1068 D). *Septies in die* occurs in the *Sermo asceticus* attributed to Basil (*PG* 31, col. 877), but this 'seven times' includes the night office and even so means that one office is divided into two portions to achieve a total of seven.

5. J. Froger, *Les Origines de Prime* (*Bibliotheca Ephimerides Liturgicae* 19, Rome, 1946) and 'Note pour rectifier l'interprétation de Cassien, *Inst*, 3, 4; 6 proposée dans *Les Origines de Prime*', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, ii (1952), 96–102. His views are criticized by Owen Chadwick, 'The origins of Prime', *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlix (1948), 178–82, and *John Cassian*, pp. 70–7.

6. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, pp. 74–5.

7. Terce, Sext, Nones, an evening office (= Vespers) and a night office.

recent developments in the monastic office.[1] And if we set aside the whole passage, it becomes possible, at last, to reconstruct the broad outlines of the development of the daily monastic office and to see where both RB and RM stand in this process.

In the second century Tertullian described five offices: in the morning, the evening and at the third, sixth and ninth hours.[2] The *Pilgrimage of Egeria* reveals that at Jerusalem around AD 385, monks and the laity who attended their churches now observed nightly Vigils; dawn hymns, in which we may see the office of Matins/Lauds; Terce, Sext, Nones; and Vespers or *Lucernaria*.[3] Matins/Lauds are mentioned in the *Ordo Monasterii* attributed to Augustine and in the sparse liturgical directions of the *Regula Macarii* and the *Third Rule of the Fathers*, both composed in southern France in the fifth and early sixth centuries.[4]

Two new offices enter the monastic *ordo* in the sixth century. Prime (celebrated at the first hour of day) makes its appearance in monastic legislation in the *Rule for Nuns* of Cæsarius of Arles (d. 542). It is clear that it was not a well-established office as Cæsarius' *ordo* (based in part on that of Lérins, which itself owed a great deal to the east) cautiously restricts its use to Saturdays, Sundays and festivals. His successor Aurelian (542–51), however, makes Prime a daily event.[5] Both RB and RM include Prime amongst their offices,[6] but the extent of indifference or even resistance to the new office elsewhere may be judged by the fact that later in the sixth century neither the *Rule* of Ferreol, Bishop of Uzès, nor the *Regula Tarnatensis* mention it.[7]

1. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, p. 76. He proposes that texts of Cassian were made to conform to western practice of the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries. This is likely: we know that Lauds did not originate with Cassian's monastery as the text of *Institutes*, iii. 4 might suggest; that Prime first became known in the west in the sixth century; and that references to the practice of the monasteries of Gaul (iii. 4) and Italy (iii. 6) are the *only* such references in the whole of the *Institutes*, thus indicating a degree of tampering and special pleading, out of character with Cassian's declared task (*Institutes*, preface, 8) of bringing the asceticism of Egypt and Palestine to Gaul. There is no manuscript evidence for Books i–iv of the *Institutes* for the period before the ninth century apart from some tiny fragments of Books iv and vi in a palimpsest originating in Bobbio (Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, F. iv. n 16). See Chadwick, *John Cassian*, pp. 41–2.

2. Tertullian, *De oratione*, chapters xxiii–xxv, *PL* 1, cols. 1191–3; Joan Hazelden Walker, 'Terce, Sext and None. An Apostolic Custom?', *Studia Patristica* v, iii (Berlin 1963), 206–12.

3. L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origins and Evolution*, trans. from the French by L. McClure (London 1912), pp. 547–9.

4. *Les Règles des Saints Pères*, ed. A. de Vogüé (2 vols. *Sources Chrétiennes*, 297–8, Paris, 1982), *Regula Macarii*, x (vol i. 377); *Regula Tertia Patrum*, v (vol ii. 536); de Bruyne, 'La première règle de Saint Benoît', 318–19 (*Ordo Monasterii* 1–3).

5. G. Morin (ed.), *S Cæsarii episcopi Arelatensis Opera Omnia*, vol. ii (1942); *Regulae*, *PL* 67, cols. 1099–1120; *S Aureliani Regula ad Monachos*, *Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 68, 385–406, 393–5, 403–6; O. Heiming, 'Zum Monastischen Offizium von Cassianus bis Kolumbanus', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, vii (1961–2), 89–156; E. Kasch, *Das liturgische Vokabular der frühen lateinischen Mönchsregeln* (Hildesheim, 1974), pp. 52–88

6. RB, chapters 16–18; RM, chapters 34, 35, 40, 45.

7. *Regula Monasterii Tarnatensis*, *PL* 66, 973–86; *S Ferreoli Uticensis Episcopi Regula ad Monachos*, *ibid.*, cols. 959–73; G. Holzherr, *Regula Ferioli, Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte und zur Sinndeutung der Benediktinerregel* (Einsiedlen, 1961).

In the Iberian peninsula in the seventh century, Fructuosus of Braga apparently felt it necessary to find biblical justification for the inclusion of Prime in his *Rule*.[1] At the other end of the monastic day, the office of Compline was apparently unknown to Cæsarius but appears in Aurelian's rules, where eight daytime offices are prescribed (making a total of nine in every twenty-four hour period).[2] It can be found in RB and RM and in the *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines*, and is also mentioned in *Expositio in Psalmos* of Cassiodorus.[3]

RB and RM, in fact, prescribe an identical number of offices: and both employ quotations from Psalm 118 in support of their schemes. De Vogüé believes that RB derives the overall structure of its day from RM – but the chronology of the introduction of both Prime and Compline makes his dating of the RM to the period 500–525 implausible. In the first place, other rules supposedly composed at that period – for example, the *Third Rule of the Fathers*[4] – mention neither office; and Cæsarius, who is the first writer ever to mention Prime and whose *Rule* was completed in 534, is somewhat tentative in the use of this new office – and is quite unaware of Compline. De Vogüé is well aware of the weakness of his own case where Prime is concerned – especially as he has to explain away the fact that RM appears more at home with Prime than does RB, written between 530 and the 550s, and he attempts to suggest that the area around Rome (his second location for the composition of RM) must have been considerably in advance of Gaul where the adoption of Prime is concerned.[5] This is all too clearly a circular argument and one for which there is no supporting evidence. (As for southern Italy, where de Vogüé originally

1. *Sancti Fructuosi Bracarensis Episcopi Regula Monachorum*, *PL* 87, cols. 1097–1130, esp. chapter ii, *De orationibus*, col. 1099 C–D.

2. *S Aureliani Regula ad Monachos*, *Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 68, 395, 406, where it is called *completa*. Heiming, 'Zum Monastischen Offizium', pp. 114–15.

3. *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 88, cols. 1053–70, 1059; Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalmos*, *PL* 70, col. 10; RB, chapters 16, 17, 32; RM, chapters 34, 42, 30. De Vogüé implies (*Règle de S Benoît*, ii. 585) that the Master's celebration of Compline in dormitory betrays a more antique usage, comparable to Cassian, but Cassian never mentions Compline as such, only bedside psalms (*Institutes*, Book iv). The extracts from RM contained in *Paris Lat* 12634 do not mention Prime – but they accompany the *Ordo Monasterii* attributed to Augustine which does not include Prime amongst its offices, though Compline (not included in the *Ordo Monasterii* either) has slipped in at fos. 36, 20; 37v, 1.

4. *Supra*, p. 578, n. 4.

5. De Vogüé concedes (*Règle de Saint Benoît*, v. 517) that 'Une acceptation assez sereine de prime suggère au premier abord que le Maître écrit *après* Benoît . . .' and suggests that the Master – writing near Rome, possibly at Subiaco (see vol. i. 11) – would therefore have been more at home with Prime than Benedict, who wrote at Monte Cassino, in a region slower to accept Prime. The arguments (referred to in *Règle de Saint Benoît*, v. 514) of G. Penco, 'L' opera di una seconda redazione nel c XVI della Regola Benedettina', *Benedictina*, vii (1953), 1–17, (see also F. Masai, 'La regula Magistri et l' histoire du bréviaire', *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L Cuniberti Mohlberg*, ii (*Bibliotheca Ephimerides Liturgicae* 23, Rome 1949), 423–39), which support the notion that RM's office predates RB's, are based on misapprehensions: that RB predates Cæsarius of Arles and that in RM c. 34 Matins = Nocturns, whereas in c. 33, Nocturns are called Vigils. Penco also seems to misread the passages concerning Prime and Vespers in c.34 and forgets that for Cæsarius, Prime was not a daily office.

located RM, it is interesting to note that in the 560s/70s, Cassiodorus – whose monastery of Vivarium was situated in Calabria – altered the list of offices in his *Expositio in Psalmos*, originally composed *c.* 548, in order to accommodate Prime).[1] De Vogüé also fails to recognize the possibility that RB derived his knowledge of Prime directly from Cæsarius of Arles: there are several reminiscences of Cæsarius in RB.[2] The office of Compline appears to make its debut at almost precisely the same time in southern Italy as in France – in the 540s or 550s. The remarkable coincidence between the structures of the two rules' liturgical day and the chronology of the development of the monastic office in the sixth century combine to demonstrate that RM cannot, despite de Vogüé's claims, significantly antedate RB. However, de Vogüé's dating of RM also takes into account the actual contents and structure of its offices, concluding that these are similar to those of the *ordo romanus vetus*, the older Roman liturgy before it was altered to the form used by RB, and therefore demonstrate RM's greater antiquity.[3] Can this be true?

Since the 1940s and 1950s liturgists have been in general agreement that the psalmody of RB's offices was heavily influenced by the practice of the major churches of Rome, where the liturgical service was performed by monks. It is believed that by either the late fifth or early sixth century these churches had abandoned their traditional psalmody, which had been based originally on the principle of the *psalterium currens*: this involves saying the psalms in order and when psalm 150 has been reached, commencing again. The traditional system had already undergone some modification in many regions – for example the introduction of Matins/Lauds led to the assigning of the so-called *Laudate* psalms (148–50) to this office. But in Rome the traditional system was abandoned altogether in favour of one based on the *psalterium per hebdomadam* or the saying of the psalter over the offices of one week, and RB's psalmody is based on this newer Roman system.[4]

1. M. Cappuyns, 'Cassiodore', *Dictionnaire d' Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*, xi (1949), cols. 1349–408, esp. 1356–7; G. Morin, 'L' ordre des heures canoniales dans les monastères de Cassiodore', *Rev. Bén.*, xliii (1931), 145–52; *Expositio in Psalmos*, *PL*, 70, cols. 895–56, col. 10.

2. F. Vandenbroucke, 'Sur les sources de la Règle bénédictine et *Regula Magistri*', *Rev. Bén.*, lxii (1952), 216–73; de Vogüé, 'La Règle de Cæsarius d' Arles pour des moines: un résumé de sa Règle pour des moniales', *RAM*, xlvii (1971), 369–406.

3. *Règle de Saint Benoît*, v. 483–554. De Vogüé's section on the weekly psalter itself (545–54) only looks at Benedict and the Roman psalter, but in the preceding pages constantly compares the individual offices of RM and RB with the 'classical' and 'pre-classical' Roman offices.

4. Heiming, 'Zum monastischen Offizium'; P. Nowack, 'Die Strukturelemente des Stundengebets der Regula Benedicti', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, xxvi (1984), 253–304; J. Mateos, 'The Origins of the Divine Office', *Worship*, xli (1967), 477–85; C. Gindele, 'Die Struktur der Nokturnen in den Lateinischen Mönchsregeln vor und um St Benedikt'; *Rev. Bén.*, lxiv (1954), 9–27; *idem*, 'Zur Geschichte von Form und Abhängikeit beim römischem und monastischem Brevier', *Rev. Bén.*, lxv (1955), 192–207; *idem*, 'Gestalt und Dauer des vorbenediktinisches Ordo Officii', *ibid.*, lxxi (1956), 3–13; *idem*, 'Die römische und monastische Überlieferung im Ordo Officii der Regel St Benedikts (kap, 8–20; 45 und 52)', *Studia Anselmiana*, xlii (1957), 171–222; *Règle de Saint Benoît*, i. 101–4 and v. 545–54.

In chapter eighteen of RB, Benedict assigns various psalms to various offices conceding that the actual disposition of the psalms may be altered by a successor only

> provided that he maintain absolutely the saying of the whole one hundred and fifty psalms every week and the perpetual recommencement *a caput* [*sic*] at Sunday vigils.[1]

This is certainly quite different from RM's system, which constantly instructs that his monks are always to go through the psalter in order *currente semper psalterio*: there is no mention of a weekly psalter (which represents a much reduced psalmody by RM's standards, although RB's offices are filled out by hymns, readings, collects and prayers) nor, with the exception of Lauds, do any offices have set psalms.[2]

To compare RM's psalmody only with that of RB lends the former an impression of archaism which is quite misleading. The *psalterium currens* was not only the basis of Roman basilical churches' older liturgy but was also the traditional monastic psalter. The Desert Fathers, according to Benedict's own account of them were veritable Stakhanovites of the psalter, sometimes working their way through it in less than a single day.[3] From at least the time of Cassian onwards, the tendency was to assign a set number of psalms to each office: but neither this, nor the growing number of offices among which the psalms were distributed, nor even the custom of assigning specific 'appropriate' psalms to Lauds disturbed the fundamental rule that once the psalter was completed, it was begun again. Amongst monastic rules, RB is unique in abandoning the tradition of the *psalterium currens*. In this Benedict stands apart, not only from his predecessors, or his contemporaries such as Cæsarius and Aurelian, who instruct that antiphons be sung *de ordine psalterii*,[4] but also from his successors, the monastic legislators of the later sixth and seventh centuries. The *Rule* of Ferreol, composed in the later sixth century, specifies that 'at all times psalms are to be sung in order to the end of the Psalter' (*ut omni tempore psalmi usque ad finem Psalterii in ordine decantentur*).[5] Neither the *Regula Tarnatensis* (late sixth century), nor the *Rules* of Columbanus, of Donatus of Besançon, of Fructuosus of Braga (d. 656) and of Isidore of Seville (d. 636) follow RB in assigning specific psalms

1. RB, chapter 18, 22–4. I hope to return to the question of Benedict's liturgical instructions on a later occasion.

2. RM, chapter 33, verses 29 and 36; chapters 35, 2; 36, 1; 40, 2; 41, 2; 44, 2 and 7; 46, 1; 39, 4.

3. RB, chapter 18, 24–5

4. Heiming, 'Zum monastischen Offizium', pp. 117–18.

5. *S Ferreoli Uticensis Episcopi Regula ad Monachos*, *PL* 66, col. 964 A.

to all their offices.[1] While RM's *psalterium currens* may appear old-fashioned when compared only with RB, it is RB's own psalmody which represents an anomaly in general monastic terms and RM's instructions could just as easily have been composed after RB as before.

Taking all the evidence into account, there are no indications that RM antedates RB. On the contrary, its psalmody is as appropriate to the late sixth and seventh centuries as to the early sixth, and the organization of RM's daily offices reveals that the earliest possible date of composition is *c.* 540–50. The other evidence offered by de Vogüé in an attempt to locate it in the pre-Benedictine period is in itself inconclusive and becomes singularly unconvincing when viewed against the background of liturgical developments. Moreover there exists a significant body of evidence which indicates that RM cannot have been composed before the latter part of the sixth century.

A small but telling number of similarities exists between RM and the monastic legislation and sermons of Columbanus. RM describes in detail a curious ceremony in which the weekly kitchen servers gather up the crumbs left at the end of each meal and once a week make them up into a kind of cake which is then served to the monks as a 'blessing'. Compare this with the enigmatic comment in Columbanus' *Regula coenobialis* (taken up also by Donatus of Besançon):

> let him who has lost the crumbs be corrected by prayer in church.[2]

There is also a striking similarity between the phrase

> unity in Trinity and Trinity in unity[3]

in Columbanus' first sermon or *Instructio* and the opening of RM's *Ars Sancta* or sacred art which the abbot should teach his disciples. The *Ars Sancta* is virtually identical to RB's *Instruments of Good Works*, apart from the inclusion of a creed strongly reminiscent of Columbanus':

> to believe, confess and fear God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, one God in Trinity and three in unity, three in the unique substance of the deity and one in the threefold power of majesty.[4]

De Vogüé – evidently conscious of the difficulty of arguing that Benedict rejected a creed – states that it cannot have been present in his hypothetical 'primitive' redaction of RM (see *supra* p. 568) but offers no concrete evidence to support his assertion. Aside from the fact that it is used by Columbanus, the creed itself constitutes a potential obstacle to

1. *Regula Monasterii Tarnatensis*, *PL* 66, 973–86; Columbanus, *Monastic Rule*, ed. Walker, pp. 122–43; *Donati Regula ad Virgines*, *PL* 87, cols. 273–98; *Sancti Fructuosi Bracarensis Episcopi Regula Monachorum*, *PL* 87, cols. 1097–1110; *Sancti Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Regula Monachorum*, *PL* 103, cols. 553–72.

2. RM, chapter 23, 33–9 and chapter 25; Columbanus *Communal Rule*, ii, ed. Walker, 146–7; Donatus, *PL* 87, col. 283

3. *Instructio*, i, ed. Walker, 60–1.

4. RM, chapter 3, 1.

acceptance of de Vogüé's arguments, as the expression 'three in unity' resembles closely the Trinitarian thought expressed in the *Breviarum* of Cæsarius of Arles (d. 542) and of the *Quicumque vult*, a creed which probably originated in his circle. The earliest surviving manuscript containing the symbol actually comes from Bobbio, Columbanus' Italian foundation and is written in an Irish hand; and the 'one in the threefold power of majesty' recalls the '*trigeminam maiestatem*' of the Briton Faustus of Riez (d. *c.* 490), whose influence can be found elsewhere in Columbanus' work.[1]

But the most significant area of resemblance between Columbanus and RM lies in the basis of their liturgical organization. Both calculate systems of psalmody which increase the number of psalms sung at winter Nocturns and decrease them in summer. Columbanus' system is simpler than that of RM: he introduces an elaborate system of gradations for the 'holy nights' of Saturday and Sunday but a simple summer–winter differentiation for other nights, while RM's gradations apply to all nights. But definitive proof of Irish influence on RM lies not just in the fact that like Columbanus' *Regula Monachorum*, it uses the spring and autumn equinoxes as the pivotal points of this system (so that the system of psalmody begun at the equinox either peaks or reaches its lowest point at the solstices) but in its dating of the spring equinox – *VIII Kal Aprilis* or 25 March. This is the day indicated by Columbanus himself and was part of the Irish system of calculating the date of Easter, a system discarded centuries earlier in Italy and Gaul where 21 March was recognized as the date of the spring equinox.[2]

The use of the Irish dating of the spring equinox in combination with the other parallels and similarities indicates that it was Columbanus or Columbanian practice which influenced RM – and not the reverse. That we are not dealing with a few later accretions, as de Vogüé attempted to suggest in the case of the creed, is evident from the way in which these resemblances are present in more than one area of the rule and form part of its liturgical organization.[3] Where and when, therefore, was RM composed? It is still an enigma: its overall approach

1. J. N. D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed* (London, 1964), p. 35: there is 'every probability' that this creed was composed in the circle of Cæsarius of Arles; and *ibid.*, p. 16; Faustus, *CSEL* xxi. 106; Walker, p. 69.

2. Columbanus, *Monastic Rule*, chapter vii, ed. Walker, pp. 128–33, esp. 128–31. RM, chapters 28, verses 28 and 29; 33, 10 and 27; 44, 5; 50, 9 and 39; 59, 1. See also P. Blanchard, 'La Règle du Maître et la Règle de Saint Benoît', *Rev. Bén.*, lx (1950) 25–64, esp. 39–42, who argues that RM was composed in Bobbio. But see *infra*, p. 586, n.2.

3. Such Irish influence indicates that RM is a product of the latter part of the sixth century. Although there may be isolated cases of Irish pilgrims arriving and settling on the Continent at a slightly earlier date (for instance at Rheims), the beginnings of real Irish monastic influence on the Continent came in the second half of the sixth century, after the great period of monastic foundation and expansion in Ireland itself. J. Ryan, *Irish Monasticism* (2nd edn., Dublin, 1971), pp. 96 ff., and J. F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: vol. i, Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929), pp. 183–209; A. Tommasini, *Irish Saints in Italy*, trans. F. Scanlan (London 1937), pp. 101–27; 265–79; 360–77.

is completely different to that of Columbanus, who is dry, brief and allusive and often, in common with other, later Irish rules, states ascetic principles rather than give detailed instructions. RM is loquacious sometimes to the point of garrulity in an extension – modern scholars would undoubtedly say an exaggeration or deformation – of the type of legislative mentality found in RB. The question of its origins is confused by the way it demonstrates certain characteristics common to both southern France and Italy. The creed of the *Ars Sancta* appears to derive from the French *Quicumque vult*, yet Columbanus' use of this formula is regarded as reflecting his anti-Arian activity in Italy (and the earliest surviving MS to contain the creed comes from Bobbio).[1] *Sexagesima*, RM's period of pre-Lenten preparation is first seen in the *Rules* of Cæsarius of Arles and there are also, as de Vogüé admits, 'remarkable' parallels between some aspects of the liturgy of Aurelian of Arles and that of RM.[2] However, *sexagesima* also appeared in Milan around the same time as it did in France.[3] The wording of RM's extracts from RB resembles that of the 'interpolated' MS tradition: in other words, it is related to a group of MSS of RB which includes one Italian MS – but also to the version of RB used by both Donatus of Besançon and Chrodegang of Metz in their compilations.[4] However, other elements are more suggestive of northern Italian origin. RM's use of the *Lives* of Saints Anastasia, Eugenia, Sebastian and Sylvester has been characterized by de Vogüé as evidence of Roman (or, originally, southern Italian) origin; but while the *Passio Eugeniae* was a work popular throughout large areas of Europe, the *Acts* of Sebastian state that he was educated in Milan and the work forms part of the pseudo-Ambrosian corpus.[5] When RM quotes from the Psalms, it appears to be using a 'Roman' psalter invaded by other elements, a mixture considered by some authorities to be characteristic of northern Italian psalters of the sixth–seventh centuries.[6] Some aspects of its language appear to link RM with Lombard Italy.[7] More circumstantial evidence also suggests that we should perhaps seek RM's background in northern Italy. Comparison with the *Rule* of Donatus of Besançon

1. Walker, p. 61; Kelly, pp. 16, 35.
2. *Règle de S Benoît*, v. 502.
3. Blanchard, 'Règle du Maître', pp. 37–9.
4. Theresia Payr, 'Der Magistertext in der Überlieferungsgeschicte der Benediktinerregel', *Studia Anselmiana*, xliv (1959), 1–84. The resemblances between RM and the 'interpolated' as opposed to the 'pure' texts of RB were also pointed out by Hanslik in his first edition of RB. De Vogüé upholds the authenticity of the 'pure' group of MSS of RB as the nearest to Benedict's original, without apparently perceiving how awkward the relationship of RM to the interpolated group is for his thesis of RM's priority. The relative status of the 'pure' and 'interpolated' groups is not of major significance for the arguments advanced here.
5. *Règle du Maître*, i. 225–7; but in *Règle de Saint Benoît* he placed it nearer Rome – in Subiaco, where Benedict could have found it, vol. i. 308–14; and also 'La Règle du Maître et les Dialogues de S Grégoire', *RHE*, lxi (1966), 44–76; *AASS* Ian II 621 ff. for Sebastian.
6. Blanchard, pp. 25–30.
7. E. Franceschini, 'La polemica sull' originalità della Regola di S Benedetto', *Aevum*, xxiii (1949), 52–72, and 'Un contributo linguistico allo studio della "Regula Magistri" ', *ibid.*, xxvi (1952), 571–2.

reveals that, while Donatus virtually copies Columbanus' liturgical system, he does not give the actual date of the equinox. We know that when, in the 620s, Agrestius levelled his accusations of 'Irish' practice against the monks of Luxeuil, he did not mention use of the Irish equinoctial date, so we can presume that, despite Columbanus' aggressive defence of Irish usages, Luxeuil had, under pressure, abandoned the Irish equinox. The fact that this date is mentioned in RM suggests that its knowledge of Columbanian practice may have been acquired in northern Italy, far from the influence of the French bishops who had attacked Columbanus. RM's lack of specific reference to Columbanus' penitential system (although it mentions the crumbs, which appear in the penitential provisions of the *Cenobitic Rule*, RM prescribes a different penalty for the monk who loses them) may also indicate Italian origins as it has been suggested that no copy of the *Regula Coenobialis* was taken into Italy.[1]

Internal evidence, therefore, suggests that in RM we are dealing with a rule possibly of French origin, but more probably composed in northern Italy, perhaps in an area with strong connections with France. The conclusions of those who have examined the two earliest MSS of RM support the thesis of Italian origin. Although neither of the two would appear to be the original MS of the rule, both Lowe and Masai suggest that they are Italian, though they fail to agree on region: Masai offers a now-unacceptable attribution to Vivarium while Lowe refuses to commit himself to any particular area (see Appendix 2). At the moment, there is no firm agreement, either, on the date of these MSS. Lowe and Masai (see Appendix 2) both suggest dates of very late sixth and seventh century for the two MSS but take opposing positions on the question of which is the earlier of the two. A dating to the late sixth century would certainly be a little too early for an Italian work influenced by Columbanus, who only crossed the Alps in 612 and settled at Bobbio in Liguria in 613. But Masai himself admits that it is impossible to assign a precise date to MSS of the period from the mid-sixth to the mid-seventh century on the basis of script alone. His attempts to do so by the alternative method of examining the ornamentation of the two MSS can appear at once both too sweeping and too precise, while between the 1920s and the 1950s, Lowe completely revised his opinion about their dates. In the face of such major difficulties and hesitations, it does not seem unreasonable to say that the attribution of either MS to the end of the sixth century is still very far from certain. While we cannot at this stage completely dismiss the theory that one of the two MSS might date to the closing years of the sixth century and that the Irish influence present in it derives not from Columbanus but from one of the earlier waves of Irish monastic pilgrims to reach northern Italy, such as the obscure Bishop Orso

1. Walker, p. xxxiii; pp. xlix–lii.

of Aosta or the only slightly less shadowy St Frediano of Lucca, the presumption of direct Columbanian influence must remain overwhelmingly strong. Although Frediano is reputed to have founded the monastery in Lucca which is named after him (and which followed a 'special' liturgy) and Orso was reputedly involved in a struggle against Arianism, these are obscure and disputed figures,[1] while Columbanus is the dominant figure in Irish monasticism on the continent and the composer of the earliest surviving Irish monastic rule, a work which had an enormous impact on Europe in the seventh century. Moreover, Bobbio became the centre of a large nexus of *cellae*, hospitals and *xenodochia* in northern Italy, through which knowledge of Columbanian practice could easily have been disseminated. The early history of several Ligurian monasteries – houses situated in an area of northern Italy near both Bobbio and southern France – has been lost as a result of the Magyar invasions of the tenth century and RM may have originated in one of these.[2] Much more work needs to be done in order to date and locate RM with any precision: both internal evidence, such as the Lenten observance of the *Regula Quadragesimalis* (chapters 51–3),[3] which may have locatable origins, and the manuscripts of RM themselves demand further and careful examination – as does the question of the transmission and knowledge of RM's major source and inspiration, RB.

What does all this add to our view of early medieval monasticism? It has obvious implications for the question of Benedict's sources and originality. And if we regard RM as a *regula mixta* and compare it with Donatus' *Rule for Nuns* and the *Cuiusdam Patris Regula ad Virgines*, we can add to our understanding of the way in which RB was viewed in the century or so after its composition. On the one hand, the significant Benedictine content of all three confirms the traditional perception of RB as rule *discretione praecipuam sermone luculentem*: despite omissions and, in RM's case, additions, they incorporate sections of its ascetic doctrine or the description of the four types of monk or its teaching on the abbot and community. These are the areas where Benedict, though often reworking earlier sources, displays his greatest originality of vision. Although there are many places where RM adds

1. Tommasini, pp. 265–71; 366–7; 370–3.

2. A. Maestri, *Il culto di san Colombano in Italia* (*Biblioteca Storica Piacentina*, xxv, 1955), pp. 147–52. The manner and date of the introduction of RB into Bobbio itself is still controversial – the bull of May 643 which alludes to the use of a mixed rule is now considered to be a later forgery. See C. Cipolla (ed.), *Codice diplomatico del monastero di S Colombano di Bobbio*, i (*Fonti per la storia d' Italia*, 52, Rome, 1918), 47–52. In any case, it seems highly unlikely, *pace* Blanchard, that, if a mixed usage were introduced at Bobbio, it would resemble RM – the Columbanian content of the latter is less significant than that of the *Rule* of Donatus of Besançon.

3. This section has its own *incipit* and *explicit* and each chapter is prefaced by the usual *Respondit Dominus per magistrum* but not by the usual *Interrogatio discipulorum*: it may have existed independently before its incorporation into RM. The mean sentence-length is, at over 33, a little higher than that of RM as a whole, but is not outside its range. (See Appendix 1.)

to or alters RB's text – for instance in its directions on abbatial succession – RB's clarity and insight provide RM's basis and inspiration. But while the significance of RB in *regulae mixtae* and the important rôle which such compilations played in disseminating knowledge of Benedict has been much discussed, less attention has been paid to the areas in which RB's prescriptions were not necessarily regarded as definitive and where there were attractive alternatives: for instance, Donatus, writing for nuns, preferred to follow Cæsarius' community structures, specifically designed for a nunnery and both he and *Cuiusdam Patris* incorporate elements of Columbanus' penitential system.

However, it is the liturgical dimension of both RM and Donatus (*Cuiusdam Patris ad Virgines* gives no detailed liturgical provisions) which is particularly intriguing. Neither appears ready to accept Benedict's weekly psalter. While Columbanus provides the smallest contribution to Donatus in quantitative terms, it is a very important one, furnishing Donatus not only with elements of a penitential system but also with his entire liturgy, based on the traditional *psalterium currens*.[1] RM reproduces many of RB's chapter-headings on the liturgy and has the same number of offices as RB, but substitutes the monastically more conventional *psalterium currens* for RB's *psalterium per hebdomadam*. It is not clear at the moment whether this attitude was characteristic of or persistent in northern Italy, as we do not yet have either an exact date or location for the composition of RM or a precise picture of the spread of RB within Italy. But the idea that RB's liturgy was regarded as unconventional in some quarters would help to explain several episodes in the ecclesiastical history of the seventh–ninth centuries. A charter issued in the 660s by Bishop Drauscius for the Soissons convent dedicated to the Virgin not only stipulates that the nuns are to follow Benedict and Columbanus (and any other rules which future bishops may deem suitable) but also specifically prescribes, as if this were something unusual or requiring legislation, the use of the Benedictine *cursus*.[2] Perhaps it is not mere coincidence that one of the nuns of the Soissons convent was Sigrada, mother of Bishop Leodegar of Autun (663–79), who attempted to impose the use of RB by decree on his diocese.[3] But not everyone appears to have shared Leodegar's enthusiasm for RB. While both Boniface and the Carolingians did, their eighth-century legislation prescribing the use of RB on its own appears to have been more successful in areas where there were no powerful existing monastic traditions than in those older Gaulish houses where the heritage of Lérins, Luxeuil, and the *laus perennis* of Agaune or St Marcel, Châlon survived.[4] Semmler suggests a connection between Carolingian efforts to import a Roman liturgical standard for

1. Donatus, chapter 75; *PL* 87, col. 296.
2. *PL* 83, cols. 1183–4.
3. F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 85, 106, 129, 176, 295–6.
4. J. Semmler, 'Pippin III und die fränkischen Klöster', *Francia*, iii (1975), 133.

the churches and cathedrals of the empire and their attempts to impose RB with its similar, Roman-derived liturgy on all monasteries.[1] Whatever the truth of this observation, it is certainly the case that Benedict was often perceived as distinctively 'Roman'. The layman Venerandus, in prescribing RB for his monastery of *Altaripa* in the 620s, described its writer as 'abbas Romensis'; and the *Ratio de cursus qui fuerunt eius auctores*, probably written in the late eighth century by a monk from an Irish-influenced house in northern Italy, comments that Benedict's *cursus* differs little from that of Rome.[2] As such, it must have represented an innovation in many older houses, including some which already used other sections of RB in their rules. The wording of the canons of the Aachen synod of 816 suggests that the Carolingians were still, in the ninth century, striving to ensure that this *cursus* was followed everywhere. After prescribing that RB should be read, studied and, if possible, committed to memory, the third clause – of thirty-six – states that the office should be celebrated according to what is contained in the *Rule* of St Benedict.[3] There must be a strong presumption that, whatever the recognized merits of RB, its liturgical provisions were not always acceptable and that on one level RM represents an attempt to come to terms with this.

But there is much more than this to RM. Up to now scholars have taken an almost entirely negative view of the work: the great monastic historians of an earlier era – none of whom doubted for a moment that RM was a later and inferior adaptation of RB – criticized its 'barbarous' Latin and spirit.[4] Although Genestout argued in his own defence that it was a source worthy of being used by Benedict and de Vogüé commended its stylistic variety, the prevailing attitude to emerge from recent controversy was summed up by Justin McCann when he excoriated its 'rhapsodies and absurdities'. Another writer expressed the pious hope that for the sake of the good name of monasticism no house would ever be found where RM was followed, and more recently Southern has derided RM's orders that monks were to avoid coughing, spitting or sneezing on the angels who, as Scripture testifies, stand before them in choir![5] This gibe both ignores the preoccupation of many monastic customaries with the problem of the monk who coughs

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 138–44.

2. Prinz, pp. 267–8; K. Hallinger (ed.), *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*, i (Siegburg, 1963), 91.

3. *Ibid.*, no. 20: *Synodi Primae Aquisgranensis Decreta Authentica* (816), p. 458.

4. A. Genestout, 'La Règle du Maître et la Règle de S Benoît' (53–4, n.5): 'Leurs arguments se réduisent à une appréciation sévère, mais que n' appuie aucune démonstration précise, de la mauvaise latinité et de l' infériorité d' esprit du Maître ... ces traits ... leur ont paru suffisants pour imposer la date plus tardive de sa règle ...'

5. Genestout, 'La Règle du Maître n' était-elle pas digne d' être utilisée par S Benoît?' *Studia Monastica*, lxi (1947–8), 77–92; de Vogüé, *Règle du Maître*, i. 196; J. McCann, 'The Master and St Benedict', *Ampleforth Journal*, lxiv (1959), 8–17, 17; and R. Weber, 'Le chapitre des portiers dans la Règle de S Benoît et dans celle du Maître', *Mélanges Bénédictines* (S. Wandrille, 1947), p. 232; Southern, *Western Society and the Church*, p. 222.

or sneezes in choir and the fact that Benedict himself broaches the subject of demeanour in choir, quoting from Psalm 137, *In conspectu angelorum psallam tibi.*[1] Medieval authors were less ready to dismiss RM. Although it never seems to have enjoyed widespread circulation – the fact that it is extremely long, about four times the length of RB, would alone ensure this – it was clearly not regarded as either eccentric or outmoded in the monastic world of the eighth and ninth centuries. Benedict of Aniane included it in his *Codex Regularum* and the author of the *Scarapsus* attributed to Pirmin, the founder of Reichenau, quotes from RM's *Ars Sancta* rather than from RB's *Instruments of Good Works*. At Corbie, where its earliest MSS arrived *c.* 700 AD, it may even have been regarded as an extended version of RB as the house does not seem to have possessed a copy of the latter.[2] Some of its provisions are paralleled in the eighth-century customary known as the *Memoriale Qualiter*.[3] RM may indeed lack the sobriety and clarity of Benedict, but even its very triviality can be revealing and in places its displays a degree of psychological acuity. The prefacing of most chapters by an *Interrogatio discipulorum* or disciples' question followed by the solemn introduction *Respondit Dominus per Magistrum* – 'God replied through the Master' – not only echoes Basil in its use of the question-and-answer method but surely aims, by invoking divine sanction, at eliminating or at least minimizing any dissent. The author's obsessions provide us with some of the most striking passages in the rule: to RB's brief and icily contemptuous treatment of the gyrovagues, pseudo-monks who wander from house to house, RM adds several pages of bitterly facetious invective, describing their *gulosae ambulatio* or gourmandizing promenade. This passage appears to owe its force to personal experience as RM later lays down that no visitor be allowed to remain in the house without working, a measure designed to deter such idle and greedy riff-raff from taking advantage of monastic hospitality.[4] Elsewhere, we are permitted a glimpse into the popular religious literature and eschatology of the period. RM's twelve 'steps of humility' lead to a remarkably sensual paradise borrowed almost literally from the *Passio Sebastiani*:

> in which there are red roses which never fade, flowery groves are green in a perpetual springtime, the ever-fresh fields are watered by streams of honey. Plants with saffron flowers give off their perfume and the fields exhale

1. *PL* 89, cols. 1069–70; *Memoriale Qualiter* c. i. *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*, i. 232; Cassian, *Institutes* ii. 10; *Ambrose De Virginibus* 3, 13, *PL* 16, col. 223; E. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, iii. 849–50; RB 19, 5.

2. *PL* 88, cols. 943–1052; Angenendt, *Monachi Peregrini*, p. 73; D. Ganz, 'Corbie and Neustrian Monastic Culture', pp. 339–47 in vol. ii of *La Neustrie. Colloque historique internationale publié par Hartmut Atsma* (Sigmaringen, 1989), p. 340: 'The absence of a Corbie copy of the RB suggests the speculation that the RM was seen as a fuller version of that rule'.

3. *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*, i. 176–261.

4. RM 1, verses 6–74 – inspired by RB 1 and also by his source Cassian, *Conference* 18: see Appendix 3 for RM, RB and Cassian. RM 78 for the regulation on work.

> the pleasing odours with which they are filled. There, the nostrils inhale breezes bearing eternal life; there there is light without shade, sky without cloud and the eyes enjoy perpetual day without the shadows of the night. There nothing hinders enjoyment and no cares come to disturb the peace. Bellowings, howlings, groans, lamentations and complaints are never heard or mentioned there; absolutely nothing is seen which is ugly, deformed, hideous, unpleasant or dirty. Beauty reigns in the charm of the groves, splendour in the pleasant air; the ever-open eyes are filled by beauty and elegance and the ears hear absolutely nothing which might disturb the mind. For there sound the instruments which accompany the hymns sung to the king by the angels and archangels . . . as soon as the soul wishes for anything, its desire is instantly fulfilled.[1]

Modern commentators would doubtless prefer to consign enthusiasm for this garden of delights to a pre-Benedictine era: but such works were popular and another post-RB rule, the *Regula Ferreoli*, prescribes that they be read in the monastery on the anniversaries of martyrs' deaths.[2] Unfairly dismissed as eccentric and 'primitive', RM may yet, on the contrary, prove to be a valuable guide to the *mentalités* of the religious world in the period after Benedict. Not only the lengthiest of all medieval monastic rules, it is also undoubtedly the liveliest. Its rehabilitation is surely long overdue.

University of Glasgow MARILYN DUNN

Appendix 1

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE-LENGTH IN RB AND RM

A random sample of sentences from the later section of the RM (chapters 11–95) was taken, the number of words measured and the mean and standard deviation of the sample was taken. A random sample of the Prologue, Thema and Chapters 1–10 was also taken and the same figures calculated. The differences between the means were calculated and, using standard statistical texts, checked for significance. The results are contained in the table. A similar exercise was carried out for RB, where a random sample of sentences in the Prologue and chapters 1–7 was compared with a random sample of chapters 8–73. The results are also contained in the table.

As the table shows, both samples from RM have longer mean sentence-lengths than both the samples from RB. However, taking the Null Hypothesis that both parts of each rule were written by the same

1. RM, chapter 10, 94–115, based on the *Passio Sebastiani*, *PL* 17, cols. 1117–19. The above translation is necessarily approximate.
2. *S Ferreoli Uticiensis Regula ad Monachos*, *PL* 66, cap. xviii. col. 965.

author, and testing for .05 significance, it would require a z-score of over 1.64 to reject this hypothesis. In both cases, the z-score is well below this figure, so the hypothesis that both parts of each rule were written by the same author cannot be rejected.

chapters	*number of sentences in sample*	*mean sentence length*	*standard deviation*	*standardized normal deviation or z-score*
RM 11–95	50	30.06	14.46	.81
RM P, T, 1–10	50	27.32	18.88	
RB 8–73	50	22.14	10.29	.58
RB P, 1–7	50	23.29	17.40	

Notes:

$$z = \frac{|x_1 - x_2|}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}\right)}}$$

where

x_1 = mean sentence-length of first sample
s_1 = standard deviation of first sample
n_1 = size of first sample
x_2 = mean sentence-length of second sample
s_2 = standard deviation of second sample
n_2 = size of second sample

Appendix 2

THE TWO OLDEST MSS OF RM

Paris Lat 12634 (= E) originally formed one codex with MS Leningrad Publ Lib Q v I 5: the most extensive survey of its composition and contents along with Paris Lat 12205 (= P), is given by Vanderhoven, Masai and Corbett (*Règle du Maître Edition Diplomatique*), pp. 1–113.

(a) *Dating*

There is no consensus of opinion. Older estimates of E (see Verheijen (*Règle de saint Augustin*, i. 112) range from the late sixth to the eighth century. E. A. Lowe, 'Some facts about our oldest Latin manuscripts', *The Classical Quarterly*, xix (1925), 197–208, assessed E as very late sixth-century/very early seventh, P as seventh-century; similarly, for the RM section of E, Genestout, 'Le plus ancien témoin manuscrit de la Règle du Maître: le Parisinus Latin 12634', *Scriptorium*, i (1946–7), 129–42. But see Lowe (2), *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol. v (Oxford,

1950), 33, 36, where P is reassessed as late sixth/early seventh-century, E as seventh-century (and the first 8 folios dated to the second half of seventh century). Payr, p. 1, n. 3, cites both Lowe (2) and Genestout.

Masai, pp. 1–118, places the script of the two MSS between 546 and 669 and ornamentation of E ('hardiment' – p. 59) towards the end of the sixth century and P *c.* 600; followed by de Vogüé, *Règle du Maître*, i. 125–6.

Masai's own description of the section of E containing excerpts from RM etc. suggests (by its descriptions of the ink and the extent of its ornamentation) that there is a possibility that it may have been copied later than the section of the codex which now follows it (pp. 26–32), although he himself assumes (p. 59) that the greater part of the codex is late sixth-century. His attempts (pp. 53–60) to date the letter-ornamentation of E by reference to other MSS of the late sixth century are based on the very few surviving MSS and are characterized by a desire to achieve an unrealistic degree of precision: for instance (p. 56) he dates a MS which contains the *Complexiones of* Cassiodorus to *c.* 580 ('it cannot be earlier than about 580' – but Cassiodorus died *c.* 580), claims that it is probably the original and then goes on to argue that PL 12634, which shares a similar type of ornamentation, dates from the end of the century. This assumes a great deal concerning the process of transmission of artistic fashion and the area and circumstances in which both MSS were copied. There are problems, too, with Lowe's second version of the date of P: the painted initial on fo. 53r of P may indicate that it is later rather than earlier than E and it is not clear why he has reversed his original dating of the two MSS.

(b) *Area of origin*

Vanderhoven, Masai and Corbett, and Lowe all place P and E in Italy. Masai, p. 66 urges that P belongs to a group of MSS of 'practically certain' Vivarian origin such as Leningrad Public Library Q v I 6–10: quoted by de Vogüé (*Règle du Maître*, i. 125–7, who also cites A. Mundó, 'La nouvelle édition critique de la RB', *Rev. Bén.*, lxxi (1961), 388, n. 2 in favour of a possible Roman origin. (At this stage, de Vogüé himself believed that RM was composed in the region of Capua.) But both A. Petrucci, 'Scrittura e libro nell'Italia altomedioevale', *Studi Medievali,* 3rd ser., x (1969), 183, and D. Ganz, 'The Merovingian Library of Corbie' in *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism*, pages 153–72, esp. pages 157–8 reject the too-convenient attribution to Vivarium of the Leningrad MS.

(c) *Provenance*

Masai indicates (pp. 35–42) librarians' inscriptions, marginalia and pen-trials which suggest that P and E arrived at Corbie by the 730s; Ganz (p. 170) gives the date of arrival as *c.* 700 AD. Masai (p. 40) also points to possible Luxeuil connections.

Appendix 3

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RB AND RM, AND BETWEEN RB, RM AND CASSIAN

There are great similarities between RM and RB in the opening stages of the two rules. The section of the RM extending from his introductory *Commentary on the Psalms* 2 in de Vogüé's edition (vol. i. 319) to the end of chapter 10 resembles (with some variants, notably chapters 1, 10–12, 15–92 (satire on the gyrovagues); chapter 2 on calling the brethren to council, where there are some similarities but also marked differences; chapters 3, 1 and 80–95; chapters 4 and 5) part of the *Prologue* and chapters 1–7 of RB: 'On the four kinds of monks'; 'What the abbot ought to be'; 'On calling the brethren to council'; 'What are the instruments of good works'; 'On obedience'; 'On silence'; 'On humility' (= the steps of humility). After chapter 7 of RB and chapter 10 of RM, there are many striking parallels but these tend to be relatively brief – e.g. the chapter-headings of RB 19 and RM 47 (*De disciplina psallendi*); RB 20 and RM 48 (*De reverentia orationis*); RB 23 and RM 12 (excommunication for faults); RB 31 and RM 16 (the cellarer – almost identical); RB 32 and RM 17 (the tools and goods of the monastery); RB 33 and RM 82 (that no one in the monastery should have private property – very similar); RB 35 and RM 18 (on the weekly kitchen-servers); RB 36 and RM 69 (on sick brethren – very close); RB 38 and RM 24 ('On the weekly readers' – RM adds 'at the tables'); RB 39 and RM 26 (*De mensura cibi*); RB 40 and RM 27 (*De mensura potus*); and so on including headings on silence after Compline; daily work; wardrobe and shoes; the sons of nobles who seek admission; and the priests who live in the monastery. But in these latter sections of the two rules, the fact that titles are similar or identical does not mean that the content of the chapters is the same: it often differs substantially and even in sections where there are resemblances not only between the chapter-headings but in other material there can be very significant divergences between the authors' instructions and intentions. Thus, although RB and RM use almost the same words for bedding (RB 55, 15 and RM 81, 29–31), their dormitories are organized in different ways (RB 22, RM 29); and although there are similarities in the amount of food and drink prescribed and in the fact that both appoint weekly readers to the refectory, their seasons of fasting and the organization of their refectories differ. Some verbal – or quotational – similarities are mixed with divergences in matters of divine office, profession and elsewhere. RM changes RB's directions on abbatial succession.

It is often said that RM's quotations from Cassian are in places closer to the original than RB's and might therefore indicate that he is closer,

chronologically, to Cassian. This was first raised by Genestout ('La Règle du Maître et la règle de S. Benoît', pp. 60–1), who originally concluded that Cassian was dependent on the Master! De Vogüé (*Règle de S Benoît*, i. 267–70) first puts forward the notion that RM depends directly on Cassian, then expresses caution, and finally (in dealing with RM's supposed liturgical debt to Cassian) comes down again in favour of a direct relationship between Cassian and RM. In fact, both RB's and RM's close literary dependence on Cassian is comparatively limited, but occurs at crucial points – the sections on humility (RB chapter 7 and RM chapter 10, Cassian, *Institutes*, 4, 39) and the description of the four kinds of monks (RB and RM chapter 1, Cassian, *Conference*, 18). There are instances where the RM is closer to Cassian than is Benedict: RM 10, 52, *patientiae constantiam*, cf. *Inst*, 4, 39, 2, and RB 7, 35; RM 10, 66 *praebentur*, cf. *Inst*, 4, 39, 2 and RB 7, 49; RM 10, 89–90, *amore ipsius ... bonae*, cf. *Inst*, 4, 39, 3 and RB 7, 68–9; RM 1,10 *cellas* cf. *Conference* 18, 7, *cellulas*. But these consist of occasional words or phrases, and those who argue for RM's direct dependence on Cassian ignore the more substantial instances where he differs from Cassian – and coincides with Benedict. It could be argued that RM's author used RB and then, recognizing its source – not always quoted accurately – turned to the original as well. Thus, while RB and the RM both have twelve steps of humility, Cassian has only ten, with contents and order differing in several places from both. Cassian begins by listing three types of monks, later adding a fourth – but these are *not* the gyrovagues and the RM's impassioned denunciation could easily depend on RB for its original inspiration and only then on Cassian.