Faculty Publications

2018

# The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, the Rule of the Master, and the Rule of Benedict

Brandon W. Hawk

*Rhode Island College*, bhawk@ric.edu

## Citation

THE *GOSPEL OF PSEUDO-MATTHEW*, THE *RULE OF THE MASTER*, AND THE *RULE OF BENEDICT*[*]

In the apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, a striking depiction is given of Mary's life in the Temple as a virgin ascetic.[1] The text describes her as living "in contubernium uirginum" (4:1: "in the company of virgins") and following a "sibi... regulam statuerat" (6:2: "rule she had set for herself"). The rest of chapter six lays out the details of her daily observances, including a routine of prayer and labor within the general framework of devotion to God not unlike monastic life. While it is clear that this particular apocryphon was compiled as an expanded Latin adaptation based on the Greek *Protevangelium of James*,[2] the description of Mary's ascetic life in *Pseudo-Matthew* 6 is one of the most significant divergences from the source. This scene, in fact, has sparked substantial commentary, especially about its relationship to monastic asceticism in the early medieval period.

The present article is a contribution to knowledge about the associations between *Pseudo-Matthew* and early medieval monasticism, particularly the *Rule of the Master* (RM) and the *Rule of Benedict* (RB).[3] The latter has long been accepted as a source for the depiction of Mary's

---

[*] Forthcoming in *Revue bénédictine*.

[1] *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols., Subsidia Hagiographica 6 (Brussels, 1898-1901), nos. 5334-42; and Maurits Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1992), no. 51. Quotations are from *Libri de nativitate Mariae: Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium, textus et commentarius*, ed. Jan Gijsel, CCSA 9 (Turnhout, 1997), 277-481 (Forma textus A); translations are my own.

[2] François Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3rd ed., Subsidia Hagiographica 8a (Brussels, 1951), no. 1046; Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum*, no. 50.

[3] *CPL*, 1858 and 1852. For the *Rule of the Master*, quotations are from *La Règle du Maître*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, 3 vols., Sources chrétiennes 105-7 (Paris, 1964-65); and translations are from *The Rule of the Master*, trans. Luke Eberle, Cistercian Studies 6 (Kalamazoo, 1977). For the *Rule of Benedict*, quotations and translations are from *RB 1980: The Rule of St. Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, ed. Timothy Fry (Collegeville, MN, 1981).

cloistered life as a virgin in the apocryphal gospel. Yet previous studies have not acknowledged the RM, on which (most scholars believe) Benedict modeled his own work. Indeed, certain parts of the RM without parallels in the RB appear to have influenced *Pseudo-Matthew* beyond details about Mary's life as a virgin ascetic. Evidence of verbal and thematic associations between the three texts seems to indicate that the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* was familiar with not only Benedict's *Rule* but also the earlier collection of monastic precepts. The apocryphal gospel thus poses a case of intertextuality that obscures the complexity of interwoven sources, which were used to create stronger emphasis on religious piety and asceticism in the period when Benedictine monasticism was beginning to blossom throughout Western Europe.[4] Yet, through the composite use of these sources of monastic life, the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* firmly rooted the text and its legacy in the Benedictine tradition.

General consensus now holds that the RM is a direct precursor to and model for the RB.[5] This assessment was first proposed by Augustin Genestout, who caused major upset as it both shocked scholars and greatly changed the approach to the two texts.[6] Since his study, subsequent scholarship has continued to debate the issue and provide evidence, with many now leaning toward the conclusion that the RM preceded the RB. The most significant developments came in Adalbert de Vogüé's two editions of the RM and the RB, in which he offered the most extended

---

[4] For context, see, for example, Marilyn Dunn, *Emergence of Monasticism: From the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Malden, MA, 2000).

[5] See a summary of scholarship in *RB 1980*, ed. Fry, 79-83 and 478-93.

[6] See Augustin Genestout, "La Règle du Maitre et la Règle de S Benoit," *Revue d'Ascetique et de Mystique* 21 (1940), 51-112, although he had announced his findings earlier and others had begun to discuss them in print before his article appeared. For a summary of references, see Bernd Jaspert, *Die Regula Benedicti-Regula Magistri Kontroverse*, 2nd ed. (Hildesheim, 1977); and Marilyn Dunn, "Mastering Benedict: Monastic Rules and Their Authors in the Early Medieval West," *English Historical Review* 105 (1990), 567-94, esp. 567 n. 1.

arguments in favor of the priority of the RM.[7] Yet there has been some dissent about this view, particularly by Marilyn Dunn, which sparked some debate with de Vogüé.[8] While I hold to the view put forward by Genestout and de Vogüé, the following examination of influences on *Pseudo-Matthew* from the RM alongside the RB does not necessarily preclude the alternative perspective. In what follows, I begin by discussing parallels between *Pseudo-Matthew* and the RB, as well as where these overlap with common material in the RM, before moving on to present the evidence for also considering the RM as a source.

### *Pseudo-Matthew* and the *Rule of Benedict*

In his study of the *Protevangelium of James* and its reception in the Latin West, Émil Amann first drew attention to connections between *Pseudo-Matthew* and the RB.[9] Although he did not demonstrate specific parallels, his general comments demonstrated associations between the description of Mary's *regula* in the Temple and the daily routine of prayer and work (*ora et labora*) in the RB. Less concerned with specifics than general conclusions, Amann used these associations to propose the date of the composition of *Pseudo-Matthew* in the sixth or early seventh century. Such suggestions about the influence of the RB on the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* have often been repeated, but, like Amann's assertion, subsequent gestures toward his

---

[7] *Règle du Maître*, ed. de Vogüé, *passim*; and *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé and Jean Neufville, 7 vols., Sources chrétiennes 181-86 (Paris, 1971-77), 1:173-207 and 245-314.

[8] See Dunn, "Mastering Benedict"; Adalbert de Vogüé, "The Master and St Benedict: A Reply to Marilyn Dunn," *English Historical Review* 107 (1992), 95-103; and Marilyn Dunn, "The Master and St Benedict: A Rejoinder," *English Historical Review* 107 (1992), 104-111.

[9] See Amann's discussion of *Pseudo-Matthew* in *Le* Protévangile de Jacques *et ses remaniements latins* (Paris, 1910), 101-9, with a focus on the *Rule of Benedict* at 106-7; and his note on Mary's time in the Temple in *Pseudo-Matthew* 6:2, at 298-99.

work are posed in broad terms.[10] Indeed, while Amman's claim and its implications are generally

accepted, close parallels remain elusive. Jan Gijsel, the most recent editor of the text, writes

about chapter 6 of *Pseudo-Matthew*, "The influence of the rule of Saint Benedict is undeniable

here. But one does not have the impression that the author is inspired by a determined monastic

rule."[11] Elsewhere, he also observes that "Our text seems to be the first to portray Mary as a

young nun, living according to the Rule of Saint Benedict (although the literal quotations of the

Rule are rare or unconvincing),"[12] and he notes parallels in the commentary of his edition. These

assessments are doubly revealing: Gijsel's statements both conform to the general assessment

that *Pseudo-Matthew* 6 is significant for the portrayal of Mary according to monastic life and

raise questions about how much this scene is indebted to specific details in the RB.

On the other hand, Rita Beyers has raised doubts about how much the author of *Pseudo-

Matthew* relied on a specific monastic rule, instead arguing that the apocryphon is indebted to

literary depictions of female asceticism.[13] She demonstrates that Ambrose's portrait of virgin

asceticism in *De virginibus* (written in 377) is one model for the description of Mary's life in

*Pseudo-Matthew* 6. Beyers does not fully reject the influence of monasticism on the text—she

---

[10] See *Libri de nativitate Mariae*, ed. Gijsel, esp. 58 and 66-67; Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše, *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* (Oxford, 2011), 75; Rita Beyers, "La règle de Marie: caractère littéraire et inspiration monastique," *Apocrypha* 22 (2011), 49-86; and idem, "The Transmission of Marian Apocrypha in the Latin Middle Ages," *Apocrypha* 23 (2012), 117-40, at 129-30. Mary Clayton also discusses monastic influences on *Pseudo-Matthew*, although she does not specifically invoke the *Rule of Benedict*, in *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 26 (Cambridge, 1998), 18-23.

[11] *Libri de nativitate Mariae*, ed. Gijsel, 58: "L'influence de la règle de saint Benoît est ici indéniable. Mais on n'a pas l'impression que l'auteur s'inspire d'une règle monastique déterminée."

[12] Ibid., 330, n.1: "Notre texte semble être le premier à dépeindre Marie comme une jeune moniale, vivant conformément à la Règle de saint Benoît (même si les citations littérales de la Règle sont rares our peu convaincantes)."

[13] Beyers, "La règle de Marie"; see also idem, "Transmission of Marian Apocrypha," 129-30.

acknowledges that it contains "an undeniable monastic undertone"[14]—but she makes the case for considering the author's indebtedness to late antique literature about virgins besides the RB. Her study therefore opens up possibility for recognizing multiple sources interwoven together in this apocryphon. It appears that the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* did not simply turn to a single source to expand the depiction of Mary's ascetic life in adapting the *Protevangelium*. Instead, the representation is multifaceted and complex, reflecting various strands of late antique ideas about asceticism that were becoming synthesized in the developing Benedictine tradition.

In examining the use of various sources in *Pseudo-Matthew*, it is first appropriate to discuss specific, demonstrable parallels with the RB. As already indicated, the clearest, most extended parallel with the RB occurs in *Pseudo-Matthew* 6:2:

Hanc autem sibi ipsa regulam statuerat ut a mane usque ad horam tertiam orationibus insisteret, a tertia uero usque ad nonam textrino se in opera occupabat. A nona uero hora iterum ab oration non recedebat usque dum illi dei angelus appareret de cuius manu escam acciperet, et ita melius atque melius in dei timore proficiebat.

(And this was the rule she had set for herself: that from morning to the third hour she persisted in prayers; from the third hour up to the ninth she occupied herself at work in the weaver's shop; and from the ninth hour again she did not retire from prayer until there appeared the angel of God, from whose hand she might receive food, and so she progressed more and more in the fear of God.)

Mary's daily observances of prayer and work closely follow the precepts established in the RB 48.10-14:

---

[14] "La règle de Marie," 49: "un verni monastique évident."

A kalendas autem Octobres usque caput quadragesimae, usque in hora secunda plena

lectioni vacent; hora secunda agatur tertia, et usque nona omnes in opus suum laborent

quod eis iniungitur; facto autem primo signo nonae horae, deiungant ab opera sua singuli

et sint parati dum secundum signum pulsaverit. Post refectionem autem vacent

lectionibus suis aut psalmis.

In quadragesimae vero diebus, a mane usque tertia plena vacent lectionibus suis, et usque

decima hora plena operentur quod eis iniungitur.

(From the first of October to the beginning of Lent, the brothers ought to devote

themselves to reading until the end of the second hour. At this time Terce is said and they

are to work at their assigned tasks until None. At the first signal for the hour of None, all

put aside their work to be ready for the second signal. Then after their meal they will

devote themselves to their reading or to the psalms.

During the days of Lent, they should be free in the morning to read until the third hour,

after which they will work at their assigned tasks until the end of the tenth hour.)

The fact that the phrasing of Mary's rule echoes Benedict's instructions for Lent is all the more

important since the next chapter, "De De quadragesimae observatione" ("The observance of

Lent"), begins "Licet omni tempore vita monachi quadragesimae debet observationem habere"

(49.1: "The life of a monk ought to be a continuous Lent"); yet the text also notes that "tamen,

...paucorum est ista virtus" (49.2: "few, however, have the strength for this"). With her rule,

Mary seems to fit into a superior category of monks who follow the more strenuous observation

of asceticism.

Just after the description of Mary's *regula*, a series of further parallels with the RB occur in *Pseudo-Matthew* 6:3. With these parallels, however, *Pseudo-Matthew* may be seen to echo both the RB and RM, as the following comparison demonstrates.

| *Pseudo-Mathew* 6:3 | RM | RB |
|---|---|---|
| Hanc irascentem nullus uidit, hanc maledicentem numquam ullus audiuit.... Semper in oratione et scrutatione legis dei permanebat. Et erat sollicita circa socias suas ne aliqua ex eis uel in uno sermone peccaret, ne aliqua in risu exaltaret sonum suum, ne aliqua in iniuriis | 3.24: Iram non perficere, iracundiae tempus non reseruare. 3.61-62: Lectiones sanctas libenter audire, orationi frequenter incumbere.... 10.75-79: ...linguam ad loquendum prohibeat et taciturnitatem habens, usque ad interrogationem non loquatur.... non sit facilis ac promptus in rius.... 3.39: Non esse superbum.... | 4.22-23: Iram non perficere, iracundiae tempus non reservare. 4.55-56: Lectiones sanctas libenter audire, orationi frequenter incumbere.... 7.56-59: ...linguam ad loquendum prohibeat monachus et, taciturnitatem habens, usque ad interrogationem non loquatur.... non sit facilis ac promptus in risu....[16] 4.34: Non esse superbum.... |

---

[16] Cf. RB 4.51-54: "os suum a malo vel parvo eloquio custodire, multum loqui non amare, verba vana aut risui apta non loqui, risum multum aut excussum non amare" ("Guard your lips from harmful or deceptive speech. Prefer moderation in speech, and speak no foolish chatter, nothing just to provoke laughter; do not love immoderate or boisterous laughter."); and 6.8: "Scurrilitates vero vel verba otiose et risum moventia aeterna clausura in omnibus locis damnamus et ad talia eloquia discipulum aperire os non permittimus" ("We absolutely condemn in all places any vulgarity and gossip and talk leading to laughter, and we do not permit a disciple to engage in words of that kind").

| aut in superbia circa parem suam exsisteret. ...ne forte uel in salutatione sua a laudibus domini tolleretur, si quis eam salutaret, illa pro salutatione "Deo gratias" respondebat. | 3.27: ...pacem falsam non dare.... 23.2: ...respondeat "Deo gratias"....[15] | 4.25: ...pacem falsam non dare.... 66.3: ...Deo gratias respondeat.... |

As many of these examples show, parallels between the RM and RB are likely due to echoes because of Benedict's reliance on the RM. Associations across these three texts portrays a sequence of influence: the influence of the RM on the RB, and the influence of the RB on *Pseudo-Matthew*. While it may be the case that the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* relied on the RB, through which parts of the RM were mediated, the intertextuality is not so straightforward, since a number of parallels exist exclusively between the apocryphon and the RM. These will be explored in the next section.

### *Pseudo-Matthew* and the *Rule of the Master*

With the type of overlap demonstrated so far, the simplest explanation is to look to the RB as the immediate antecedent, but Beyers's work on this apocryphon has opened up questions for further explorations beyond the RB.[17] The case for the influence of the RM on *Pseudo-*

---

[15] Cf. RM 54.5: "respondentes 'Deo gratias'" ("they respond, 'Thanks be to God'").

[17] "La règle de Marie"; and "Transmission of Marian Apocrypha."

*Matthew* alongside the RB may be demonstrated by looking beyond the description of Mary's ascetic life. In what follows, I present three examples where *Pseudo-Matthew* contains parallels with passages in the RM that do not overlap with the RB. In particular, recognizing the use of the RM as a source helps to explain certain lexical and thematic features of *Pseudo-Matthew* that have remained otherwise unexamined in detail. On their own, none of these instances is especially poignant for posing a clear source relationship, but together they present cumulative evidence for the case at hand.

The first example appears in the account of the Holy Family's flight to Egypt to escape Herod's slaughter of the innocents. In *Pseudo-Matthew* 17:2, Joseph is warned by an angel about Herod's plan and told: "Tolle Mariam et infantem et per uiam heremi perge ad Aegyptum" ("Take Mary and the child and go by the desert road to Egypt"). The significant term is *heremus*, a loanword from Greek ἤρεμος that does not appear in classical Latin; the term was adopted into Latin literature during the late antique period, especially in monastic texts. Elsewhere, the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* variously relies on both the more standard Latin *deserto* (19:1) and *heremus* (20:1). It is notable that all of these instances occur in the section of *Pseudo-Matthew* that does not rely on the text's main source, since the *Protevangelium* ends after Jesus' presentation at the Temple and does not mention the flight into Egypt.

The term *(h)eremus* appears three times in the RM and once in the RB, with some overlap. The passages with common material appear at the start of each rule, in discussions about anchorites or hermits ("anachoritarum, id est (h)eremitarum"):

RM 1.5: "...et bene instructi fraterna ex acie ad singularem pugnam heremi...."

RB 1.5: "...et bene exstructi fraterna ex acie ad singularem pugnam eremi...."

(...well-equipped, they leave the ranks of the brethren for the single combat of the desert....)

In addition to this description, the RM 1.11 also relates, "Simul et hii qui nuper conuersi inmoderato feruore heremum putant esse quietem" ("Likewise there are those who, recently converted, in unrestrained fervor think that the desert is a place of repose"), although this passage is omitted from the RB. This statement seems to be influenced by Cassian's *Conferences of the Desert Fathers* 18.8, which follows contemporary conventions about asceticism and the desert.[18]

The most important instance of *heremus* in the RM, for a parallel with *Pseudo-Matthew*, appears in a section about gyrovagues in 1.25. Here such wandering monks are described as "uelut lassi et quasi quibus iam uniuersus clausus sit mundus, et ex toto eos nec loca nec siluae nec latus ipse Aegypti heremus capiat" ("feigning fatigue, as if the whole world were shutting them out and as if in all of it there were neither place nor forest nor the wide expanse of the Egyptian desert to take them in"). This reference in the RM is significant since the RB contains no equivalent passage, nor the association between *heremus* and Egypt as in *Pseudo-Matthew*. This link is not surprising for a text about monks, since the earliest Christian ascetics lived in Egypt and late antique texts about them often invoked the idea of the desert as an escape from society into wilderness.[19] Cassian, as already mentioned, serves as a representative, as he discusses the desert fathers retreating to the *heremi vastitas*.[20] While the association does not clinch the case for the RM as a source for *Pseudo-Matthew*—since the author of the apocryphon

---

[18] See the note on this passage in *Règle du Maître*, ed. de Vogüé, 1:330.

[19] See, for example, discussion and references in R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990), 157-97.

[20] Ibid., 165.

may have been familiar with the idea from another text like Cassian's—this lexical echo is one piece of evidence among others to be discussed.

Another instance of lexical similarity with the RM is found in *Pseudo-Matthew* 21:1. In this passage, Jesus addresses a palm tree that had been integral in a miracle in the preceding chapter, as it had acquiesced to Jesus' commands to bend down to share is fruit and open its roots to share a fountain of water underneath. As the Holy Family prepares to leave, Jesus addresses the tree: "Hoc exagilum do tibi, palma, ut unus ex ramis tuis transferatur ab angelis meis et plantetur in paradiso patris mei" ("I give this inheritance to you, palm: that one of your branches will be transferred by my angels and planted in my Father's Paradise"). With the likeliest meaning of "inheritance," the word *exagilium* (from *exagella*, *exagellium*, or *exagellia*) is a rarity in late antique and early medieval literature. In a study of the word, Ludwig Bieler notes that it occurs in a handful of texts composed between the fifth and seventh centuries: the *Confessions* of Saint Patrick (d.461), *Life of Epiphanius* by Ennodius (d.521), *Acts of John* (sixth century), and the RM.[21] This connection to the RM is especially intriguing. Beyers has also briefly addressed the odd use of *exagilium* in *Pseudo-Matthew* (citing and summarizing Bieler), but without pursuing the literary connections or implications.[22]

The relevant passage appears in the RM 91.48-52 concerning "Quomodo suscipi debeat filius nobilis in monasterio" ("How the son of a noble is to be accepted into the monastery"):

> Quod si forte propter inmanitatem diuitiarum uel amorem nutritae domi familiae grauis uobis et minus dulcis haec diuina praeceptio conuenit, audite regulae nostrae a patribus salubre statutum consilium. De portione eius tres fiant aequaliter partes. Vna distracta

---

[21] "Exagellia," *The American Journal of Philology* 69 (1948), 309-12.
[22] "Transmission of Marian Apocrypha," 131-32.

abbatis manibus pauperibus uel indigentibus erogetur. Aliam uobis uel fratribus suis

pergens ille ad comitatum sanctorum exagiliario munus titulo derelinquat. Tertiam uero

partem uiatici sui utilitate deferat secum monasterio sanctorum usibus profuturum.

(But if, because of the greatness of your wealth and your love for your family reared at

home, this divine precept strikes you as hard and less than sweet, listen to our Rule's

salutary advice set down by the Fathers. Let his portion be equally divided into three

parts. Let one be sold and distributed to the poor and needy through the hands of the

abbot. Let him, as he departs for the court of the saints, leave the second to you and his

brothers as a gift in the form of a bequest. But the third part let him bring with him to the

monastery as his travel funds, to be used for the benefit of the saints.)

These precepts are omitted from the similar but condensed section in the RB 59, "De filiis

nobilibus aut pauperum qui offeruntur" ("The offering of sons by nobles or by the poor").

Like the previous case concerning *heremus*, it is possible that the author of *Pseudo-Matthew*

knew one of the other texts in which *exagilium* is used—since all three were common books in

monastic contexts—but added to the other associations, it is likely that the author took the word

over due to a familiarity with its use in the RM.

The passage in the RM containing the lexical oddity of *exagilium* also reveals another

striking parallel with the very start of *Pseudo-Matthew*. Here we encounter not a lexical

borrowing but a thematic influence. The apocryphal gospel begins (1:1) by describing Mary's

parents, Anna and Joachim, and recounting their righteousness in relation to Jewish law. Among

the details of their piety, the text relates Joachim's generosity in charity: "Siue in agnis, siue in

haedis, siue in lanis, siue in omnibus rebus suis, de omnibus tres partes faciebat. Vnam partem

dabat uidis, orphanis et peregrinis atque pauperibus, alteram partem colentibus deum, tertiam

Joachim's charity and the precepts for a noble in the RM offers cumulative evidence for the influence of this *regula* on *Pseudo-Matthew*.

**Conclusion**

Considering manuscripts of the RM, it is difficult to say much about a precise origin for *Pseudo-Matthew* based on this new knowledge of sources, but we may say something about how the RM might have been encountered alongside the RB. Only three complete witnesses of the RM survive (and ten more with fragments or extracts): Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 12205 (s. vi-vii, S Italy);[24] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28118 (s. viii^ex. or ix^in., St. Maximim, Trier); and Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, W.f. 231 (1465-1467, Gaesdonck), copied from Munich Clm 28118.[25] Yet there is ample evidence that monastic houses continued to turn to the RM together with the RB and other rules after the sixth century, as is borne out by several manuscripts including the RM. Several examples demonstrate the possibilities.

One significant *florilegium* of extracts from various monastic precepts now known as the *Rule of Eugipius* is found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France. lat. 12634 and St. Petersburg, Public Library, Q 15 (s. vii and vii²), containing the RM alongside anonymous rules as well as Augustine's *Ordo monasterii* and *Precepts*, Basil's *Rule*, Pachomius' *Precepts*, and

---

[24] E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, 11 vols. and Supplement (Oxford, 1934-71) [hereafter *CLA*, by vol. and no.], 5.633.

[25] On these manuscripts and the following, see *Règle du Maître*, ed. de Vogüé, 1:125-45; and the list of witnesses with links to digital descriptions and facsimiles at *Monastic Manuscript Project*, ed. Albrecht Diem, http://www.earlymedievalmonasticism.org/texts/Regula-magistri.html.

Cassian's *Conferences* and *Institutions*.[26] Another prominent example is Munich Clm 28118, now known as the *Codex regularum* of Benedict of Aniane. This collection contains the RM, the RB, and a host of other precepts for both monks and virgins. For example, we find rules attributed to Macharius, Pachomius, Basil, Augustine, Paul and Stephen, Columbanus, Isidore of Seville, Fructuosus of Braga, Ferriolus of Uzèz, Aurelianus of Arles, Caesarius of Arles, Johannes of Arles, and Donatus, as well as several anonymous rules. Similarly, other manuscripts contain excerpts of the RM alongside parts of Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia regularum*: Orléans, Bibliothèquie municipale 233 (203) (s. ix^{in.}); Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale 60 (s. xi); Verdun, Bibliothèque municipale 36 (s. xi); and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 10879 (s. xii). It is not unlikely, then, that the author of *Pseudo-Matthew* found the RM alongside the RB in the same library or (like Munich Clm 28118) perhaps in the same manuscript.

With influences of the RM on *Pseudo-Matthew* established, other implications emerge. There are, for example, intriguing affinities between the authors of *Pseudo-Matthew* and the RM in their approaches to apocryphal sources. Curiously, among the various sources on which the author of the RM relied, de Vogüé identified certain Christian apocrypha.[27] In 34.10 the RM mentions "sanctus Paulus in reuelatione sua" ("Saint Paul in his revelation") and quotes from chapter 7 of the *Visio Pauli*. Similarly, in 72.8 the RM cites apocryphal acts, saying that "in Actibus Apostolorum legitur fracta eucaristia et sumpta a se apostolos discessisse Andream et Iohannem" ("one reads in the Acts of the Apostles that the apostles Andrew and John departed

---

[26] *CLA*, 5.645-46. See description and references at *Monastic Manuscript Project*, ed. Diem, http://www.earlymedievalmonasticism.org/manuscripts/Paris-BN-lat-12634-St-Petersburg-Q-I-5.html.
[27] *Règle du Maître*, ed. de Vogüé, 1:214-20; and notes to specific passages cited.

after having broken and eaten the Eucharist"), referring to episodes in the *Acts of Andrew* 20 and *Acts of John* 109-11. In this way, the RM implicitly accepts these apocryphal books as some other late antique authors did—in a category of "useful books" not to be rejected despite their status outside of the canonical Bible.[28] This approach also seems to be the view of the author of *Pseudo-Matthew*, who clearly saw the earlier *Protevangelium of James* as a useful enough book to be translated from Greek for those who might want to read a version in Latin.

Returning to the subject that sparked this study, monastic life is one other part of the history of *Pseudo-Matthew* for which conclusions emerge. Since Amman's study, scholars have placed the origin of the apocryphal gospel in a Benedictine monastic milieu, since it relies so heavily on the RB. Adding the RM as a source solidifies this context even further. All of this helps to recognize in *Pseudo-Matthew* a concern for monastic asceticism previously acknowledged in the depiction of Mary in the Temple. Including the RM as a source enables seeing how broader concerns about monastic ideals also extend to Joachim's life as a pious believer, the desert road to Egypt as an ascetic wilderness, and the spiritual inheritance Jesus evokes in his address to the palm tree.

*Rhode Island College*                                                                        Brandon W. Hawk

---

[28] See François Bovon, "Canonical, Rejected, and Useful Books," *New Testament Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II*, ed. Glenn E. Snyder (Tübingen, 2009), 318-22; and idem, "Beyond the Canonical and the Apocryphal Books, the Presence of a Third Category: The Books Useful for the Soul," *Harvard Theological Review* 105 (2012), 125-37.