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INTRODUCTION
I. Aim and scope of the Dissertation:

It is the purpose of this dissertation to describe the influence of Western European monasticism on the high evaluation and dutiful practice of work which it took over from early Christianity. This influence will be seen to consist not so much in any change it wrought in the content of the ideas on work which it inherited from Christian teaching as in the fact that it was monasticism which was, by reason of its peculiar nature, best adapted over a period of a thousand years to proclaim, exemplify, and so to perpetuate this tradition. The dissertation, therefore, will be devoted: first, to an examination of the early Christian teaching on the subject; second, to a description of the characteristics of monasticism as a method of Christian life which peculiarly fitted it to embody and perpetuate this teaching; and finally, to an account of the ways in which, from age to age, this tradition was actually maintained in the history of monasticism in Western Europe.

The theme as stated, will, in point of geographical limits, exclude the later history of monasticism in the Greek and Eastern Churches; on the other hand, because Benedictinism, the main stem of Western monasticism owes so much to antecedents in Egypt and Asia Minor, these limits
must be transgressed in the account of the beginnings. Obviously it cannot be maintained that the history of monasticism as a whole will exhibit a continuous tradition of work; it presents too great a diversity of thought and custom to warrant any such predication. It will only be maintained that, insofar as such a tradition was maintained or revived, its exponents will be found in the Religious Orders. The theme finds a natural chronological limit in the 14th century when the Mendicant Friars, by their substitution of begging for work, bring it about that the champions of work are found thenceforth in the camp of the opponents of monasticism, rather than in the Orders themselves.

The term "work" as used in this paper will have a more limited sense than it has as employed by the monastics themselves. With them it included such intellectual tasks as teaching, the copying of books, and sometimes even the "Opus Dei." Even their "opus manuum" included the work of the scriptorium. But the intention here is to exclude such intellectual and spiritual activities, and treat only of such work as was applied to the maintenance of the physical needs of the monastery and the production of economically useful goods.¹ "Work" as herein used will be nearly equivalent during the early period to what we would understand today by "manual labor" both skilled and unskilled. The

¹ This will, of course, include book-making insofar as books were a marketable product, but not in its aspect of intellectual exercise.
tasks of management, marketing and finance will enter only negligibly in the early periods, but will become more and more important in later centuries, when economic horizons widen, and the monasteries, possessed of vast domains and monopolies, engage in commerce and industry.

II. Previous Investigations: The materials used in the preparation of the Dissertation.

a. General works, Monographs, etc.:

There are, so far as I have been able to discover, no works devoted to a complete and exclusive treatment of my topic. The one whose title indicates that it comes nearest to mine, I have, unfortunately, not been able to obtain at any one of a half-dozen libraries, where I have enquired or had inquiry made. It is Auguste Sabatier's L'Église et le travail manuel, Paris 1895. There is an English translation of a recent work by an Italian, Adriano Tilgher called Work: what it has meant to men through the ages, (Tr. by Dorothy Canfield Fisher, New York, 1930). It is a work prodigal in generalities, stimulating, and, in the main, justified, but all too sparsely supported by references. The translator, in her Preface, warns "Ph. D's" that they will be irritated by the work. In the sweep of his subject, Tilgher has only a few pages of general comment on work in the monasteries. For the most part, then, I have found the greatest help in monographs and scattered references in more general works.
Of the general works I have had frequent recourse to M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden u. Kongregationen der Katholischen Kirche* (2nd ed.) 3 vols., Paderborn, 1907. Heimbucher was a Roman Catholic priest and teacher; his work is thoroughly dependable.

C. Montalembert, *The Monks of the West from St. Benedict to St. Bernard*, English tr., 7 vols., Edinburgh, 1861-79, (there is a later English ed., 1985). This work must be used with caution, however; even Catholics admit Montalembert is "a panegyrist rather than a historian of the Monks."\(^1\)


\(^1\) Phrase used in a letter on bibliography to the writer of this dissertation from the Rev. Fr. Swickerath, Professor of Church History at Weston College. For a Protestant estimate see G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. I (Cambridge, 1923), xli.
Of the histories of particular Orders, three deserve especial mention. Dom Cuthbert Butler of Downside Abbey is the author of the standard English history of Benedictine monasticism: *Benedictine Monachism*, (London, 1919). It gives an excellent synthetic view of the Order's history and its place in the history of monasticism in general. For the "reformed" branches of Benedictinism there are: Ernst Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser* (2 vols., Halle a.S., 1892-94), and E. Winter, *Die Cistercianenser*, 3 vols., (Bound in one), Gotha, 1868-71. Both of these works are standard. The scholarship of Sackur is above reproach. Winter leaves something to be desired in the matter of giving documentary support for his statements.

Of numerous monographs bearing more or less directly on the subject of the dissertation, I shall mention only four here. P. Boissonade, *Le travail dans l’Europe chrétienne au moyen age*, Paris, 1921. Written from the economic viewpoint, this book has much information on the organization of the manors and guilds. It stresses the financial relations of the Papacy as an agency in promoting trade and industry, and the services of the monasteries in teaching the industrial arts and improving transportation. A complete absence of footnotes mars its value. There is an English translation by Eileen Powers, called *Life and Work in Mediaeval Europe*, New York, 1927. P. Dr. E. Hoffman
(Professor of Theology in the Abbey of Marienstatt), Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterzienordens in seinem Ursprung und seiner Organisation, Freiburg, Schweiz, 1905. This is an especially valuable treatise on the lesser order of the Cistercian brotherhood, employed by them to manage business involving contact with the outside world, and to do the work on their farms. M. Maurenbrecher, Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum Wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit, Leipsic, 1898. A clear and careful treatment of the subject. I have depended on Maurenbrecher's exposition rather than going to the works of Thomas himself. T. Brecht, Kirche und Sklaverei, Barmen (there is no date, but it must have been printed between 1886 and 1904.) It is written with a "thesis," namely that religious emancipation sentiment is a product of the Protestant sects; but produces good evidence at least for the negative aspect of Brecht's contention - that the early and mediaeval Church did almost nothing to eliminate slavery.

A controversy which raged during the years 1691-2 between Mabillon, the great Maurist scholar, and De Rancé, Abbot of the monastery of La Trappe in Paris, over the validity of scholarship as an occupation for monks, was productive of considerable discussion of manual labor and its place in the Benedictine Rule. The principal literary results of this controversy were: De Rancé's Traité de la
Sainteté et les Devoirs de la Vie Monastique, written in 1683. This may have been intended simply for his own community at La Trappe; but its depreciation of studies as a monastic occupation was interpreted among the learned Maurists as an attack upon them. However it was not until 1691 that Mabillon could be induced to take up arms in defense of his own and his colleagues' scholarly activities. This he did in his Traité des études monastiques. De Rance replied in February, 1692 with a Réponse au Traité des études monastiques. Mabillon's reply Réflexions sur la Réponse de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe came that same year. I have had access to the second edition of each of Mabillon's works published at Paris in 1692 and 1693 respectively. De Rance's I have not been able to obtain. I have, however, been able to discover their intent from Mabillon's works, from a monograph, La querelle de Mabillon et de l'Abbé de Rancé (Amiens, 1892) by Canon A. Didio, and from a life, Histoire de l'Abbé de Rancé et de sa Réforme, 2 vols., Paris, 1869, by Abbé Dubois.

b. Sources:

1. General:

Of the vast literature of monasticism, I have been able to read only a fraction. I have, consequently, endeavored to light upon those works which have promised to be most valuable for my purpose. Of first importance have been biographies of and writings by the great monastic leaders.
In the latter class, the various Rules have been the best source of information on the ideal of labor. For the long history of the interpretation of the Benedictine Rule, the Commentaries have been invaluable. In the "Lives" of persons influential in moulding monastic ideals, I have sought to discover not only indications as to current ideals of labor, but also how far the leaders have practiced what they preached. It is always necessary to check such statements of ideals as are given in the "Rules," for instance, by other sorts of reports which will indicate not so much the standards of conduct as the actual practice maintained in everyday life. Of these there is a lamentable paucity, which only begins to be relieved during the Carolingian times. Even the ninth century produced little, save in comparison with the barren ages which preceded it; the tenth and eleventh produced still less, though from the latter century come several of the collections of "Consuetudines" so ably edited by B. Albers, Consuetudines Monasticae, V vols., Stuttgartiae et Vindobonae, 1900. These Consuetudines give incidental information on the work-a-day life of the chief Cluniac houses of the time, (Farfa, Cluny, Subiaco, etc.) but are chiefly concerned with liturgical matters. More valuable for the light they throw on the every day conditions of great Cluny itself are the "Statuta," a collection of regulations embody-
ing the reforms of Peter the Venerable (M.F.L. 189:1025-1048). With the foundation of the Cistercian Order with its annual General Chapter, we are abundantly informed on conditions economic and moral within the Order as a whole.¹ The chronicle of the Benedictine Jocelin of Brakelond,² recounting the efforts of Abbot Samson to restore discipline and order in the temporalities of Bury St. Edmund, gives a vivid picture of the economic conditions at the end of the 12th century. It was this record of Samson's heroic efforts to restore order in his monastery which excited the admiration of Carlyle and was the inspiration of his Past and Present.

It seems convenient at this point to give as compactly as may be, an enumeration of the more important of the "Rules" and "Lives" which will be used as sources, especially those which have a somewhat complicated literary history.

11. To the Rule of Benedict:

1. St. Anthony. The Life of St. Anthony is one of the prime sources for the beginnings of the anchorite movement. I have used the English translation found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, (Schaff and Wace, editors) Vol. IV, pp.195-221. The Greek text is in M.P.G. 26: 857-976. Anthony was not the first to flee to the desert, but the Life achieved such popularity that he has long been regarded as the "Father of

---

¹ "Statuta Ordinis Cisterciensis" in Martène and Durand's Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, Tomus Quartus, Paris, 1717.
³ Tr. by the Rev. H.Ellershaw, with notes, etc. by the Rev. A.Robertson.
Monasticism." Its value as an actual account of the life of Anthony has been questioned especially by Weingarten. The estimate which prevails at present, however, allows it full value certainly as an account of monastic ideals during the time of Athanasius, and probably as an actual biography of Anthony. Bardenhewer calls it simply "ein Musterbild Christlicher Volkommenheit." Yet the reasons alleged by Robertson in his Preface seem to me to warrant the conclusion that Athanasius at least edited, if he did not actually compose the work, and that it tells us much about Anthony himself. Even granting the view of Bardenhewer, the value for our purpose will be unimpaired.

The so-called "Rule of Anthony," found in Lucas Holstenius' Codex Regulorum Monasticarum, Vol.I, pp.4,5, is, on the face of it, not a formal Rule compiled by Anthony, for the organized cenobitical life it presupposes post-dates his time. It is a valuable source, however, for the next generation of monasticism, which saw the rise of such communities. It is possible that the spirit, and even something of the form of this Rule came from Anthony through his disciple, Isaiah.

3. Rome, 1661. I have used the second edition, with notes by Brockée, 6 vols. (Bound in three), Vienna, 1759. The "Rule of Anthony" is printed also in M.P.G., Vol.40, but this is a translation of the Arabic recension; see Baudrillart, Dict. d'hist. et de gecog. eccl., Vol.III, 731.
2. Pachomius. There are four principal lives of Pachomius: one in Greek, in the Bollandist Acta Sanctorum, May, Vol.III, p.25*ff; two in Coptic and one in Arabic, published with French translation by E.Amélinaud, in Vol.17 of the Annales du Musée Guimet, Paris, 1889. Grützmacher¹ and Amélinaud² contended that the Coptic and Arabic lives were primary, and that the form of the "Rule" contained in them is the trustworthy one. Ladeuze, however, in his Étude sur le Génobitisme Pkhomien,³ seems to have established the contrary, namely that the Greek life is the earliest, having been written c. 368 (Pachomius died 346), the Coptic lives soon after this, and that the Arabic life, which is a compilation, and of inferior worth, was put together much later. The primitive form of the so-called "Angelici Rule," according to Ladeuze⁴, is best conserved by Palladius in the Lausiac History.⁵ But he is sceptical of the real value of any attempt to isolate the original Rule, and thinks the best we can hope for is to see it in the Latin translation of a Pachomian Rule (found in Holsten. I, pp.22,3) by Jerome, the state of the Rule c.400 A.D.⁶ For the purpose of the dissertation, the Coptic lives are valuable for the period at which they were written, namely the end of the fourth or beginning of

². Annales, etc., passim, especially p. lxvii.
⁴. Ibid., p.262.
⁵. For the Lausiac History of Palladius, see below, p.13.
The "Angelici Rule" will be found in Clarke's translation, Chap. xxxii.
⁶. Ladeuze, op.cit., pp.262,263.
the fifth century, rather than as the most trustworthy source of the actual life and ideals of Pachomius. The Arabic life, too, will give indications of monastic ideals; but their value is seriously impaired because they cannot with certainty be assigned to any particular period.

3. The *Lausiac History*. Palladius (Bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia from 400 to his death between 420 and 430) spent much of his time between 388 and 412 among the ascetics of Egypt and Palestine - both from choice, and during an exile for his espousal of the cause of Chrysostom in his difficulties. His sympathetic observations of monasticism when it was in a fluid state, are very valuable, particularly his reports of the second generation of the Pachomian communities. These observations he recorded in a book which has come to be known as the *Lausiac History* because of its dedication to Lausus, the "Praepositus" at the court of Theodosius II.

The value of the book was long in doubt. Weingarten rather sums up the opinion common in his day when he likened it in respect of historical veracity to the report of the journeys of Gulliver in Lilliput. From this estate of low repute the work was rescued by Abbot Butler, who, in his critical edition, has disentangled the original work of Palladius

from the accretions put upon it during the vicissitudes of a complicated transmission-history. This he has done in such skilful and convincing fashion that it is now accepted almost universally as the genuine work of Palladius, a sincere, if somewhat credulous eyewitness of the things he describes.

Butler found a long and a short recension of the Lausiac History, and a work called the Historia Monachorum in Aegypto, all three printed in Rosweyd's Vitae Patrum (Antwerp, 1615, 1628). The short recension, poorly thought of until lately, appeared only in the appendix. Butler discovered that the long recension was composed of the short recension plus the Historia Monachorum. This established the independence and priority of the short recension, which he was able to identify with the original work of Palladius, and the text of which he has printed in his edition. This result is confirmed by textual comparisons with early versions, and with the extracts made of it by Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History.¹

4. Basil the Great, (d. 379). The so-called "Rule of Basil" is not, in the Benedictine sense, a "Rule" at all, but a series of questions and answers, on the principles and practices of the monastic life, divided into what are known as the "Longer" and "Shorter" Rules. The former in general laid down principles of the monastic life, the latter gave briefer complementary decisions in matters of application. Basil's Works were edited in Paris by the Benedictines

¹ With these results Workman agrees. See Evolution of the Monastic Ideal, pp. 354-357.


The effect of his teaching in the monastic realm was to establish the coenobitic life so firmly as to make it the prevailing type.

5. John Cassian, (d. 435), did not introduce monasticism into Gaul (the foundations had already been laid there by Martin of Tours, Cassarius of Arles and Honoratus) but so far as there was a unifying influence in the movement in that country, it was Cassian who exercised it; and the wide influence of his "Institutes" and "Collations" (the latter of which, especially, was read to the monks all over the West, so that even now a meal is sometimes called a "collation") entitles him to be called one of the first founders of cenob-

itism in Europe. The first printed edition of the Collations and Institutes came from the press of the Brethren of the Common Life in Brussels in 1746; of this there is but one known copy now in the British Museum. The standard edition of the "Opera" is that of M. Petschenig in the Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (2 vols. 1886-88). I have used the reprint in Migne P.L. (vols. 49, 50) of the Douay edition with notes by Gazaeus. Cassian is an important figure as one of the links between the monasticism of the East and that of Europe. He was brought up in a monastery at Bethlehem, and spent the greater part of the last five years of the fourth century in Egypt. Weingarten (again the "villian of the piece") considered his works unhistorical and polemical; but, though undoubtedly idealized, they may be taken as fairly representative of conditions as he saw them.

The De Institutione Coenobiorum (M.P.L. Vol.49) describes the manner of life, the discipline and the dangers of the Eastern ascetics. In the Collationes Patrum (Ibid.) he reports in the form of dialogue his interviews with the champions of the monastic life in the places he had visited. "No works were more popular in the Middle Ages than these of Cassian." How far the ideals expressed in these works were actually incorporated into the life of Cassian's community at Marseilles and that of others who followed altogether or

2. Ursprung des Mönchtums, p.62. For another unfavorable estimate, see LeClereq's article "Cénobitisme", in the Dictionnaire d'Archeologie Chrétienne, etc., vol.112 cols.3108,9.
in part his Rule, I cannot say, as his Rule has only recently been discovered in Munich,¹ and has not yet been published. In the preface to his De Institutione he expresses his belief that no better set of regulations could be found anywhere, but he recognizes that certain extreme practices might be impossible in a west-European climate.²

It is difficult to decide whether to reckon Cassian an Easterner or a Westerner. Certainly his writings show the most admiring and complete dependence on the ideals and practices of the communities he had known in Egypt and Palestine. Every concession he made to abatement from the letter of what he had learned was grudgingly made because of a harsher climate. There is no evidence of bold re-apportionment of the elements of his ascetic life, based on a scheme of values so different as to be almost new, such as characterized Benedict. The same may be said of the other foundations of Gaul - of St. Martin of Tours, of Honoratus at Lérins, of Caesarius of Arles.³

6. Benedict. Of the dominant importance of the Benedictine Rule, which ordered the monastic life of Europe without a rival until the founding of the Mendicant Orders in the 13th century, of its contributions not alone to mon-

---

1. Workman, ibid., p.123,n.2.
3. Exceptions of detail might be made in the case of the division of Labor in the monastery of Marmoutier, founded by Martin of Tours, where the old men gave themselves exclusively to prayer, the young men to writing. (Heimbucher, I, 171), or the provisions by Caesarius that all the monks should live together in the same room, with no privacy whatsoever. (Ibid.p.179.) But these innovations corresponded too little to the needs and genius of life in common to be permanent contributions to cenobitic practice.
asticism, but to Western civilization in general, and of the reasons therefore, we shall have occasion to speak later. Here we can only indicate in briefest fashion a few facts concerning its composition and the rapidity with which, from sheer merit, it displaced all previous Rules. We have no precise information as to the date of the composition of the Rule. We know it came out of Benedict’s rich experience in the technique of religious living, both as a solitary, practicing extreme austerities in the cave at Subiaco, and as head (against his will) of the turbulent community who had compelled him to be their Abbot. Most probably it was written after the founding of Benedict’s own community at Monte Cassino, for which the date is usually set at 529. The Rule is so evidently the product of the same spirit, that it is generally admitted to be from a single hand. That that hand is Benedict’s, tradition bears unanimous witness. There is, it is true, some question (not very important) whether the Rule did not originally end at Chapter 66, where an injunction to read “hanc Regulam” frequently in the Chapter seems to some to indicate as much. Moreover the chapters from 67 to 73 seem to have more of an occasional nature, and to be more specific in character than those which preceded them. However, even those who contend that the Rule once ended at Chapter 66 admit the unity of the last seven chap-

1. An echo of this experiential background is found, for instance, in a phrase of chapter 59 of the “Rule”, “quod ex-perimento didicimus.”

ters with the rest.\textsuperscript{1} So it seems perfectly safe to take the Rule at its face value. Even the text seems to have been transmitted with extraordinary purity. There have been many differences in the history of the Order over the interpretation of the Rule, but not over its wording; the factions have quoted one part of the Rule against another part, but not one text against another. The best edition is that of Dom Butler: \textit{Saneti Benedicti Regula Monachorum Editionem criticopraetici augmentavit D.Cuthbertus Butler...Friburgi Brisgoviae, S. Ludovici Americae, 1912.} This edition is especially valuable for its indications of the sources from which Benedict composed the Rule. The Rule is printed with a valuable commentary by Martène in M.P.L., Vol.66. There is an English translation by Cardinal Gasquet: \textit{F. Gasquet, The Rule of St. Benedict, translated with an Introduction, London, 1925. I have used all of these editions at times. Citation by chapter will easily be found in any of them.}

The importance of the Rule in the monastic history of

\textsuperscript{1} For the literary criticism of the "Rule" see Grützmacher, \textit{Die Bedeutung Benedikts v. Nursia u. seiner Regel in der Gesch. des Mönchtums,} Berlin, 1892, pp.10-20. He takes pains to point out that all the oldest MSS. and commentaries contain all 73 chapters. Dom Butler, \textit{Benedictine Monachism,} (London, 1919), p.168, says the "hanc regulam" refers just to the chapter (56) in which it occurs, but this seems a little strained to me. The view of v. Schubert, \textit{(H.v.Schubert, Gesch. der christliche Kirche im Frühmittelalter,} Tübingen, 1921, p.63) who says: "c 67-73 mögen spätere aber eigene Zusatze sein," seems to me to be the correct one.
Europe is indicated by the fact that it had within two centuries displaced every other Rule in the West, and even governed communities in Palestine.


III. Commentaries on the Rule:

Ziegelbauer gives a list of some one hundred and thirty commentators on the Rule of St. Benedict.2 Of this list only a few have been thought worthy of publication. Of those which have come down to us from the Middle Ages, many are fragmentary (such as, for example, that of John Trithemius, written as late as 1484) or are mere patchwork, made up of scraps of previous works (e.g. that of Smaragdus, d. c. 824). Of the ones written before the 13th century, and made available by publication, I have been able to obtain the following:

1. Paulus Diaconus, called Warnefridus. Written c. 780-799 by the author of the famous Historia Langobardum, this is the first and one of the most valuable of the commentaries.3 Martène, who, it was probable, had before him a copy

3. Pauli Warnefridi In Sanctam Regulam Commentarium, typis Abbatiae Montis Cassini, 1880.
of the commentary as it was enlarged by Hildemar (see no. 4, below) which he identified with one ascribed by other commentators (Leo Marsicanus, Petrus Diaconus, Bernardus Cassinensis, Petrus Boherius, et al.) to Warnefrid, was led to deny that the latter composed any commentary. The editors of this volume, however, relying on the external evidence of the witnesses named above, and on certain internal evidence which makes it probable that it was written by one who was not a Frank (as was Hildemar) have made out a good case for the authorship of Warnefrid. 1

2. Benedict of Aniane, called by his contemporaries, and not without reason, the "second Benedict" has given us two valuable works, products of his devotion to "the Rule" and his zeal for uniformity. The first of these is the Codex Regularum Monasticarum, found in the M.P.L., Vol. 103, col. 593ff. This is a collection of as many of the old monastic rules as he could find, from all quarters: Egypt, the East, and through Europe to Gaul and Spain. Whether by this pious work of his Benedict actually rescued Rules which would otherwise have been lost to us, 2 I do not know; but in any case this collection witnesses to his conception of the importance

1. See the preface to the above edition, especially pp. Iff, XVIIIff, XXIII. Also Butler Benedictine Monachism, p. 178.

2. von Schubert calls this and the Concordia Regularum "beides für uns die unschätzbare Quelle unserer Kenntnis der ganzen eben geschilderten Entwicklung." (Gesch. der Christl. Kirche Frühmittelalter, p. 618) The material thus preserved might even yet have been lost but for the scholarly zeal of Holsten, by whom it was rescued from the obscurity ("tenebris erutum") of the Vatican Library, to be published as the first part of his larger Codex Regularum. (From Brockie's note, found in this instance in M.P.L. 103:396).
of monasticism as a whole, which is quite in contrast to the mind of the usual monk, whose outlook was bounded by his own cloister walls, and by the narrow time limits of his own life-span. The *Concordia Regularum* (M.P.L. ibid., col. 701ff) is a re-working of the same material in which he puts first the various chapters of the Benedictine Rule, and under each, the parallel or apposite passages from the other Rules of his collection. Manifestly there is not much originality in these works. But they deserve mention here as the basis of Benedict's reform, whose purpose in general was a return to the strict observance of the Benedictine Rule. He thought he was doing nothing more than "return" but he could not turn back the four centuries that had elapsed since the first Benedict's time so easily. Whether he was conscious of it or not, changes were kept. By reason of these changes, and of the renewed strictness of the movement, Benedict's reform is regarded as forming a midway point between the first Benedict and the Cluny reform. ¹ The documents which best represent the Aniane reform, and so deserve mention, though they are not by Benedict himself, are: the famous *Capitulare Manasticum*, published 817 after a council held under Louis the Pious at Aquisgranæ (Aachen) at which Benedict presid-

¹ v. Schubert, op. cit., p. 617. Albers in his Preface to the *Consuetudines Cluniacensis* (Cons. Mon., Vol. II, p. IV) quotes Mabillon to the effect that a book of Ben. of An. called *Antiquae consuetudines monasteriorum ordinis S. Benedicti* was the source of the *Consuetudines Cluniacensis*. So Cluny was heir to the Aniane tradition, though naturally it introduced modifications.
ed; and the Murbach Statutes, the result of the Abbot of Murbach's effort to reform his monastery in harmony with the principles enunciated at Aachen.  

3. Smaragdus, a contemporary disciple of Benedict of Aniane, Abbot of St. Mihiel, which he himself founded, wrote a commentary of no more originality than was manifested by Benedict's Concordia, but which indicates his adherence to the strict principles of his master. He later made another compilation of ascetic works which he called Diadema Monachorum. This he worked over into a treatise addressed, possibly to Charlemagne, more probably to Louis, called the Via Regia, which is remarkable for its request that the monarch emancipate the slaves in his dominions. These documents are all found in M.P.L. Vol. 102.

4. Hildemarus. Hildemar's commentary has been published in a volume containing also Gregory's life of Benedict (the second of his Dialogues) and the text of the Rule: Vita et Regula SS. P. Benedicti, una cum expositione Regulae a Hildemaro tradita (the word "tradita" instead of, for instance, "composita" is significant) Regensburg, 1880. The dates of its composition are given as between 833 and 850. Martène by a mistake pardonable because of the complete incorporation of the commentary now known to be by Paul Warnefrid, confused the two works. The nature of the agreement between the two

1. Note by Mabillon, appended to Ardo's life of Benedict, M.P.L. 103:384. The document is in M.G.H. Capitulares, Vol. I, p. 343ff. It is very possible that Benedict himself wrote it. In any case his ideas, supported by the influence of Louis were paramount in its promulgation.


makes it probable that Hildemar's really consists of a series of lectures taken down by a pupil.

He used Warnefrid's commentary as his text, dictating it almost in its entirety, but adding comments and modifying it slightly here and there.  

Hildemar was a Frank, who, however, spent much time in Italy. Martène called this commentary "the best of all," which is a tribute which belongs mostly to Warnefrid.

5. Rupertus Tuitensis. After the group mentioned above, who wrote their commentaries under the impulse of the Carolingian renaissance and the reform of Benedict of Aniane, we have no others of importance until the twelfth century. Two of considerable importance then appeared: one by Ste. Hildegarde (d. 1179) which contains nothing bearing on our subject, and one by Rupert, Abbot of Dietz (or Deutz). This commentary, written towards the beginning of the century (he died 1135) contains the earliest attempts to justify in theory changes that had long since taken place in actual fact - chief among them the substitution in the monasteries of sacerdotal duties for manual labor. Rupert's Commentary is printed in M.P.L., Vol.170, col.477ff.

6. Ioannes Trithemius. In the thirteenth century, two of the Abbots of Monte Cassino wrote commentaries on the Rule: Abbot Richard Annibald, and Abbot Bernard I. I have not been

able to obtain the commentaries of either of these, though Bernard's was edited at Monte Cassino by Caplet, 1894. Nor have I been able to find editions of those of Daniel a Monte Runiano and Petrus Boherius, written during the fourteenth century. This is the more regrettable because of the sixteenth century commentary of Trithemius, only the part on the Prologue and the first seven chapters have survived. As partial compensation for this, we have a sermon delivered by him to his monks on manual labor. The edition is: Ioannis Trithemii...Opera Pia et Spiritualia, Moguntiae, 1605. Trithemius entered the Benedictine Monastery at Sponheim at the age of twenty, in 1482. His studiousness and affability gained him the admiration of all his fellow-monks who made him Abbot after he had been there only a year. He labored hard for the profit of the monastery's temporal affairs, and especially that of its library. His interests were always scholarly, and he was soon given a smaller monastery where he could spend the greater part of his time in study. He is known as the author of several historical works which are not dependable save for his own times. He is even accused of inventing "sources" for them.  

7. Martenius. Commentaries since the Reformation have been numerous. I have read that of Martene, the scholarly Benedictine whose commentary, published first in Paris, 1690, and reprinted parallel with the text of the Rule in M.P.L. 

Vol. 66, is of the best, embracing the results of his own and Mabillon's researches in monastic history.

IV. Franciscan Literature:

It is possible to use this specific term "Franciscan Literature," for our sources for the period beginning with the thirteenth century, for the Mendicants alone of the Religious Orders had vitality enough to produce a literature, and of the Mendicants, the Franciscans alone were concerned with work. The Dominicans deliberately rejected it as an element of the religious life. Francis enjoined work upon his followers, and the controversy which ensued over this particular injunction furnishes a brief, but interesting concluding chapter in the pre-Reformation writing on the subject.

I cannot here go into the complicated questions concerning the dates and relative worth of the manifold sources for the life of Francis. Indeed these questions are still far from settled. For our purpose it is sufficient to name over the documents read, with a bare word, concerning each.

1. The Opuscula of Francis. The most recent edition is that of Boehmer-Wiegand, Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus v. Assisi, Tübingen, 1930. Of the Opuscula of Francis, those most valuable to us are the Rules of 1221 and 1223 respectively, and the Testament, written shortly before his death (1226).

2. The Vita Prima of Thomas of Celano. Written between
1226 and 1229, when Gregory IX, who asked Thomas to compose it, died. It is not highly regarded by Sabatier, for it was not written by one of Francis' immediate companions, and because it was too much under the domination of church officials. But Burkitt is of the opinion that we cannot get behind the information it gives us, however much we might regret the compiler's over-discretion and subservience. The most recent edition of the "Vita Prima" is in the Analecta Franciscana, published at Quaracchi, 1926. I have used, for this and the "Vita Secunda," the English translation by A.G. Ferrers-Howell: **The Lives of St. Francis of Assisi by Bro. Thomas of Celano**, London, 1908.

3. **The Vita Secunda by Thomas of Celano.** Written at the request of the Minister-General John of Parma who was the one Minister-General who represented the wishes of the "Spiritual" party, during 1246 and 1247. Sabatier rates it more highly than the first life on this account, and because it contains the "Leonine" tradition. The best edition is that of P. Edouard d'Alençon, Rome, 1906.

4. **Speculum Perfectionis.** A much disputed legend. Sabatier found and published a recension which he ascribed to the year 1227, just a year after Francis' death; for its

author he proposed the name of Brother Leo. Burkitt, however, gives it as his judgment that it is, in this form, a mere re-arrangement of material from the "Legenda Antiqua" drawn up in Perugia in 1311. A shorter recension was published by R.P. Lemmens which he contended was earlier than Sabatier's document. It now seems as though the extremely high value put upon the Speculum as a whole by Sabatier cannot stand; but parts of it undoubtedly contain Leonine tradition, and are therefore valuable. I have used the Everyman Edition containing the "Little Flowers, The Life of St. Francis (Bonaventura's) with the Mirror of Perfection," London, (J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd,) 1910. (Reprint of 1927.)

5. The Legend of the Three Companions. Here again, Sabatier has assigned a comparatively early date, 1246, which seems likely not to stand. Burkitt calls it "A late compilation" from the sources of Celano, and therefore of value where it does not repeat the "Life." The most recent edition is that of da Civezza and Domenichelli, Rome, 1899. I have used the translation by E.G. Salter, in the Temple Classics, J.M.Dent, London, 1904.

6. The Little Flowers. The Little Flowers represent the popular element in the legend of St. Francis, and though

2. Essays in Commemoration, p.53.
3. Documenta antiqua Franciscana, Pars II, Quaracchi, 1901.
5. Essays in Commemoration, p.53.
they are not valuable by reason of any close personal con-
nection with the Saint, yet they do convey to us the im-
pression he made on the mind and heart of the people of
his time, and are valuable from that point of view. In
their Latin form, they are called the Actus Beati Francesci
et Sociorum eius. The Italian version was edited by Sa-
batier, Paris, 1902. I have used the Everyman edition
of the English translation mentioned on the preceding page.

Comments on the Franciscan Rule were fairly numerous
during the early years of the Order. I have read that by
Bonaventura, in the Quaracchi edition of the Opera Omnia,
(1892-1902) Vol.VIII, and that by Angelo Clareno, Expositio
Regulae Fratrum Minorum, ed. E.Oliger, Quaracchi, 1912. The
former represents the party anxious to transform the manual
labor of the Rule into scholarly work, the latter represents
the "Observants" who wished to make work their mainstay and
have recourse to begging only as a last resort. The Inten-
tio Regulae, ascribed to Leo² published by Lemmens (Documenta
Antiqua Francescana Pt. I, Quaracchi, 1901) I was unable to
obtain. There are others, by Olivi, Hugues de Digne, and
Pecham, but I believe Bonaventura's and Clareno's are repre-
sentative. Another writer who championed work rather than
begging was Wm. de St. Amour, who defended his views at a
disputation in Paris. His works were condemned, and no copy

1. Written between 1318 and 1328. See V.Scudder The Francis-
can Adventure, N.Y., 1931, p.315.
2. F.van den Borne, Die Franciskanischer Forschung in ihrer
Entwicklung dargestellt München, 1917, p.90.
of them has since been found. They can be partly reconstructed from Bonaventura's reply, De Perfectione Evangelica, (Opera, Vol.V) and have been summarized by the editors in the Prolegomena to that volume. It was from William that Jean de Meung took the arguments for work which he expressed so vigorously in his portion of The Romance of the Rose.
CHAPTER ONE
WORK IN THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY PREVIOUS TO AND OUTSIDE OF MONASTICISM.
1. Injunctions to Labor in the Christian Tradition:

It might be, and indeed has been said that Christianity had its most numerous adherents among working people, so "naturally" their teaching magnified work. That is doubtless true, but it tells only part of the story, for the tradition to which they were heirs, and which had for them the worth of "supernatural" sanction found a worthy place for work. This also was not without its influence in the Christian attitude toward work.

The sacred Scriptures of the earliest Christians spoke of the divine creation of the world as a work so analogous to that of man that the Creator "rested" when it was finished. One tradition of the placing of the first man in the garden of Eden speaks of his being placed there "to dress it and to keep it." And if, from another point of view, (though seemingly in the same source-document, J) the origin of toil is represented as being a punishment for sin, yet even here it has a place in the divine economy, and is, by implication at least, a means of expiation and reconciliation with God. The prudential injunctions of the Proverbs reiterate the value of industry. The Jews, largely pastoral and agricultural in their culture, accepted work as a matter of course - it made no man ashamed.

1. Genesis 2:15
3. E.g., 12:10,11,24. 31:10ff, esp. 30.
ians coming from a pagan background could scarcely help being impressed by this as they read their sacred books; and indeed the Fathers of the Church frequently cite the Patriarchs of the Hebrews as examples of sturdy industry.

Jesus had very little to say about work. John reports him as saying, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,"¹ which is a good theology to make a man strive at any good task of transforming either nature or human nature. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden"² would indicate that he had sympathy for those whose toil was great. The imagery of his parables, too, abounds in allusions to the work of the farmer and the builder, betokening his familiarity with manual toil. In Mark 6:3, Jesus is called "κέντων," which also was put to good use by expounders of Christian morals.³

It is when we come to Paul that we find a distinct and repeated emphasis on the duty of work. The Thessalonians seem to have been in special need of exhortation to labor for he admonishes them in both his letters. There are no words of Scripture quoted more frequently in this connection in monastic exhortations than just these of the "Apostle;"

¹. John 5:17. It is worthy of note that this conception comes to us in the non-apocalyptic tradition.

---

1. John 5:17. It is worthy of note that this conception comes to us in the non-apocalyptic tradition.
But we exhort you, brethren, that ye ... study to be quiet, and to do your own business and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing. (I Thess. 4:10-12).

For yourselves know how ye ought to imitate us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat bread for nought at any man's hand, but in labor and travail, working day and night, that we might not burden any of you: not because we have not the right, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you, that ye should imitate us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, If any will not work, neither let him eat. (II Thess. 3:7-10)

Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need. (Ephesians 4:28)

Exhortations to industry are frequent in the literature of early Christianity. It occurs in one of its most striking forms in the Syrian Didaskalia, Chapter XIII:¹

All you Christians should every day and at all times, as often as you are not in the church, be diligently at your work, so that all your life you are present in the assembly, or busy at your work and never be idle.

2. The motives for this encouragement of work in the early Christian communities:

First of all, the Christians were to work "that the Gospel be not hindered." With Paul, for instance, this motive was a large one. It was part of his plan to be "all

things to all men," and "void of offense." He and earnest Christians generally recognized that there were dangers to be feared from accusations by "those who are without" and for the sake of the cause they were serving, it was necessary to avoid even the appearance of evil. Paul insists that he had a right to cease working if he wished, but that he did not avail himself of it for this very reason. This implies that even among the pagan peoples to whom he was preaching there was the feeling (however little it was lived up to) that everyone ought to "pay his own way," and that it behooved Christians not to offend against this feeling.

Chrysostom in his homilies on the Epistles of Paul, commenting on Paul's expression "That ye may walk blamelessly before those that are without (I Thess. 4:11), strikes the same note:

He does not say "That ye may not be ashamed by begging." But he has indeed insinuated the same...for if there are those among us who are offended at such a thing, much more those who are without, finding numberless accusations and handles, when they see a man who is in good health and able to support himself, begging and asking the help of others. Wherefore they call us Christ-mongers (χριστοποίουσι)²

Again, Christians were to work to save themselves from idleness, beggary, mischief, and worse. In addition to the quotation from Chrysostom above, the Apostolic Constitutions

1. I Cor. 9:6,12,22.
echo Paul's "study to be quiet" when they urge work in order not to be "a wanderer and gadabout;" Barnabas recalls Paul's "let him that stealest, steal no more" when he warns his readers not to be like those "who do not know how to furnish themselves with food by means of labor and sweat, but in (their) lawlessness seize what belongs to others." In short, salutary role of work in moral education was recognized, and it was enjoined on this account.

Labor is approved rather than business enterprise of a more lucrative sort, for what a man can earn by the work of his hands has a limit, whereas trade's returns are capable of indefinite extension. The hand-worker was therefore supposed to be less subject to the ravages of avarice, as well as freer from possible suspicion of not giving due value for his return in money.

There is an ever-recurrent suspicion of most "Business" as a temptation too strong to be tampered with. As early as the Epistle of James, traders were singled out to be warned against a boastful neglect of Providence. Clement of Alexandria wavers in his attitude toward business and politics. Now he regards them as not a hindrance to the Christian life, now as completely in another and lower sphere, and again he mentions merchants' gains as powerless to oppose Christian faith.

-------------
2. Epistle of Barnabas, 10:4, quoted from Cadoux, p. 195.
Labor is thus enjoined on Christians as a means of disciplining the moral life, and of earning a livelihood without "taking thought" too much for the acquisition of gain. But the motive most frequently stressed was that labor furnished the means of charity which bulked so large in the early Christian life. The modern idea would be that if it is good to earn with one's hands to give to the poor, it is better to earn more by business, so as to have more to give; but the early Christians evidently felt too suspicious of large enterprises to draw that conclusion. First of all, work to maintain one's self was regarded partly from the point of view of others, so that in itself it became a sort of charity, negative, to be sure, but still necessarily preliminary to almsgiving. Insistent as they were on the tender care of those in need because of circumstances beyond their control, they were equally insistent that all others should maintain themselves. This appears more than once in Paul.1 But from this minimum, they moved constantly to the duty of earning something to give to the needy. Here again, Paul's requirement, "working with the hands that which is good, to have whereof to give to him that is in need," set a standard of high motivation for work.

It is when work is mentioned in connection with furnishing the sinews of charity that early Christian teaching

1. "If any one will not work, neither let him eat," 2 Thess. 3:10. See also 2 Cor. 12:13,14,16; 2 Thess. 3:8.
approaches most nearly a "religious evaluation" of productive activity.\textsuperscript{1} Chrysostom has an eloquent passage in which he exalts the "spiritual" value of work above that of fasting and mortifications, and it is in just this connection:

Where then are those, who look out for work that is spiritual? Seest thou how he (Paul, in I Thess. 4:11) takes from them every excuse saying: "with your own hands"? But does one practice fasting with his hands? or watchings all night, or lyings on the ground? This no one can say. But he is speaking of spiritual work. For it is truly spiritual, that one should by working impart to others, and there is nothing equal to this.\textsuperscript{2}

This is of immense significance because it furnishes a motive for performing work freely and spontaneously, as a service to others, rather than under the compulsion of the task-master's whip. In the ancient world that harsh goad had been the chief device for getting work done; henceforth the inner prompting of love was to be an effective impulse.

3. Results of the Christian teaching of work:

We find that, partly no doubt because they were compelled by their economic status but also partly because it was required of Christians in general because of their common ethic, the early Christians did work. The Christians

\textsuperscript{1} Harnack, Mission and Expansion, Vol.I, p.155,n.3: "In fact this is almost the only point at which work is taken into consideration at all, within the sphere of the religious estimate."

addressed in the Didaché have wine-vats, threshing-floors, oxen and sheep, jars of wine and oil - enough and to spare. Clemens says: "The good workman receives the bread of his labour with frankness; the sluggish and idle does not look his employer in the face." Tertullian replies to the charge that Christians are "useless in business affairs" on a purely naturalistic basis:

We are said to be useless in the business affairs of life. But how can men who live with you, men with the same food, clothing, habits and necessities of life as yourself be so? For we are not Brahmans or Indian Gymnosophists, forest dwellers and exiles from social life. We remember that we owe thanks to God our Lord and Creator: we reject no fruit of His works; though we exercise restraint lest we use them excessively or wrongly. And so we dwell with you in this world, not without a forum, not without a provision market, not without your baths, shops, workrooms, inns, weekly markets, and other places of business. With you we go on voyages and serve as soldiers, and till the soil, and trade; we mingle our crafts with yours; we make our work public for your use. I know not how we can seem useless for your affairs, living with you and by your help as we do.1

Here we have a picture of Christians engaging in many of the active pursuits of the world about them; though certain occupations were regarded ipso facto unfit for Christian participation, such as idol-making, participation in theatrical performances, services as gladiators, etc.

1. Tertullian, Apol. 142. Quoted, Cadoux, p. 313.
There is evidence to show that even the clergy worked until into the fourth century. They lived partly on the gifts of the faithful, but also on the proceeds of a certain amount of secular work. Such a practice seems to be behind Eusebius' reproach to certain heretical leaders for accepting gifts and salaries from their followers. ¹ Benedict of Aniane recalls Gregory of Tours' description of Nicetus, Bishop of Lyons, recounting how, after he was a clerk and even a presbyter, he continued to work with his hands. ² The participation of the clergy in business was evidently carried so far as to be a serious detriment to their ecclesiastical influence and efficiency. Augustine, Jerome, and Sulpicius Severus complained of it, but the Church could not bring itself to forbid the practice, until finally Valentinian III took matters in his own hands and forbade all business activity to the clergy of the West. ³

One of the effects of the Christian teaching on work was the acknowledgement of the duty of the community to furnish work for those who needed it. Harnack says: "It is beyond question ...... that a Christian brother could demand work from the Church and that the Church had to furnish

him with work..... they formed a guild of workers in the sense that the churches had to provide work for a brother when he required it." In support of this statement, he quotes the Didaché, ch.XII:

If any brother has a trade, let him follow that trade and earn the bread he eats. If he has no trade, exercise your discretion in arranging for him to live among you as a Christian, but not in idleness. If he will not do this (i.e., engage in the work with which you furnish him), he is trafficking with Christ. Beware of men like that. ¹

And the Clementine Homilies, VIII: "For those able to work, provide work; and to those incapable of work, be charitable." ¹ To this might be added the advice to Bishops in the Apostolic Constitutions, IV, 2: "To the young man, give assistance, that he may learn a trade, and may be maintained by the advantage arising from it." ²

These references seem to me to be comparatively few to sustain such a sweeping generalization as Harnack has made. It should be noted, too, that these three really reduce to two, for the "Apostolic Constitutions" were largely influenced by the "Didaché", indeed they embody almost every sentence of it; and all three documents cited are of Asiatic or Syro-Palestinian origin. ³ Still it is much that the obligation was recognized at all. It tells of a very prac-

¹. Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, (Eng.tr.2nd.ed. New York, 1908) Vol.I, pp. 175,176. I was unable to verify the reference to the Clementine Homilies.
tical application of the Gospel ideal of love in the economic realm at least within the "brotherhood" itself.

But perhaps the most revolutionary result of the preaching of work as a duty, is to be seen in the change wrought in the way in which work and workmen were regarded. From the complete indifference or utter contempt of the classical world, work and those who performed it were freed by Christian teaching. Work was no longer something which ipso facto degraded those who did it. Workmen were no longer regarded as almost of an inferior species. Though emancipation in a political and economic sense was centuries in the future, and perhaps was not then accomplished by the Church, yet emancipation began here in the Christian circle of ideas. Without this ideal emancipation, the other would never have come about. Allard in general, places much too high a value on the agency of the Church in the amelioration and abolition of slavery, but I believe he is fully justified when he says:

Le travail est nécessaire à toute société: tant qu'esclavage et travail demeurèrent synonymes, il fut impossible de prévoir qu'un jour le premier prendrait fin. La réhabilitation du travail constituait une révolution morale presque aussi difficile à réaliser que l'abolition de l'esclavage, et pouvait seule y conduire... Le seul instrument de progrès moral que l'antiquité ait connu, la philosophie, était précisément l'auteur de l'idée deshonorante attachée au travail.
Il est permis d'affirmer que sans le christianisme, cette idée n'eut jamais disparu.

It would not be true to say that before Christianity all peoples despised labor, or that all Christians esteemed and preached it. It was not so despised, for instance, among the Jews, nor among the Zoroastrians of Persia. As for the early Romans, we remember the story of Cincinnatus, twice called from the plow to be Dictator. In pre-classical Greece, we have a poem of Hesiod which praises the industrious man, contrasting him with the idler, much in the tone of the wisdom literature of the Old Testament:

And he who works much shall be much dearer to the Gods
And to men as well, for they greatly hate the idle.
Work is no reproach, but idleness is reproach,
If thou shouldst work, quickly shall the idle envy thee,
Growing rich. And virtue and honor attend the rich.

And even in the time of Aristotle and after, as the Church Fathers loved to relate, there were philosophers much es-

2. See below, p. 59. For Christians who were not expected to work, see p. 49.
3. καὶ τ' ἔργα σωμάτως πολύ φιλτερος ἀθανάτος ὡς ἁγιάζοντας ἐργαζόμενων αἰεργίων ἐργον τ' ὠδέον ἐβεβόν ἀπρομηθεύσεται τοῖς ἐκείσας.

teemed, who worked with their hands.

Nevertheless, it remains true that the most influential of their philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, had nothing but the most complete scorn of workers, and denied even the possibility of good living to them, while calmly building their ideal states upon their labor. And these views were consequences of the most fundamental postulates of their metaphysics and ethics.

The perfect constitution will turn no citizen into a working mechanic.

...Of all constitutions, those which put power into the hands of the working classes are judged by Aristotle to be the worst.1

"No man," he says, "can practice virtue who is living the life of a mechanic or labourer."2 "(In) the best form of government..... the citizens must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue."3 "The meaner sort of mechanic has a special and separate slavery; and whereas the slaves exists by nature, not so the shoemaker or the artizan."4 The same unworthy role in moral and political life was assigned to the slave and artizan by Herodotus, Xenophon, Cicero and Seneca himself.5 After the Golden Age of Greek philosophy declining antiquity rejected all occupations motivated by

1. A.Tilgher, Work; what it has meant to men through the ages, New York, 1930, p.7.
3. Ibid., 1328b 33f.
4. Ibid., 1260b 1.
5. Allard, op.cit., p.381.
a desire for profit more completely than did the classical period. This is true even of Cynic doctrine, though there is nothing specific in it on the esteem due to manual labor in their literature.¹ Stoic philosophy which came to have great influence in educated circles, diminished, it is true, the gulf between the free and servile arts, though on the other hand, their emphasis of the ethical as over against the intellectual, could not help giving the "artes liberales" the preference because they were regarded as the more conducive to virtue.²

Contrast with these views the confident assertion of Tertullian that "the least Christian workman knows better than Plato the nature and perfections of God."³

Man was no longer regarded as primarily a "political animal" so that only citizens were in the truest sense men; nor was he regarded as simply an ethical being, with the result that he whose station in life permitted him to follow "the good life" might be regarded as truly man, while the rest are ignored; in Christianity he was regarded first of all from the religious point of view, as an actual or potential son of God, and as such entitled to respect, no matter

---

1. So Allard. But see Troeltsch, Social Teachings, I,119, where he says that the Cynics had expressly taught the value of work.
what his station in life might be. Chrysostom chides his congregation:

Are you not ashamed, do you not blush, to act like a wild beast, to debase your nobility? You are poor, but you are free; you are workmen, but you are Christians. 1

If a man is a Christian, he is capable of "nobility," and this nobility is not incompatible with poverty and labor. It is for sullying this nobility by disregard of its obligations that they should be ashamed, rather than for his poverty and humble toil.

4. The Limitations of the Christian Teaching on Work:

The Apocalyptic views of early Christianity considerably affected its teaching on work, both in its larger sense which embraces effort to transform the world in accordance with an ideal, and in the narrower sense of the manipulation of Nature to satisfy bodily needs. Where it is said that "the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ," 2 the transformation has taken place by an irruption of Divine might in the affairs of men. It is true that every effort was made by zealous evangelists to spread the Gospel, and Paul speaks of "fellow workers unto the Kingdom" 3 but the actual establishment of that Kingdom was not in the hands of men, but of God. And one of the great attractions of the Kingdom is that "they may rest

2. Rev. 11:15.
from their labours.”¹ As for labor in a gainful occupation, Christians were bidden to work to provide for the necessities of the interim and Paul so worked; but all, because of this feeling of the shortness of the time, were convinced of the uselessness of ambitious toil. “Let every man abide in the calling wherein he was called,”² has much of this feeling behind it, as well as that utterance in Timothy which was so often quoted later by those anxious to exchange bodily labor for contemplation or for nothing at all: "Bodily exercise profiteth little, but Godliness is profitable for all things.”³

This element of Christian ideology had much to do with keeping it from formulating a distinct policy of social reform.

It is clear that the message of Jesus is not a programme of social reform. It is rather the summons to prepare for the coming of the Kingdom of God.⁴

Even after the vivid expectation of the Kingdom as a catastrophic intervention of God had faded, a sense of hopelessness in the face of the ubiquitous and seemingly invincible Empire paralyzed any efforts at a well-planned scheme for social reform. So the idea of the equality of all men which was fervently preached was confined to the religious sphere alone. All men were brothers, but only "in Christ." No attempt was made to carry out this equali-

². I Cor. 7:20.
³. I Tim. 4:8.
tarianism in the actual social and economic arrangements of the day. Paul could tell Philemon that Onesimus was "more than a servant, a brother beloved," but he nevertheless sent him back to his master; and he exhorts slaves in general to be obedient. The post-Apostolic Church never questioned the right of slavery as an institution to exist. They did not even regard manumission as a duty. There is evidence to show that in particular cases church funds were used to redeem slaves, individual Christians did manumit slaves as "a good work," Christian churches became places of refuge for slaves, and Christians in most cases did treat their slaves better than pagan masters. On the other hand, manumissions were not infrequent in pagan circles, the pagan temples had been asylums for slaves before Christianity, and Tertullian has a remarkable passage (De Resurrectione Carnis 57) which indicates that not all Christians were better slave-owners than might be expected of pagans.

I ask thee if thou hast emancipated thy slave, seeing that the same flesh and feeling will remain which were formerly exposed to whips and shackles and brand-marks, will they for that reason have to suffer the same things again? I trow not.

2. Col. 3:22-25; Eph. 6:5-8; I Tim. 6:1; Tit. 2:9f.
3. Cadoux, p.452.
5. T.Brecht, Kirche u.Sklaverei, Barmen (no date) p.76.
7. G.Uhlhorn, Christian Charity in the Ancient Church, p.192.
8. Quoted, Cadoux, p.453.
Indeed Christian principles may in a sense have retarded their own social application; it was urged that Christians should hold on to their slaves in order to wield a moral and religious influence over them. And Lactantius says loftily:

We estimate human affairs not according to the standard of the body, but of the spirit,

and goes on to emphasize how "in the spirit" slaves were esteemed as brothers.¹

Finally, it must be said that with all the change Christianity wrought in the rehabilitation of work, it did not in the modern sense teach the "dignity of labor," nor did it give a religious evaluation to work as such. Paul's injunction, "Let each man abide in the calling wherein he was called" does not exhibit a real inner appreciation of the value of a man's work in life, but rather a patient endurance of something out of which good might be gained, it is true, but not in itself good. Work was, for most people, the only way certain spiritual, moral, and physical necessities could be gained, therefore they used it as cheerfully as might be. But where these benefits (maintenance of life, substance for almsgiving, the avoidance of idleness, etc.) can be otherwise obtained, work is nowhere enjoined. The people with whom this was most apt to be true were the rich.

¹ Uhlhorn, op.cit., pp.191,192,193.
I have nowhere found any case in which work was enjoined on rich Christians. On the contrary, Chrysostom, in a passage in one of his homilies, seems to take it for granted that the rich will not work, and indeed have no reason to. He is, to be sure, defending a Providence which allows poverty to exist, and is trying to point out its advantages, so perhaps he ought not to be taken too literally. But that his assumption is incidental seems not to diminish, but rather to enhance its value. He describes two cities, the one made up completely of well-to-do people, the other of people who are poor and have to work for a living. The latter city of course flourishes by reason of the diligence of the inhabitants; but the former city is soon in confusion and decay because none of the inhabitants will stir a finger to counteract the deterioration of time and use. ¹ All this eloquence in describing these two hypothetical cities may or may not have made his hearers more content with their poverty; but it certainly indicates plainly enough that neither he nor anyone else expected work of any save those who were driven to it by poverty.

The Apostolic Constitutions, after exhorting Christians to work to avoid idleness, only advise the rich brethren to keep company with such as are fellow-Christians, and talk on holy subjects, or stay at home and read the Bible:

Thou shalt not be a wanderer and a gadabout....But minding thine own trade and employment endeavor to do what is acceptable to God....Nay, although thou beest rich, and so dost not want a trade for thy maintenance be not one that gads about....but either go to some that are believers ....and confer or discourse with them about the lively oracles of God, or if thou stayest at home, read the books of the Law....and peruse diligently the Gospels....

Even the first part of the exhortation, that to those who must work, does not imply that the work itself is "acceptable to God," but simply that such things are to be done while carrying it on.

Uhlhorn says in general, summing up the teaching of the early Church on work:

The ancient Fathers say little, indeed remarkably little about work. Whenever the subject is mentioned, however, then we feel immediately that in the pagan world it had been regarded quite differently....certainly the deeper moral estimate of labour, the conception of vocation, the connection of the earthly calling with the heavenly one, had not yet dawned upon the Church....the general duty of work, the significance of labour in a calling for the exercise of the Christian life and the furtherance of the Kingdom of God is never expressed anywhere.

3. Quoted from Die Christliche Liebestätigkeit, Vol. I, pp. 76-79, 129-131, in Troeltsch, Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, Vol. I, p. 184 (n. 60). Troeltsch comments: "All this, however, only means that the later Lutheran doctrine of the ethic of work and of the "calling" were unknown to the early Church. These ideas were unknown because they arose out of another kind of spirit."
This, in the main, is true. Judged beside our modern conception of the earthly activity of a man as a "calling," the early Church teaching on the subject is more meagre than might have been expected. But, as we have seen, from the beginning Christian teaching did make a difference in men's attitude toward work. It was enjoined as a duty, not because it had in itself a religious value, but because it too could be made to aid the religious life. It was a means whereby the task of mission preaching was made easier; it saved the individual Christian from the perils of idleness - beggary, mischief, and thievery; it put an end to cupidity; and above all it was the essential basis of charity. In short, as a technique of moral discipline, and as a means of charity, both of which were matters of intense religious concern, it was capable of escaping from the odium attaching to servile occupation and of entering the religious sphere. Thus the groundwork was laid for the later concept of earthly activity as a "calling."
CHAPTER TWO

CHARACTERISTICS OF MONASTICISM IN GENERAL WITH REGARD TO WORK. COMPARISON WITH CHRISTIANITY AS A WHOLE.
1. Monasticism as a lay movement:

The hierarchical Church has so successfully incorporated monasticism in its own organization that it is sometimes difficult for us to remember that it was, in its beginnings, a lay movement. The anchorites who retired to the desert manifested a perfect willingness to dispense with the sacramental administrations of the Church. It does not appear that they had any active quarrel with the hierarchy or with those who wished to depend on their ministrations for their religious life; nor does it appear that when those ministrations were conveniently available, they were refused even by the hermits. But they simply counted them as matters of indifference for the soul's health, and depended rather upon their own spiritual and bodily exercises. Duchesne says it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that St. Anthony did not receive the Eucharist for years together.\(^1\) Gregory tells how it required a miracle one year to inform Benedict that it was Easter Day.\(^2\)

Even when eremitism was largely displaced by cenobitism, it was not intended that the monks should be priests. There were priests among them, but they were to be monks first of all, and only afterward priests.\(^3\) The priests might say

---

2. Dialogues, II, I.
3. Benedict's Rule, c.60: "If any one in the ranks of the priesthood shall ask to be received into a monastery, let him not receive permission too quickly......he shall understand......that no mitigation(of the Rule) will be allowed to him." cf.c.62.
Mass, probably once a week; but there is no regular provision for it in the Benedictine Rule. Another indication of the lay character of the movement is the regulations, or rather lack of regulations on dress. The tunic was to be rather that of the common laborer or slave of the time than the religious garb it later became, not necessarily uniform in color or texture. ¹

From these things it is manifest that monasticism is a lay movement that tried to shake off the growing intermediation of the hierarchy as a factor in the personal religious life, and which assumed that it was possible for each man to work out his own salvation. ² The lay character of monasticism is important for the incorporation of labor as an integral part of its life, because a distinct clerical caste has usually militated against productive activity of the worldly sort; it was well that monasticism was in its inception free from this clerical consciousness. In spite of the fact that for the first four centuries clerics worked to gain at least part of their own living, priests soon succumbed to the feeling that it was beneath their dignity as custodians of the altar to work with their hands. Monks, however, who only rarely and then as a matter of concession more than anything else, were of priestly

². Martene in his commentary on the Rule says specifically that in the early days of monasticism the monks were scarcely distinguishable from laymen. M.P.L. 66:720c.
rank were free from this temptation; free, too, from the
force of such decrees as those of Valentinian III which
made it illegal for clerics to engage in gainful occupations.
The history of monasticism shows that there is a real con-
nection between the ordination of monks to the priesthood
and aversion to labor.\footnote{Butler, Benedictine Monachism, p.374.}

2. Monasticism as a protest against secularism:

The Church as a whole acknowledged her obligation to
teach and baptize the hordes without her gates. As ever
larger numbers were admitted, it became increasingly clear
that the Church's very success was a peril to her ideals,
which were penetrating the world only at the sacrifice of
their purity. The necessity of applying Christian prin­
ciples to the daily life of people in a complex world led to
compromises in matters of business ethics, sex-morality,
the matter of sacrificing on pagan altars. These were per­
haps inevitable in the very nature of the task, but were
viewed with alarm by those who took Christian principles
more seriously. These earnest souls became aware that
God was evidently not going to establish his Kingdom sudden­
ly and completely; aware also that the Church was not going
to convert the world to the high ideal of primitive Christ­
ianity - she had tried and had obtained results only at the
cost of surrendering the precious purity of that ideal.
"Very well, then," said these earnest souls, "we will create our own Christian community. We will withdraw from this obdurate, insidious world, and will by the simple process of exclusion establish a world where that pristine ideal can be maintained. The Church has sacrificed purity for universality; we will keep our purity even at the cost of universality." Embodied in this withdrawn community, albeit with some of the distortion inevitable in the nature of the movement, were perfectly genuine elements of the Gospel life. Asceticism, which is often regarded as a perversion of the Gospel, has its roots in what Troeltsch calls the "radical supernaturalism" and the "ethical rigorism" of the New Testament teaching. Other elements entered in, no doubt; a sort of dualism in both intellectual and practical realms, an evaluation of renunciation for its own sake, and, as has already been mentioned, abandonment of the responsibility for society as a whole. But fundamentally asceticism and its organized form monasticism, have a more legitimate position in the history of Christianity than Protestants are usually willing to admit.¹

So far as the ascetic ideal is concerned, being on the whole just the ideal of Christians generally,² only applied more rigorously and consistently, we are not surprised to

---

¹ See Troeltsch, Social Teachings, I, pp.102-110, 162.
² Basil regarded the monk as the Christian "par excellence," and used the word "Christian" for "monk" several times. See Clarke The Ascetic Works of Basil, p.14 and n.1; 129, 184, 188. Cardinal Gasquet says the Regular life "was regarded merely as a systematic form of life on the lines of the Gospel counsels of perfection to be lived... as the full expression of the Church's true and perfect life." His translation of the Rule of Benedict, London, 1925, p.xiv.
find labor as a part of its content, and indeed more strenuously and effectively emphasized. If the early Christians insisted on labor as a technique for self-discipline, the more so would the ascetics, whose life was devoted to self-discipline. In spite of all its negative tendencies, the monastic ideal never got so far from the Gospel teaching that it did not have a place also for a high estimate of positive and productive activity.

Since it was not based... indeed... upon any system at all, but was only an extraordinary effort of the will and an eschatological and eudaimonistic guarantee... it (asceticism) was able to unite with all positive tendencies of deliberate charity or useful occupation.\(^1\)

It will be proper to note here, however, that this combination of asceticism with labor is, so far as I am aware, unique in Christianity. Neither asceticism nor appreciation of labor by a religious system was new with Christianity, but the combination was. Buddhism, neo-Platonism, Pythagoreanism, Cynicism, Stoicism, all manifested to a greater or less degree characteristics of the ascetic temper. Fasting, silence, possibly continence, infliction of extreme pain on the body are used as expressions of this temper. But labor is conspicuous by its absence. Indeed it could scarcely be otherwise, for neither reabsorption into the deity, nor independence of external things, nor the

\(^1\) Troeltsch, op.cit., p.104.
preparation of the soul for a higher stage of existence by mortifying the sinful flesh are scarcely served by labor involving close contact with the material element.

On the other hand two religions, Judaism and Zoroastrianism inculcated labor, but are non- or even anti-ascetic in temper. Of the favorable Judaistic teaching regarding work we have already spoken. Such ascetic tendencies as manifest themselves in later Judaism are not strong, and are regarded as importations from other religions. Asceticism is not a genuine part of Judaistic teaching or practice.

An essential part of the Zarathustrian reform was the care of cattle and pasture land; the new faith was inseparably connected with a "zeal for economics;" activity and productive work as well as the good things of eating and drinking, marrying and child-bearing were highly esteemed. But in Persian religion there was a distinct anti-ascetic trend. Fasting and practices of mortification were a sin. This appears not only in its positive teaching, but also in some of the penalties for offense against the Avesta law, for they consist in the imposition of useful duties, and satisfy the requirements alike of punishment and agriculture. ¹

So it seems as though pre-Christian asceticism had no place for labor, and such religions as cherished labor, excluded asceticism. It was the glory of Christianity alone

¹. I have drawn the material for these two paragraphs from the article "Asceticism," in the Encycl. of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, pp. 63-112.
that it included in its system both asceticism and labor; and the combination was of immense significance for the history of civilization.

3. Elements in the ideal of renunciation favorable to work:

The fact that the monastic movement was a withdrawal from the world made it desirable to restrict worldly relationships as much as possible. This was achieved sometimes by setting up spiritual barriers or at least differentia, while remaining in the presence of other men; but more often separation was obtained by seeking actually isolated spots for monastic ventures. Basil emphasized this less; his foundations were in cities for the most part; but Benedict's ideal was an economically self-sufficient monastery. Contact with the outside world was to be limited, as far as possible, to the reception of guests. Monks in a solitary district will have to provide their own living. Further, such a district is apt to be wild and unfruitful, requiring more than usual labor before it can bring forth the necessary sustenance.

Other elements in the ideal of labor of renunciation will not militate against labor, but rather further it. Such elements are notably poverty and obedience: the one, renunciation of private property; the other of self-will.

But it should be noted that poverty in and of itself is not incompatible with an economically non-productive life. The poverty vowed by the monk was personal. This personal poverty might co-exist with corporate wealth; in which case it was not necessary for the monks to work to maintain themselves; or even when poverty was corporate the living might be gained by begging, as in the case of the Dominicans. When in the Middle Ages monastic land possessions brought with them crowds of bondsmen of various degrees to do the work, by relaxing somewhat the principle of seclusion from contact with the world the monks could live upon the products of their bondmen's labor; or they might take the course of the Cluniacs and Cistercians and create a semi-monastic order of "lay-brethren" upon whose labor they might subsist while still preserving a measure of seclusion from the world.

The Fathers of monasticism evidently never envisaged the possibility of the corporate wealth becoming so extensive as to prove a hindrance to religious life. Yet it was just this increase of wealth which proved the downfall of most monasteries. It seems to me to be the great flaw in the otherwise admirably farsighted construction of Benedict, that he contemplated the reception of gifts by the monastery, when an "oblate" or young child was dedicated to the monastery by its parents.\(^1\) The primary object seems

---

to have been to prevent the oblate from keeping anything of the patrimony for himself, but rather turn it over to the monastery in case they did not wish to sell and give to the poor. But this operated in time greatly to increase the possessions of the monastery as such and so was distinctly harmful to the religious life of its occupants.

Basil seems to have been wiser and discouraged gifts to the cloisters.\textsuperscript{1} Cassian likewise reports that in Egypt gifts were not allowed to be brought to the monasteries and makes a like regulation for his own. But the reasons he gives are not fear that the monastery will become too wealthy but that it might puff up the donor, and that later he might withdraw and leave the monastery in an embarrassing position if the gift had been dissipated.\textsuperscript{2} These regulations were made under a money economy and assume that a monk might withdraw when he wished. Yet later gifts were made chiefly in land, and the monk's vows were perpetual so that he could not withdraw if he wished.\textsuperscript{3}

Nevertheless personal poverty was completely insisted

\textsuperscript{1} Grützmacher, Die Bedeutung Benedickts, p.43. Shorter Rules, 304, Clarke's tr. p.348. Yet it should be noted that even personal poverty was not as absolute in the Basilian foundations as the Rule would indicate. See evidence given by Clarke, ibid., p.252, n.4. Cf. The same author's St. Basil a Study in Monasticism, Cambridge, 1913, p.81ff.


\textsuperscript{3} Pachomius seems to have been consistent on this point. Once when a neighbor seeing that the monks lacked bread, wished to give them some wheat "for the salvation of his soul," (sp early did that idea appear) Pachomius took it, but insisted on setting a day for its return. (Greek Life, A.SS.,Mail III, 32*B.)
on by Benedict, and so long as corporate possessions remained within moderate limits, and the brotherhood had not become so deeply involved in the feudal system as to have many servants and bondmen, poverty would naturally quicken their desire to work by the power of imminent hunger. Another great advantage of the provision was the absolute equalitarianism it involved. No one could buy exemption from tasks by reason of personal wealth. Augustine it is true could not entirely rid himself of the aristocratic idea that a man's wealth before he entered the monastery might be accepted as a valid exemption, and can only insist that he ought to work to set an example, and to "heal the swelling of the old pride." But in Benedict's Rule, there was no exception save for bodily infirmity, no mention being made of his previous condition in secular life.

Thus, where the Church as a whole was content to exhort the poor to labor, tacitly exempting the rich from this counsel, the monasteries having no rich and poor were able to require it of all alike.

Work was required by obedience which, an instrument of renunciation and means of humility, was also a great leveller of distinctions. "For monks are men who can claim no dominion even over their own bodies or wills." Their self-

1. "Above all others, let this vice be extirpated from the monastery," Rule, c.33.
2. "On the Work of the Monks," 25,32. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, III, pp.516a,518b, esp.33,p.519a. "If indeed they (rich monks who have contributed to the monastery) be unwilling to do this (work), who can venture to compel them?"
3. Rule, c.48, fin.
4. Ibid., c.33.
surrender was greater than that of any slave; it was freely undertaken but as complete and irrevocable as that of the slave. And this lay on all alike. As there were in the monastery no rich or poor, so there were no free or slave. All in a sense were free, yet all were slaves. The great thing was that all (save the Abbot who was chosen in theory by the community) were on the same footing. The monasteries presented the nearest approach to a democracy that could be found in those days. It was not a modern democracy in the sense that each individual was possessed of certain sovereign rights, but it was a democracy in the sense that in the monastery each man was treated solely on the basis of his performance in the community. The low-born were to be as freely received into the brotherhood as the high-born. Augustine says:

But now there come into this profession of the service of God, ... persons from the condition of slaves, or also freedmen ... likewise from the life of peasants and from the exercise and plebeian labor of handicraftsmen ... whom not to admit, is a heavy sin, and meet to be imitated.  

A man joins the Pachomian community with relatives and servants. Benedict insists that no worldly wealth is to make any difference in receiving candidates; and is very explicit that rank shall make less difference than merit after he is in. "Let not the free-born be put before the

---

1. Cunningham, Christianity and Economic Science, p.27.
3. Greek Life, 50 A.D. SS, Mail III 38c.
4. Rule, c.59.
serf-born in religion, unless there be other reasonable cause for it, because, whether bond or free, we are all one in Christ and bear an equal burden of service under one Lord, for with God there is no accepting of persons.\(^1\) Monasticism did no more than did the Church to abolish slavery in the world, and no slaves were received into the order without the master's consent. But since monastic duties were incompatible with a division between free and slave, all slaves were freed before they were admitted; within the cloister there was no distinction. Hence, while in the outside world work could not but retain something of the old stigma which always exists where some of it is performed by slaves under compulsion, in the cloisters, at least in the brave beginnings, it was not so. Work was there done by all alike because it was a necessary and serviceable part of the life as organized about the religious motive and so lost the stigma of contact with slavery.

5. The inherent social nature of monasticism:

We have already spoken of how the motive of monasticism arising out of recoil from the compromises made by the Church in the world, was the search to find, or the urge to create, an environment where such compromises would not be necessary, but where the ideal of the Gospel life could be fulfilled in all its purity. The first sporadic and spon-

\(^1\) Rule, c.2. Cf.c.63, "The brethren shall take their places according to the date of their conversion, the merit of their lives, or the appointment of the Abbot. And the Abbot ... must not by any arbitrary use of his power, ordain anything unjustly."
taneous excursions to the wilderness resulted in anchor-etism - a natural result of the urge toward individualism of which the movement was an expression. But anchoretism was doomed to be but a passing phase of monasticism. It was neither possible nor desirable that it should last. It was not possible, first of all, because the greatest solitaries found that, in spite of themselves, groups of admirers gathered around them. Some of them moved several times to avoid such crowding, but without success. Again, it was impossible and was soon to be seen so, to live the life of the Gospel in solitude. Pachomius tried the life of a solitary first, but changed his way of thinking, and became the "father of cenobitism;" Benedict too lived as a hermit some years, but saw what a truncated life it was and became the "founder of cenobitism in the West." Ere­mitism was too great a deviation from the Gospel life, which can be practiced only in society, long to endure. Basil sums it up well, as he strikes lusty blows at the solitary life:

Many commandments are easily performed by a number living together, but not by a solitary man;....For example, when we visit the sick man, we cannot receive a stranger; when we bestow and distribute the necessities of life, especially when these ministrations have to be performed at a distance, we neglect work; so that

1. Some have laid the beginnings of anchoretism to the persecutions of Marcus Aurelius or Decius. But see Workman, p.82: "It was not persecution but rather its cessation which made the hermits." But see ibid., pp.95,96, where it is implied that the expedient of fleeing to the desert may have been at least suggested by the Decian persecution.
the greatest commandment of all and that which conduces to salvation is neglected and neither the hungry is fed nor the naked clothed. Who then would choose the idle and fruitless life in preference to the fruitful life which is lived in accordance to the commandment of the Lord?"

The eremitical life was not found desirable because of the extravagances and disorder to which it gave rise. Every man was a law unto himself, and the results were bizarre and unedifying to say the least. So even before the death of Anthony, Pachomius' communities were flourishing, destined to become the model for the prevailing type of monastic life. Eremitism and cenobitism were, it is true, to exist side by side for some time. The first persisted long in Palestine and Syria. In some places the solitary life was regarded as the goal and the common life but the preliminary stage. But for the most part men early came to see the truth of the saying in Ecclesiastes, "Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth there is none to lift him up." The rectifying influence of membership in a community was necessary to sane and enduring religious life. It is not surprising then to find cenobitism becoming the successful and prevalent form of monasticism. Hermits are mentioned, it is true, until quite late in the Middle Ages, but were, not long after Benedict's time, negligible in numbers and influence.

1. Longer Rules VII. Clarke's Translation, pp.163-166.
2. Schenoudi, the successor of Pachomius had this view; it was also that of Cassian, and doubtless prevailed in south Gaul. See Workman, p.126; Cassian Collationes, XVIII and XIX; Duchesne, op.cit.,Vol.II, pp.515,516,518, 520.
The very nature of a cenobium as the dwelling place of a number of poor men on an equal footing will introduce an element of urgency to work. The hermit may work as much or as little as he pleases, or as his extremely simple needs will compel him to work. If he lives in a cave, has a spring and a few palms nearby, there is scant reason why he should work at all, providing he is willing to subsist on what these natural resources will provide for him. But where fifty or a hundred or more are living close together, they can no longer wait for nature to feed them unaided. They must help the soil by their own labor. The food thus produced must be stored; this storage and their own living quarters require building; each cannot prepare himself a meal when he feels like it; repasts must come at set times and must be prepared by some for all. Sanitation (even the minimum required by body-scorning monks) becomes a problem where so many men are gathered together, and cleanliness can be neglected only with disastrous results. So a multiplication of tasks and a specialization of labor is bound to result at the forming of a large community. Where a convent of monks is near one of nuns, this will be carried still further.¹

Again, since the individual is no longer supplying all his own needs but, let us say, one need for the whole community, the way is opened to put an altruistic construction

on such effort. It is no longer time unwillingly taken from contemplation and given grudgingly to the base needs of a clamant body, but becomes a service to one in need and capable as such of positive religious interpretation. It has been the custom in Protestant circles to emphasize the lack of social responsibility which the monasteries represented. This is true to a large extent so far as the outside world is concerned; but we forget the degree of social responsibility which each member assumed for the other members of his house --- a degree unapproached in any Protestant organization save perhaps the family. We have been willing to recognize the monasteries as organized self-discipline, but forgotten that they were also organized charity. The charity was exercised within a closed corporation, perhaps. But we must not forget the honest conviction which drove them into the cloister, the conviction that the life of the Gospel, expressed as well in charity as in other things was impossible in the fullest sense in "the world." Nor must we forget that in practice, at least, even the charity of the early church was largely confined to its own members.¹

The "communism of love" as practiced in the Jerusalem community was of short duration, and save for the exceeding seriousness with which the Churches undertook the work of

¹ Gal.6:10, "especially toward them that are of the household of faith." Cadoux, pp.199,452,604. On the first of these pages there is a quotation from Uhlhorn, Christian Charity, p.125: "The object aimed at and actually attained, was that no member of the Church should suffer want." Harnack, however, is not willing to go so far: "We lack all Christian testimony on this point." Mission and Expansion, I, p.162, cf.173.
communicating to the needy, was not renewed in church
communities proper. But monastic communities were not
only a revival of that communism of love, but even an ex-
tension of it as well; for whereas in Jerusalem there
was only partial communism in consumption, in the monas-
teries it was complete and extended not only to consumption
but to production as well. Nor was consciousness of this
fact absent from Christian minds. Troeltsch reproduces a
quotation from Chrysostom: "Thus today men live in the
monasteries in the way in which in other days the (Jerusalem)
believers used to live." "The Church," Troeltsch goes on,
gave no practical expression to these ideas at all, as is
emphasized by Harnack (Reden,43)....but rather the contrary."¹
Hildemar in his Commentary on the Rule of Benedict voices
the same sense when he says:

Dividebatur singulis prout cuique opus
erat. Hoc autem scriptum est in historia
Actuum Apostolorum. Ordo enim qui in
illa primitiva ecclesia erat, in monachis
remansit.²

It is my judgment, therefore, that the inherently social
nature of monasticism tends not only to make work more neces-
sary, but also that it makes possible its performance from
a motive higher than compulsion by one's own imperative needs,
so that it is susceptible of being described as organized
charity. This is confirmed if one compares the larger view

1. Social Teachings, I,175,n.31.
   Compare Cunningham, Christianity and Economic Science,p.25:
   "We can study the details of an industrial community per-
   meated with religious sentiment and designed to express
   Christian principles....throughout long centuries of mon-
   astic life."
of labor which obtained in Upper Egypt, where under the influence of Pachomius cenobitism early prevailed, with the somewhat meager toleration accorded it in Lower Egypt, where, due to the influence of Anthony, the eremitic form survived a longer time. In Lower Egypt the highest value that could be ascribed to labor was that it served the purposes of penance, but in the Pachomian communities it was allowed a much more positive place in the religious life.¹ It is to my mind indubitable that it was just this element of communal, even communistic living, which made possible this higher evaluation.

5. Monastic incorporation of the Christian ideal in the routine of daily living:

Finally be it noted how well adapted was the monastic organization to incorporate the various elements of the ascetic ideal --- renunciation, labor, prayer --- into the daily lives of the monks. Indeed that was the single guiding principle of Benedict, who achieved the successful articulation of such a scheme. There was not to be a moment of time, a motion of the body, a spoken word, and, insofar as it was susceptible of social control, not a thought of the mind that was not to be subordinated to this great purpose --- that of living the Gospel life, achieving the Christian perfection. There is something sublime in the daring of the conception; and scarcely less admirable is the manner in

¹ Workman, pp.127,155.
which, with the peculiarly Roman genius for realizing profound governmental principles in practical, detailed regulation, Benedict was able to realize that conception. The learned researches of Dom Butler have been able to restore the horarium of the Benedictine monk for the whole twenty-four hours winter and summer, with the possible exception of sixty minutes, between lauds and prime. Every other waking minute is filled with work reading, or prayers, with a short time for meals; and, according to Gregory that unaccounted for sixty minutes may have been used for private prayer.¹ It is at this point where monasticism is conceived as a definite program for the whole Christian life, and labor is included as a part of this program that the greatest contribution of monasticism to the tradition of work is made. So far as theory or evaluation goes, it did not materially alter that which it inherited from the early Christian thought; but the significant thing is just this peculiar fitness of monasticism to see the theory and evaluation perpetuated in daily action.

We can see, then, what advantages the monasteries had over the "churches in the world" as a nursery of the tradition and practice of work. The monasteries are, first of all, composed of a picked body of Christians, with an ideal which, in spite of its negative tendencies, is flexible enough to include positive, productive activity. The monks

¹ Butler, Benedictine Monachism, pp.284,5. Of this horarium more will be said later, See below, pp. 118, 119, 123.
are resolved to carry out that ideal in its highest form, in the most completely integrated manner possible, submitting themselves with complete obedience to a regime which directs the minutest detail of their lives toward the desired end. They live together in complete personal poverty, sharing the goods of the community in an absolute communism of love. Their ideal bids them work. The principle of renunciation under which they live requires work to maintain life, and the government of the monastery is so conceived and administered to require it of all and in equal degree. The secular Church expected work of the poor alone, the rich and the priests were exempt; but in a monastery there were no rich, and priests were like any other monks. In the secular Church, there remained many slaves whose condition inevitably tainted work with servility; in the monasteries there were no slaves. The secular Church might or might not be able to furnish work for its needy members; the monastery's very existence made work for its inmates. The secular Church might exhort its members to work or hold up the advantages of work before them; the monastery could exact it "on holy obedience," and enforce it on recusants by a definite discipline. In short, where secular Christianity could enjoin labor as a technique of self-discipline and as the presupposition of charitable activity, monasticism could the more effectively exact it because it was itself, inter alia, not
only rationally organized self-renunciation, but also rationally organized, if somewhat circumscribed charity.

Let me conclude this chapter with quotations from two thorough students of ecclesiastical history. It is Troeltsch's judgment that "The idea of free labor and the demand that a livelihood shall be based upon labour, was first clearly recognized in the monasteries, and from them it first spread into the world."¹ From von Schubert comes this generalization:

Even though at first in small groups, detached from the life of the rest of the world, the New Testament idea of labour was here first realized. Men work because God has commanded it, everyone does his part in the common task, work and prayer are combined, work and rest alternate, and the aim of this labor is not merely the selfish aim of gaining something for oneself, but it is the unselfish aim of earning something in order to be able to serve others with it.²

---

1. Social Teachings, I, 163.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF WORK BEFORE BENEDICT.
Section I. The Hermits: 1

Work seems to have been quite general among the hermits, especially of Egypt. In Syria, where the solitaries practiced wild extremes of asceticism, little account was made of the steadying and prosaic occupation of work. But in Egypt, due no doubt to the immensely influential Life of Anthony, which according to the preface "is a sufficient pattern for monks," and which represented him as working with his hands, the indications are that most of the solitaries did actually work, though naturally rather casually and from pressure of necessity than from any set plan or motive of a higher sort. 2 Unfortunately, the interest and sympathy of Palladius are aroused more by the prodigious austerities of the champions of "the philosophic life" than by their commonplace labors. Nevertheless, he gives us indications that they do work; and these taken together with the life of Anthony are sufficient basis for concluding that work formed a well-recognized part of the eremitic life.

Anthony, at the beginning of his search for the perfect Christian life, after having sold all that he had and

1. The sources for the life of the hermits are chiefly the Life of Anthony, the Lausiac History of Palladius, and the Conferences of Cassian, See ante pp. 10, 13, 15.
2. Even the "virgins" spun. Lausiac History 31, Clarke's tr. p.111.
given to the poor, worked hard with his hands while hunting an ascetic near his own village who might guide him in his search, "having heard 'he who is idle, let him not eat,' And part he spent on bread, and part he gave to the poor."¹ The work was continued when Anthony went to the "Inner Mountain" to stay by himself; he cultivated a little plot of ground so he would have something to give those who came to visit him.² During his later years, at the plea of his discipulæ, he gave up gardening; but he would not let their gifts of food go unrecompensed, for he insisted on weaving baskets to give them in return.³

The Rule of Anthony, which may represent his view on labor though it comes more probably from the hand of his disciple Isaiah, prescribes work for its monks:

Coge te ipsum in operae manuum tuarum, et timor Domini inhabitabit in te...
Cum sederis in cella tua, sollicitus esto de tribus hisce rebus perpetuo: nimirum, de operae manuum tuarum, de meditatione tuorum Psalmorum, et de oratione tua.⁴

In the bits about labor in the Life we have already given the two motives of monastic labor --- self-maintenance and charity. The hermits of Egypt seem to have had a sort of sturdy pride in not being dependent on the charity or labor of others for their living. Pambo of Nitria:

². Ibid., 50, p.209.
fell asleep, not from an attack of fever, nor from any illness, but while he was stitching up a basket at the age of seventy.

This Pambo on his deathbed, at the very moment of his passing, is reported to have said to the bystanders...

From the day that I came to this place in the desert and built my cell and inhabited it, I cannot remember having "eaten bread for nought," not earned by my hands. ¹

Philormus expresses much the same feeling: "From the time that I was initiated and born again until today (the eightieth year of his age) I have never eaten another's bread for nothing, but always as the result of my own labors." ² The same is told of Chronius who had been a priest for sixty years. ³ Cassian even dares to imply that the man who so earns his own bread is superior to kings:

For certainly the whole human race, except only that class of monks who live in accordance with the Apostle's command, by the daily labor of their own hands, looks for the charity of another's compassion. Wherefore it is clear that not only those who boast that they themselves are supported either by the wealth of their relatives or the labors of their servants or the produce of their farms, but also the kings of this world are supported by charity. This at any rate is embraced in the definition of our predecessors who have laid down that anything that is taken for the requirements of daily food which has not been procured and prepared by the labor of our own hands ought to be referred to charity, as the

¹. Lausiæ Hœris, 10, Clarke's tr. p.63.
². Ibid., 45, p.146.
³. Ibid., 47, p.149.
Apostle teaches: If a man does not
work......etc.\ref{1}

This being a burden on no one is the more necessary, Cassian
thinks, because the Apostles worked in addition to preach-
ing the word, but the monks have no responsibility in that
direction.\ref{2}

But this work was carried on because it had a value
in mortifying the body. Palladius tells of Dorotheus,
a Theban ascetic, how he

would collect stones all day in the
desert by the sea, and build with them
continually and make cells, and then
he would retire in favor of those who
could not build for themselves. Each
year he completed one cell. And when
once I said to him, "What do you mean,
Father, at your great age, by trying
to kill your body in these heats?" he
answered thus: "It kills me, I kill
It."....He would sit up all night long
and weave ropes of palm leaves to
provide himself with food, but also to
keep himself from sleeping.\ref{3}

Candida, a widow, says Palladius, used to "work all night
long with her hands at the mill to subdue her body; and she
used to say: 'Fasting is insufficient; I give it an ally in
the shape of toilsome watching that I may destroy the insol-
ence of Esau.'"\ref{4} Certainly the value of the product was
not the main thing; of the "Abbot" Paul, Cassian tells that
he used to work a whole year weaving palm-mats, and then
burn them up because he could not sell them.\ref{5}

\textbf{References:}
1. Collations, 24:12, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2,
Vol.XI, p.536b.
2. Institutes, 10:8.
3. Lausiac History, 2, Clarke, p.49.
4. Ibid., 57, p.152.
As we have already seen, in a small way the demands of hospitality and charity had appeared in the motives of Anthony. Mabillon says that the solitaries of the Thebaid used to work more to nourish others than to nourish themselves.\(^1\) Cassian reports of those of Libya Mareotis that they labored not only to support themselves and their visitors, but also for the needs of the people of the barren district in which they lived, "Substantium de fructu manuum suarum rationabile ac verum sacrificium Domno se offerre credentes."\(^2\)

Cassian's ideas are in illustration of, rather than an addition to those of the Egyptians. He does however go so far as to say that even those who might receive sustenance from relatives must work.\(^3\) The chief advance over the economic arrangements of Egypt is implied in the Institutes, 4:14, where it seems that the monks are sent out to work for other people and bring back their earnings to the organization. He who earned more than his keep was not to be puffed up over his success, or take more than the limited portion of bread assigned to each. Cassian, like the Egyptians, was careful to choose his work so that the contemplative activity might not be too much disturbed thereby. On this account agriculture was incompatible with the contemplative life, because "the multitude of thoughts

---

1. Traité des Études Monastiques, Paris, 1692, Vol.I, p.119. I have not been able to find the source of this statement.
2. Institutes, 10:12, MPL 49:393.
3. Collations, 24:12, Ibid., 1300.
generated by such work makes unbearable the prolonged silence and quiet of the hermit's cell.\textsuperscript{1} Anything that takes him into the open air for work dissipates his concentration of mind.\textsuperscript{2}

Even the charity of the hermits was regarded as much for the good it did the giver's soul as for the help it offered others. Anthony seems to regard almsgiving as a good weapon against the demons, along with fasting, sleeplessness, and prayers.\textsuperscript{3} And the spirit of humility which work induced was efficacious for obtaining forgiveness of sins, according to the Rule of Isaiah.\textsuperscript{4}

It is clear, then, from these indications that while work was fairly general among the hermits and the amorphous communities which succeeded them, it was still very casual. Evidences of sustained charity are almost wholly lacking. Such as it was, it was rather hospitality to chance guests. It did not, therefore, play a large part in the monks' ideas about work, though a beginning was made. Cassian attained the idea that money so earned and so expended might be considered "a sacrifice to the Lord;" but even charity was considered as a weapon in the arsenal of the combatant against the demons. Nevertheless, it was held that work was a valuable part of the eremitical life because it enabled the worker to maintain himself without

\textsuperscript{1} Collations, 24:4.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 24:3.
\textsuperscript{4} Regula Isaias Abbatis, 15, Holsten, Vol.I, p.6: "Scito quod labor et paupertas et peregrinatio et afflictio et silentium afferunt humilitatem, humilitas autem peccata omnia condonat."
charge to any one, and helped him to subdue the passions of the body. The fact that Cassian insisted on choosing just such occupations as would not interfere with contemplation and prayer indicates that they had no idea of work as such being worship; but rather something that was apt to interrupt and dissipate the worshipful temper. The wholesome influence of complete community life had not yet appeared to elevate the idea of labor.

Section II. Pachomius:

Anthony is no longer regarded as the first (though he is still the greatest) hermit:¹ but Pachomius' position as the "Father of cenobitism" remains unchallenged.² We have already discussed the intimate connection between the communal form of monastic life and the development of work in it.³ It is not surprising therefore that we should see in the Pachomian communities a tremendous industrial development.

1. Pachomian labor and its organization:

Pachomius himself organized the work required to keep abreast of the daily needs of the monastery.⁴ In charge of all the physical needs of the monastery was the

¹ Workman, Evolution of the Monastic Ideal, p. 95f.
³ Ante, p. 68f.
⁴ Ladeuze, Etude, etc. pp. 296, 7; Heimbucher, I, 107-112.
Oikonomos, and under him a Deuteros, who was charged with the sale and purchase of goods for the monastery. Then there were mikroi oikonomoi, who prepared the table and cooked the food; the hebdomarius, who officiated for a week at a time, from each one of the small constituent houses in turn. Each of these small houses had, again, its own oikiakos and deuteros. The duties of the hebdomarius are rather vaguely indicated; he calls the brethren to religious services by sounding a gong, and carries food and drink to the brethren working away from the monastery, as does Theodore in the Greek Life. There are doorkeepers who welcome strangers, and instruct the postulants. Some of special piety are entrusted with the buying and selling for the community. The sick are taken care of; a bakery is mentioned in the Coptic life.

Labor to produce goods for other than internal consumption was comparatively simple during the lifetime of Pachomius; the gathering and weaving of rushes from the Nile, and of palm-leaves was apparently the major occupation. But after the death of Pachomius, his flourishing congregation required and developed a more diversified system of industries. Agriculture increased greatly during

1. Greek Life, 19 (A.SS.Mai1 III p.29#F and following), also 50,52,59.
2. Greek Life, 19,A.SS.Mai1 III,p.29#F.
3. Ibid., p.20#A.
4. Ibid., 93, p.50*
5. Ibid., p.33#F.
6. Ibid., 19,p.30#A.
7. Ibid., 53, p.39#A.
the abbacy of Horaiisi. Thus early did the possession of landed property occasion strife in the congregation.¹
Rules 58-63 in Jerome's translation apply, doubtless, to agricultural labors at a distance from the monastery.²
The Lausiac History of Palladius gives the following account of the workmen in a colony of 7,000 monks at Taben-
nisi:

Among them was the noble Aphthonius, who became my intimate friend, and is now the second in the monastery. Him they send to Alexandria since nothing can make him stumble, in order to sell their produce and buy necessaries....
I found when I entered the city of Panopolis (a monastery of 300 monks in which were) 15 tailors, 7 smiths, 4 carpenters, 12 camel-drivers, 3 and 15 fullers. But they work at every kind of craft and with their surplus output they provide for the needs both of the women's convents and the prisons. They keep pigs too.....(for scavenging purposes and) the pigs are to be killed and their meat sold, but the tidbits are to be devoted to the sick and the aged, because the neighborhood is poor and populous....
But those who are to serve that day rise early and get to their work, some to the kitchen, others to the tables. They spend their time then until the meal hour in arranging and preparing the tables, putting loaves on each, and charlock, preserved olives, cheese of cows' milk (the tidbits of the meal) and chopped herbs....So also is it with their work. One works on the land as a laborer, another in the garden, another at the forge, another in the bakery, another in the carpenter's shop, another in the fuller's shop, another weaving the big

¹. Ladeuze, op. cit., p.295; Greek Life, 81 A.S.S. Mail III, 46*D.
². Ladeuze, op. cit., p.295.
³. Ladeuze translates the word καρποφόροι as "fabricants des câbles."
baskets, another in the tannery, another in the shoe-maker's shop, another in the scriptorium, another weaving the young reeds. And they all learn the Scriptures by heart. 

The Arabic life gives the following explanation of this: "Et s'il y avait parmi eux qui eût pratiqué un métier (auparavant) il le pratiquait (encore); quiconque n'en avait pas allait s'occuper des choses du monastère, obéissant aux ordres du chef établi sur eux par notre père Pakhôme." 

The Rule of Pachomius which represents the state of the communities at the beginning of the fifth century gives evidence of varied productive activities and a more highly articulated organization. The mikroi oikonomoi appear in their old role of cooks and table servers. In a fragment of a rule, which Amélineau says dates from the time of Schenoudi (Abbot at Atriópe, d.452), explicit directions are given to the oikonomos for cleanliness and frugality in cooking. Especial emphasis is laid on careful use of their precious firewood. Only so much of the bread must be put to soak (it was baked only very seldom and was so hard it had to be soaked before it was edible) as would

1. Writing was already a recognized part of monastic labor, cf. Lausiac History, Clarke's tr. p.67.
2. Ibid., 32, p.115f.
4. The Regula S. Pachomii will be found in the translation of Jerome in Holsten, I,pp.22-33; MPL,23:61-78. For the "mikroi oikonomoi" see Rules 35, 41.
last the day, in order that it might not become bitter.
The tendency was evidently to do up several days' supply
to save work. Only three sticks of wood were to be put
on the fire at once, and these not until the previous re-
plenishment had almost burnt out.

The "janitor" appears in charge of the guests\(^1\) (perhaps
also of the postulants);\(^2\) he seems to have been used as a
sort of intermediary between the brethren at a task who
were forbidden to communicate directly with each other.\(^3\)
We read of a gardener whose title indicates his duties.\(^4\)
The hebdomarii appear with increased duties. Some one,
called by Jerome a "minister" inquired the number of rushes
needed for his subordinates in the next day's weaving. It
is uncertain whether this "minister" was one of the oikonomoi
or a hebdomarius.\(^5\) In the Rule of Schenoudi's time, we
are given minute directions for the conduct of the brethren
working in harvesting parties,\(^6\) in the bakery,\(^7\) and in
parties working in the fields.\(^8\)

It is evident that labor plays no inconsiderable part
in the lives of the brethren, also that its performance
is attended by some temptations; regulations appear fre-
quently forbidding those working with the food, either in
the kitchen or in the fields, to take advantage of their

\[^1\text{Regula S.Pachomii, 51.}\]
\[^2\text{Ibid., 49.}\]
\[^3\text{Ibid., 59.}\]
\[^4\text{Ibid., 73.}\]
\[^5\text{Ibid., 26.}\]
\[^6\text{"Monuments," etc., p.262-266.}\]
\[^7\text{Ibid., pp.266-275.}\]
\[^8\text{Ibid., pp.275ff.}\]
opportunity to eat at odd times. No talking except what was absolutely necessary, and certainly no laughing was permitted, although psalm-singing was. Worthy of notice is the recurrent emphasis upon frugality in the use of materials. Only the proper amount of bread must be prepared; only so many dates for the date water; only so many sticks for the fire. Again and again, too, is the injunction of careful, even respectful handling of implements and tools: "Que leur négligence ne leur fasse mépriser aucun ustensile de terre, pas même le plus petit plat de terre." 

Cum ad domos suos pervenerint ferramenta quibus opus fecerunt et gallicas (These "shoes" were evidently common property, and were worn only when engaged in rough work) tradunt ei qui secundus est post Praepositum et ille inferet ea vespere in cellulam separatam, ibique concludet. Omnia autem ferramenta hebdomada completa, reportabilitur in unam domum: et rursus qui succedunt hebdomade singulis domibus noverint quid distribuant. 

That the economic productivity of the Pachomian communities attained considerable volume appears from the fact that monks went to Alexandria to dispose of their products from time to time. Even early in their history they sold two boats. They kept pigs and sold the flesh, expending the money for the good of the monastery.

3. Ibid., p.257, 8. 4. Ibid., p.258.
5. Jerome, 66.
2. Charity in the Pachomian foundations:

To what extent was the charity which, in early Christianity and in Basilian monasticism was so powerful a motive to labor, a part of the Pachomian thought and practice? We might indeed expect it to play a considerable part in Pachomius' personal life, for it was the charity of Christians to him and his fellow-soldiers on conscript duty which led to his conversion. And thenceforth we might reasonably look for it to form a salient feature of the scheme for the Christian life. But the scattered indications we have on this point are by no means unanimous. His first lone-handed attempt to lead the Christian life was, like that of Anthony, filled with works of mercy to others. He settled in a village called Schenesat, where he worked with his hands and ministered to the poor. When a pestilence devastated the village he remained to help by bringing firewood to those in need. The Arabic account of his apprenticeship with the famous hermit Palaemon tells how the surplus from their mat-weaving was given to the poor. During the early years of his foundation he had a vision as the brethren were cutting reeds by the river for their weaving, which sounds in his ears a clear call to the service of others.

αὐτὸῦ (παρθενίου) ἀγγελοῦντες
capitālis eüxēs thal to θελύμα

to téleios του θεου διδαξαθαν.

1. Greek Life, A.SS.Mail III, 264c.
3. Arabic Life, Ibid., p.347. The Greek Life does not mention this.
It is true, his service was not necessarily bodily work; his "diakonia" was to be leading men to God; but if he reflects that his own entrance to the fold was through the gateway of charity opened by Christians to him, a pagan legionnaire, we might expect charity to be extended by him in his turn as a way of fulfilling the angel's command to reconcile men to God.

In the Greek Life there is a hint that such charity is exercised by the young association of monks: 'Επερευν ὡσα ἔχον εἰς ἐλεήμονας εἴδους, ἦγενετο πότε ὑπερεύθαι αὐτοῖς ἀρτῳ. The imperfect of the verb would seem to imply a customary action "since they used to give whatever they had;" but there are indications that this ideal was not invariably pursued by the community, nor even undoubtingly assented to by Pachomius. For instance a curious story contained in the Coptic and Arabic lives indicates that Pachomius, or at any rate his early biographers, adopted the opinion that not only were charitable actions not specific to the monastic life, but they might even prove a hindrance to it. The story tells how Pachomius, after having served in Schenesat through the plagu

1. Greek Life, 15, A.SS.Maii III, p.29*A.
2. Greek Life 27, Ibid., p.32*B.
decided to leave his ministry of helpfulness to others:

Alors il reflechit en lui-meme et se dit, "Cette action de servir beaucoup de gens n'est pas le fait d'un moine mais celle des vieillards et des pretres; je ne ferai plus ainsi, afin que personne ne m'imite en cela, et n'en éprouve scandale."¹

The passage goes on to quote from Scripture in apparently contradictory praise of good works: "C'est une chose pure, innocente, sans souillure pres de Dieu que de rendre visite aux veuves et orphelins quand ils en ont besoin, et de se conserver purs de toutes les souillures du monde."²

It would seem from the use of this quotation that the latter half was regarded as incompatible with the former, and as for the one who quotes, he will choose to "keep himself un-spotted from the world", leaving it to priests and old men to "visit the orphans and widows". Here we have an example of that halting between world-serving and world-fleeing which runs through all the history of monasticism.

In spite of the part charity played in Pa-chomius' own Christian life and the occasional references to charity practiced by him and his community, it is not surprising in view of what has just been quoted, that we find no indication of the exercise of charity to others as a natural and inevitable outflow from the springs of Christian experience.

Sister Margaret Murphy in a dis-

¹ "Annales," etc., Vol. XVII, pp. 8-10, 345.
² Loc. cit.
sertation prepared for the Catholic University of America, justly says:

> Active charity to the neighbor had no part in his (Pachomius') scheme of work; to him work was but the means for the maintaining of his monks and giving them occupation for such times as could not be devoted to formal prayer. ¹

That they did not always or at all times give away their surplus appears from such hints as in the following passage: "And all the extra garments in each house the Oikiakos or the Deuteros keeps locked in a cell till they need to wash or wear them."² So we will find no organized charity as a motive for labor in the Pachomian communities. They may on occasion have a surplus from their work, and give it to the needy. But to obtain such a surplus was not one of their objectives.

3. The place of work in the religious life of the Pachomian communities:

In the light of what has been said about the volume of productive activity of the Pachomians and the careful way in which it was organized, we might be tempted to agree with Grützmacher, when he says:

> Mit genaalem Blicke hatte es Pachomius verstanden den ganzen Klosterverband zu einer grossen Produktivgenossenschaft zusammen fassen. In dieser Beziehung ist seine Stiftung auch von national-

¹ The Dissertation, "St. Basil and Monasticism," is published in the Patristic Series of the University, Vol. XXV, Washington, D.C., 1930. The quotation is from p. 70. On this point see also Ladeuze, Etude, etc., pp. 297, 298.
² Greek Life 38, A.SS.Maii, III p. 35. Cf. also the Arabic Life "Annales" etc. Vol. XII, p. 377, where the money for the sale of produce is spent "for the good of the monastery."
But the judgments of scholars vary widely on this point. Weingarten, for instance, goes so far as to say that the original Rule contained no prescription of work as a well-established daily task. We know, indeed, very little about the "original Rule." But Weingarten's judgement gains color from an anecdote contained in both the Greek and Coptic lives which pictures Pachomius himself as doing all the work of the first community. However in the nature of things that could not last long; and whether or not the "original Rule" contained a specific prescription of work, they must, judging from the results, have worked and worked hard. But that, again, is a different thing from implying as Grützmacher does that it was a part of Pachomius' intentions to create an organization which should be primarily, or even largely, a productive one.

The amount of time given to prayer and learning the Scriptures, etc., is instructive in this connection. It is almost impossible to reconstruct the Pachomian monk's day as we can that of Benedict. Bardenhewer, basing his statement on a passage in Cassian's Institutes, says that there were only two periods for common prayer during the day, and that the rest of the time was devoted to work.

1. Pachomius u. der Alteste Klosterleben, p.132. With this dictum Zöckler agrees (Askese u. Mönchtum, Frankfort am Main,1897,p.204.) I was not able to verify this citation.
2. Der Ursprung des Mönchtums, p.65.
3. "Annales," etc., XVII, p.31; A.SS. Maii III, p.29*C.
4. Geschichte der Altkirchliche Literatur, III,pp.63,64. The passage in Cassian is Inst.2:3. But later on, Cassian speaks of Tierce, Sext, and None as of Egyptian origin, (Not necessarily Pachomian, however) though he admits matins is a western innovation. Insts.2:4,3:3,4.
Dom Butler, relying on Palladius, finds four periods of common prayer. Ladeuze is sceptical of any attempt to get behind the Latin translation of the Rule by Jerome, and the "Lives;" in these he finds five required prayers, four of them in the whole body collected (synaxis), and one in a group consisting of the inhabitants of each single house.

It is true that we find the time devoted to prescribed prayer surprisingly small, when compared with the elaborate system of offices carried on in the later mediaeval monasteries. However it must not be forgotten that in the intention of the founder, these prescriptions constituted the minimum requirement for the weakest novices; the strong were expected to live a prayerful life according to their strength, without commandment. In the words of Palladius:

When Pachomius objected to the angel that the prayers were few, the angel said to him: "I gave this rule so as to make sure in advance that even the little ones keep the rule, and are not afflicted. But the perfect have no need of legislation, for by themselves in their cells they have surrendered the whole of their life to the contemplation of God."

Again, we must remember the time spent in teaching and learning the Scripture, the house conferences, the cata-

chesis which was so important a part of the religious life, and which made them as a body far more familiar with the Scriptures than their later Western successors.\(^1\)

Moreover, when prayer and work conflicted, prayer was always to take the preference over work: "Ad collectam et ad psallendam et orandum, nullus sibi occupationes inveniat, quibus se dicat occupatum quasi ire non possit."\(^2\)

Fasting, too, in the Pachomian eyes was more important than work. Whereas in Basil's foundations, fasting was limited by regulation in order that a man's working capacity might not be lessened, the opposite is true in the Pachomian rule: in it, the severity of labor was to be mitigated for those who fasted the more rigorously. Where fasting and work conflicted, the fasting was the more excellent way, and concessions were made to the austerities which were regarded as more specifically religious.

We remember, too, how simple were the gainful occupations of Pachomius' time --- the elaborate system of agriculture came later, and weaving of mats and a little gardening were all he encouraged. When it came to marketing, if Pachomius was interested in profit, he went about it in a singular manner. He did not allow his monks to sell at the market price. Once one of the brethren tried to sell a pair of shoes so cheaply he was repulsed with suspicions,

---

because the prospective purchaser thought they must have been stolen, or they would not have been offered so cheaply. Individual initiative was not esteemed. Obedient submission to authority, rather than productivity, made a good monk.

All these considerations make it difficult for us to accept Grützmacher's implications that a productive organization was one of the objectives Pachomius had in mind. The religious purpose was uppermost, and the economic one only subordinate, coming into view only insofar as it was necessary to the maintenance of a group of men in a rather poverty-stricken neighborhood.

To what extent was work regarded as a sort of worship? Bardenhewer, in the place already cited (Geschichte der Altkirchliche Literatur, III, pp.83,84), in which he estimated that there were only two seasons of public prayer in a day, and that the rest of the time was devoted to work, goes on to say that the work "was itself a sort of worship." Indeed, if work bulked so largely, as he supposed, in a life devoted wholly to religion, the conclusion that it has itself a large religious value is unavoidable. But we have already seen that he probably greatly underestimated the time given to prayer, and overestimated the time given to work. So his major premise

2. Ibid., p.363. Greek Life, 19, A.SS.Mail III, p.30*E. Rule, 124 (Jerome's tr.)
was hardly correct. So far as his conclusion goes, I have been able to find only one or two places which would support it; the tone of the documents in the main indicates the contrary --- that work was regarded as something which interrupted the devotional frame of mind.

There is no doubt that such occupations as basket and mat weaving were the main industries of the early Pachomians because meditation and prayer could be kept going while the fingers mechanically performed their task. It was often continued far into the night, in order to ward off sleep, and so was an aid to their vigils. If work were, in itself, "a sort of worship," Pachomius would hardly have been so unadventurous in his choice of occupations; nor would the injunctions to prayer and meditation while working been emphasized as they were. It was the prayer and meditation which were the specifically worshipful feature of these hours, not the work itself.

Again, work is an auxiliary to the religious life in that it fosters obedience, rather than in and of itself: "Other houses," says the Greek Life, "were ordered under them to work at trades and mat-weaving, and to be ready unto all obedience, not to have the will of their hearts in anything, in order that they might be fruitful toward God." It is the spirit of humility and obedience here which

2. Greek Life, 19, A.SS. Maii III, p. 30*B. See also, ante, p. 95 and note 2.
bear fruits to God. Or again, work has a religious value because of the pains and toils which it involves — on the somewhat mechanical principle of "pains now, joys later." The world was regarded as a painful place at best, so one might as well make the best of the labor that is in it. In the Arabic life is a bit which may or may not represent the early Pachomian ideas; it tells of rest monks who refused from their toils,

\[
\text{through desire to save their souls, and through the ambition which they had... thinking that the world was a place of fatigue and fasting, and that he who gives himself pain here will rest in the other life, as the Gospel witnesses, saying: "He who loses his life for my sake, shall find it."} \]

All these considerations lead us to the conclusion that Bardenhewer, when he says that the labor of the monks was regarded as a sort of worship, is less correct than Helmbucher who says: "Die Arbeit sollte durch Gehorsam, Gebet und Stillschweigen zum Gottesdienste sich gestalten." 2

The opinion is expressed that labor done in and for a cloister is different from other labor; sanctified, as it were, by the group among whom and for whom it was done. Pachomius once sent some men down a well to clean it, a disagreeable task, which had to be performed, half in and half out of the water. An old man, a newcomer to the com-

munity said: "That man (Pachomius) has no pity - he makes the children of men to suffer.... Suddenly he saw the Angel of God who was working with them, and saying to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit, for you are not working for a man, but for the servant of God.'"¹

From whatever motive, the spirit of work seems to have been all-pervasive in the Pachomian monasteries. From Palladius, who knew the second generation, we get a picture of a hive of industry. Even the guests were required to work after the first week. But alas! "If he is an important person, they give him a book, not allowing him to talk to anyone before the hour."² Even the working community was not able to escape entirely from "respect of persons." Yet that this laboring brotherhood exercised an influence which tended to level the world's distinctions is seen by the fact that a certain Petronius, who left the house of his father, brought with him his brothers, sisters, relatives, and slaves, who all joined the community.³ Nothing is said of the relationships of master and slaves after their entrance, but the presumption is that the old obedience was blotted out by the new, both being subject alike to their conventual superiors, the master working beside his slave for the common good.

Finally, there is one passage, from the Arabic Life,

2. Lausaic History, 7, Clarke's tr. p.58.
3. Greek Life, 50, op. cit., 38*0.
to be sure, and so not certainly primitive tradition, but worthy of mention because it is, so far as I know, unique in Pachomian writings, and approaches a religious evaluation of labor, mentioning it in the same breath with fasting, vigil, and prayer.

Our father Pachomius planned to change those who were in charge and to replace them by others; he wished... that the new brother in charge should profit in the spiritual fruits from the cares attached to the office, and that he obtain from the Lord the recompense, that is to say the forgiveness of his sins; for our father knew that a charge fulfilled with the fear of God, with faith, with application to its requirements would have a recompense equal to that of him who fasts, watches, and prays for the glory of God. 1

Section III: Basilian Monasticism.

We are better informed about the practice of labor in the Pachomian communities than we are about the ideas on which it was based. It is just the other way when we consider Basilian monasticism, for Basil has left us a full account of his motives for enjoining labor, but we have next to no information on the way in which it was performed. We do know that Basil himself worked in his youth, when with his friend, Gregory Nazianzus, he first embarked on his monastic life. Gregory writes him two letters, in which he looks back with longing on the days

---------------------

when they worked together, and were not yet beset with administrative cares. In the first he writes jocundly of their early monastic days together and their work (of which his hands still bear the marks), much in the spirit in which one boy writes to another of a camping trip which had been full of hardships, but splendid fun.\(^1\) In the second he regrets the loss of Basil's companionship in ascetic exercises, among them the "lesser and lighter" (μικρότερα, εὐτελέστερα) things, namely the bodily labors; and severe labors they were, too, carrying heavy materials for building and ditching fields.\(^2\)

In the Rules which he wrote for monastic communities\(^3\) Basil not only expressly prefers the cenobitic to the eremitic life because of the social values conserved in it, but emphasized the duties of the monk to help even those outside the communities. This social element he stressed more than any other monastic writer up to his time, and more even than Benedict, so that it may safely be said that in no writer does the element of the social responsibility of the monks find clearer or more emphatic expression. He is proportionately insistent on the necessity of the laborious life. And not until we met to Angelo Clarenco, who, indeed, is very familiar with Basil's writings, do we find such forcible insistence on the performance of work.

---

2. Ep. VI. op. cit., 29f.
3. For Basil's Rules see ante, p. 14f.
as a social duty. Heimbucher says of him:

Durch die Aufnahme von Oblaten ferner von Waisen, sowie auch anderer Knaben deren Unterricht und Erziehung Aufgabe der Mönche war, durch den Betrieb des Ackerbaues und Handwerkes, durch regelmäßige Unterstüzung und Pflege der Armen und Kranken machte Basilius Zugeleich einen bedeutenden Schritt von Beschaulich Leben zum tätigen und apostolischen, dessen Übung eine personlich Pflicht seiner Mönche bildete. 1

In the eighteenth of his Longer Rules, he replies to the question, "Whether we must neglect work for the sake of the prayers and psalmody and what times are suitable for prayer, and first of all whether we should work at all," as follows:

Since our Lord Jesus Christ says: "Worthy of the food is (not just everyone but) the laborer," and the apostle commands us to labor and to work with our hands that what is good, that we may have to give to him that is in need, it is self-evident that one should work diligently. For we must not treat the ideal of piety as excuse for idleness, or as a means of escaping toil, but as an opportunity for contending for more abundant toils, and for patience in tribulations, in order that we may be able to say: "In labor and travail, in watchings more abundantly, in hunger and thirst." For such a mode of life is useful to us not only because of the body buffet- ing it entails, but because of love to our neighbor, in order that God by our means may bring sufficiency to the weak among the brethren, after the example given us in the Acts by the apostle when he says: "In all things I gave you an example how that so laboring, ye

ought to help the weak." And again: "That ye may have to give to him that is in need"......

How great an evil is that of idleness, what need is there to tell, since the apostle plainly commands that he who does not work, neither shall he eat? As then daily food is necessary to each man, equally necessary is work according to his power....The Lord coupled slothfulness with wickedness, saying: "Thou wicked and slothful servant".....

Now since some get off work under pretext of prayers and psalmody, you must know that for each separate task there is a special time, as Ecclesiastes says: "There is a time for all things." But for prayer and psalmody, as for many other things, every time is suitable; so that we praise God with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs while we move our hands in work, with the tongue if it is possible, and conducive to the edification of the faith - but if not, then in the heart, giving thanks to Him Who gave both strength of hand to work and also bestowed means by which to work both in the tools we use and the arts which we practice, whatever the work may be. We pray moreover that the works may be directed towards the mark of pleasing God.

Thus, then, we secure steadfastness in our souls......for, unless these are our methods how can we make what was said by the apostle consistent: "Pray without ceasing," and "Work night and day"? (Basil closes with the caution that these words are not to be construed as an encouragement to neglect the formal times of prayer and psalmody.)

In this passage we notice first of all that (if the analogy of daily bread be taken at its full value) labor is required of every monk every day. Then we notice the reasons for this requirement, and find them interesting

1. Longer Rules 37, Clarke's tr. p.205f.
because they mark a progression beyond the ones usually cited up to his time. The first reason is the rather negative one that labor need not interrupt worship. Prayer, meditation, and singing can be continued either aloud or silently as the work is being done. This is nothing new, and need not detain us. But secondly, and more than this, it is implied that the works themselves are a part of piety even, a sort of worship.

Basil was thoroughly familiar with the Bible; it had penetrated his thinking thoroughly, so that his pages are strewn with quotations; not less thoroughly had it moulded his living --- he strove to live in all things conformable to the biblical pattern. We are not surprised, then, to find Basil, as other men before him but even more than they, finding the warrant for his own labors and those of the monks in the Bible, especially the New Testament. But not even Ecclesiastes is without its message for him on this point. Labor, then, was a part of piety, a sort of worship, because it was the fulfillment of several Biblical injunctions. The first of these was "body-buffet- ing." Basil was not original in this; the conviction that the painfulness of labor was pleasing to God apart from any productiveness in either the economic or the moral realm was a permanent tradition in the long lines of
monks from Anthony to Luther. Secondly, and by far the more important of Basil's emphases, is the contribution labor makes to the fulfilling of the command to love one's neighbor. We notice that the monks are to pray that the works are to be directed toward the mark of pleasing God -- and furthermore that it is God himself who has granted us not only the power to labor, but also the arts themselves. This conception is far removed from that view which held toil a curse laid on man after the Fall. Lastly, we note that the activity and weariness of labor are valuable because of their disciplinary qualities. Idleness is wicked, but by labor and prayer we attain steadfastness of soul. Labor, then, is required by Basil of his monks as a means of bodily austerity, of discipline, of furnishing the sinews of charity, and as in itself a sort of worship only slightly, if at all, less important than the prayer of heart and lips, without which that prayer would be unavailing.

But productivity for its own sake, Basil never thought of urging. It was always sternly subordinate to the religious purpose of life as a whole. This consideration determined the choice of occupations, the spirit in which the work was to be done, the methods of marketing. Basil never could be judged to have deliberately moulded his order

---

1. Besides the above quotation, cf. also Longer Rules, 41, 42, Clarke's tr. p.212-215; Longer Rules, 7, Clarke, p.163.
into a great productive organization, as was that of Pacho-
mius. 1 Pachomius, it is true, did not always take ad-
vantage of current prices, even when they were offered
freely for his products. But he does not seem to have re-
stricted the choice of markets expressly as does Basil:

We must try to secure both that the
products are not disposed of at a dis-
tance, and that we do not court pub-
licity for the sake of selling. For it
is more fitting to remain in one place
and more beneficial both for the edify-
ing of one another and the accurate ob-
servance of our daily life; so that we
may prefer to abate somewhat from the
price rather than go beyond our borders
for the sake of trifling gain. But if
experience has shown this to be impos-
sible, then we must choose localities and
cities inhabited by religious men....
When they (the sellers) have come to the
place let them choose the same lodgings
both for the sake of keeping watch upon
one another, and that we may miss no
season of prayer, either by day or night
and that each may come through his meet-
ing with grasping and extortionate men
with less harm in company than if he
were alone. For even the most violent
men avoid having many witnesses of their
injustices. 2

It cannot but occur that though this regulation was made
in good faith and for religious purposes, it would inevit-
ably result in the monks underselling their competitors
in nearby markets, inducing the unregenerate "economic man"
who lived nearby to do business first with the monastery
if possible, so increasing the volume of their trade, and

1. Ante, p. 91.
2. Longer Rules, 39, Clarke, p. 211.
not impossibly arousing the ire of the other marketers in the vicinity, whose marketing code was less dominated by religious principles.

The same religious pre-occupations were brought to bear on the choice of labor for the monks. Answering the question: "What arts befit our profession?" Basil answers:

Generally speaking one may recommend the choice of such arts as preserve the peaceable and untroubled nature of our life, needing neither much anxiety to sell what has been made, and which do not involve us in undesirable or harmful meetings with men or women. But in everything we must consider that simplicity and cheapness are set before us as our proper aim, and we must avoid serving the foolish and harmful lusts of men by working to satisfy their requirements. In weaving we must accept what befits our manner of life, not what is devised by the unchaste to trap and ensnare the young. Similarly, in shoemaking, let us serve our art and those who seek primary necessities. But building and carpentering and metalworking and agriculture, these are in themselves necessary for life and afford much that is beneficial, and are not to be rejected for intrinsic reasons. Only when they cause us disturbances, or break the unity of life of the brethren, then let us of necessity avoid them, preferring those arts which preserve for us life undistracted and waiting continually on the Lord, one which drags away those who abide in the practice of piety neither from the time of psalmody nor from prayer nor from the remainder of the disciplined life. Of them, agriculture is the best, since by it we get the necessaries of life, and it preserves its workers from much wandering or running to and fro."

1. Longer Rules, 38, Clarke, p.210,211.
One is reminded that even in the time of the scholastics, agriculture held the chief esteem of their curious hierarchy of occupations. Thus did Basil, more explicitly than Pachomius, safeguard the working life of his monks in the interests of the religious purpose which controlled all.

In regard to the spirit in which the work was to be performed, Basil was no less explicit. He was certain that it was the spirit in which the worker labored which was the constitutive factor in making it religiously valuable. The worker was not always allowed to choose his own art: (1) if he has done it to please himself; or (2) for the sake of reputation or worldly gain; or (3) if he prefers the lighter task for sloth. In a word the community's will and the community's good were the norm, not individual will, or pride of workmanship, or laziness.

If a man has an art, let him not desert it from unsettled mind. If he has no proper art, let him not take one for himself, but accept what has been approved by the majority... Moreover if any man has an art, but his exercise of it does not please the brotherhood, let him readily cast it away and show that he has no attachment to anything in the world.

No one was permitted to labor for his own profit: "You should know that he who works should do so, not to minister
to his own needs by his works. Each therefore should put before himself as the aim in his work the service of those in want, not his own need."¹

Pride of workmanship was not tolerated; murmuring against a task was so contrary to the spirit Basil wished to induce in the monks that it was regarded as rendering productive service valueless. Speaking "concerning him who works with pride or murmuring" Basil insists:

The work of a man who has murmured or has been detected in pride must not be mixed with that done by men humble in heart and of a contrite spirit; it must not be used at all by the pious.... The work of such men is unacceptable like a blemish-ed sacrifice - which is impious to mingle with the offerings of other men.... wherefore the works of the hesitating and gainsaying man are to be removed from the brotherhood.²

In a word, the spirit of the Basilian workman must be that in which the solitaries of the desert performed their austerities, yet with the noble addition that he has the results of his labor to relieve the distresses of the poor. Indeed, Basil seems to make the essence of "abstinence" to lie rather in this surrender of self-will than in doing without physical things. Replying to the question: "If a man wishes to practice abstinence beyond his strength so that he is hindered in fulfilling the commandment set before him, must we permit him to do so?" the Saint replies:

¹. Longer Rules, Clarke, p.214. Clarke expresses the opinion, St. Basil the Great, a Study in Monasticism, p.81f. that personal poverty was not so absolute in the Basilian system as this rule would imply.
². Longer Rules, 29, Clarke, p.195.
The question does not seem to me to be rightly framed, for abstinence consists not in refraining from material foods whereby the severity to the body condemned by the apostle results, but in complete giving up of one's own will.  

Thus he condemns at once the occasion of idleness, and a false conception of the nature of pious abstinence. We remember in this connection that in the Pachomian foundation the monks were allowed to fast as much as they liked, and work was given to them according to the physical power they had left afterwards. With Basil, however, work is as important as fasting, obedience more important than either. No brother might fast more than the rest, even should he desire to; neither might a brother work more than commanded. On the other hand the proper officer might give more food to such as had incurred greater physical fatigue. Another instance of Basil's idea of the importance of work as compared with that of prayer appears in answer to a question raised by the conflict of monastery duties and the set services of prayer. Basil rebukes any who will presume to dally over their work in cellar or garden to escape the offices, but goes on:

Each man keeps his own rule by doing his own work like a member in the body.

2. Shorter Rules, 125, Clarke, p.280.
4. Shorter Rules, 135, Clarke, p.279. Cf. also Longer Rules, 19, Clarke, p.183, where differing occupations call for differing amounts of food; Letters, II,6 (citation from Workman, Evolution, etc.p.155): "if fasting hinders you from laboring, it is better to eat, remembering that you are athletes, workmen of Jesus Christ."
And he suffers harm if he neglects the task assigned to him. And if he cannot join the rest with his bodily presence, let him not be disturbed, for he is doing what is written: "Let each man wherein he was called, abide."  

So did Basil insist alike on the productivity of his monks' hands, and the purity, humility, and disinterestedness of their hearts. They were to be productive to have the means to give to the poor; strenuous to gain patience and endurance of hardship; humble and prayerful that their work might be acceptable to God; and without personal greed or ambition that they might not have wherewithal to feed their pride or pamper their physical needs. He prescribed for his brethren a well-rounded asceticism in the best sense of the word - a training for soul-growth. The material gains of their labor were well and good, and could be turned to godly purposes; but the process of production was hedged around with safeguards to keep the profits from usurping more than the proper place they should occupy. The poor were to be considered, and their own needs so far as an austere sufficiency demanded; but these needs were to be subordinate to the larger purpose of furthering the spiritual welfare of the community and the individual. By this last consideration, marketing and personal pride in craftsmanship were to be tested. The

1. Shorter Rules, cxlvii, Clarke, p.283.
"efficiency factor" as it would be called today was not the whole or the primary consideration. It was not a standard of measurement, nor a mark of success. Comparing the Basilian with the Pachomian foundations in these respects, we see that Basil on the one hand went farther than Pachomius in allowing positive religious value to manual productive labor, yet on the other hand took more care to safeguard this form of activity so that it might not interfere with larger spiritual ends.

Section IV. Augustine and the "spiritual" Brethren. Summary and Prospect.

Of course there is another side to the picture. There were monks who were not willing to work; some from laziness, but some who ostensibly at least based their unwillingness on Scripture itself, comparing themselves to Mary who had chosen "the better part;" or who prided themselves that they were obeying the command of the Lord when he bade men be as the "birds of the air who sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns," or as the "lily of the field that toils not nor spin." Leaders of sounder minds did not lack ways of converting these "spiritual" brethren.

A monk arrived one day at Sinai, saw some of the brethren working and inquired in a lofty tone: "Why work for meat that perisheth?" Abbot Sylvan heard these words, and had him shown to a cell where he could deliver himself up to
contemplation. When the time of their single meal came, no one called him; he stood it as long as he could, then came out and asked: "Do not the brothers eat today? Why was not I called?" Sylvan replied: "Because you are a spiritual man, you have no need of this gross food; while we who are carnal beings need to eat. That is why we work. You have chosen the better part; you have given the whole day to holy reading, and wish for no material nourishment."  

It was to refute just such brethren as this, out of the very Scriptures to which they appealed, that Augustine wrote his "De Opere Monachorum," (c. 401). The work itself contained not much that was new in the way of arguments for manual labor; it was influential, however, for its vigorous insistence that Paul meant literal, manual toil, when he said, "If any will not work, neither let him eat."  

---

1. J. Besse, Les Moines d'Orient, Paris, 1900, p. 356; Cf. also the incident related on p. 357.  
2. The treatise is found in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, (First Series) Vol. III, pp. 503-524. The argument is chiefly that manual labor is a Scriptural command, and so should be fulfilled. "Paul willed that they should need food and clothing of no man, but with their own hands procure these for themselves." (4). Working does not prevent praise of God (20). If they cannot take time from psalmody to work, then they ought not either to eat (loc. cit.) Not all men are fit to discourse on the Scriptures and edify others. (21). Work is good "to heal the swelling of old pride." (32). Work in a monastery is not for personal advantage but for the community's good (loc. cit.). Interesting are those except from work: evangelists, ministers, dispensers of the sacraments do not have to work (8; 24), nor do those, of course, with bodily infirmity. Those who have been wealthy and contributed their goods to the monastery cannot be compelled to; but they should, to give a good example (33). "But it is by no means seemly that in that mode of life where senators become men of toil, there common workmen should become men of leisure." (ibid.). There is something of the aristocrat still in the Bishop of Hippo. He speaks here too not simply
"Who can bear," said he, "that contumacious persons resisting most wholesome admonitions of the Apostle, should, not as weaker brethren be borne with all, but even be preached up as holier men; insomuch that monasteries founded on sounder doctrine should be by this double enticement corrupted, the dissolve license of vacation from labor, and the false name of sanctity?" The book was written at the request of Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, who was troubled about certain monks of his city, "who wished so to live on the oblations of the faithful, that doing no work they thought and boasted that they did rather fulfill the precept of the Gospel, where the Lord saith, 'Behold the fowls of heaven and the lilies of the field (Mt. 6:26)'. Whence the Church was troubled."

From the standpoint of a monk, but also that of a Bishop accustomed to view things from the point of view of a church administrator. The "De Opere Monachorum" inspired ch. 48 of Benedict's Rule, and together with his "Rule for Nuns" (Ep. CCXL) and other letters entered into the "Rule" of the Augustinian Eremites, founded in the 13th century. (Catholic Encyclopedia, 1:80b, VII 261.)

Chaucer bears witness to the influence of this Rule in the later Middle Ages (even though in this case it was honored rather in the breach) when in his description of the easy-living monk he says:

"What should he...swynken with his handes and laboure
As Austyn bit? How shal the worlde be served?
Lat Austyn have his swynk to him reserved!"

Quoted from G.G. Coulton, Life in the Middle Ages, (Four Volumes in one, New York, 1931) Vol. IV, p.32.

1. From the Retractations, 2:21, prefixed to the translation cited, op.cit.,p.503.
We have already mentioned the monasteries of St. Martin of Tours where, according to Sulpicius Severus, no work except writing was carried on. Still, in pre-Benedictine monachism, particularly in Egypt, the monks generally recognized and fulfilled the obligation to work. Of the seven Rules given in Holstenius before Benedict's, six enjoin it. It is true that they do not specify hours, but the conclusion is inescapable that most of the monks worked as a regular part of their daily life. They worked to earn their own living, and to be dependent on no one. The hermits further than this looked on work chiefly as a means of mortifying the flesh. In the coenobia, (especially Basil's) it is insisted on as a pre-requisite of charity; its productivity, however, is never the major objective - it was always made to serve spiritual ends. The product was to be sold cheaper than those of others, and so avarice was to be prevented. Humility was to be served in that no man's labor was to be an expression of his own will - the superior's command was to be heeded in everything. The work must be done in the proper spirit: pride or murmuring rendered it valueless. It should be performed either in silence, or to the accompaniment of psalmody or prayer. If done in the proper manner, and with the proper spirit, it brought in its train certain spiritual

benefits and a just recompense from the Lord.

Work, therefore, has achieved a specific place in the religious life. As such it has a certain religious evaluation, not, however, as productivity (save in a minor way and as the product was devoted to charity) but as exercise that can be turned to spiritual profit. Already the main elements of the monastic motivation, practice, and evaluation of labor are before us. The Middle Ages will fill in the outlines somewhat, fit the concepts more precisely to each other and into the program of life, but will add nothing essential. The great Benedict will fix the proportion of working hours to hours of prayer and reading, will analyze more clearly the relation of the active to the contemplative life, but he will not add anything to the high esteem for labor which was manifested in Basil, nor will he add to the reasons for which it was esteemed. Rather the contrary, for he will contract the limits of that charity which is with Basil the prime motive for work, and to that extent impoverish the concept of its religious function.

The monks of the Middle Ages, when they work, and give reasons for their course, will turn back to the tradition of Benedict and Augustine, who in turn do little more than sum up the teaching of Scripture and apply them to the monastic life. Even the Friars for all their wider con-
ception of service to society will add nothing new to the
theory of labor. The service of monasticism to the Christ-
ian teaching on labor consists not in any additions to or
developments of the religious sanctions on which it rests
but rather in its successful embodiment in a Christian
community peculiarly adapted to cherish, realize, and reviv-
ify that teaching as a part of its own tradition.
CHAPTER FOUR

WORK AMONG THE BENEDICTINES TO THE CLUNY REFORM.
1. Qualities of Benedict's Rule which gave it its influence:

Two characteristics of the Benedictine Rule gave it its influence in Europe: its adaptation to the peculiar conditions of that continent, and its precision. It contained no new principles, no new methods of holiness.\(^1\) Even its moderation was not new, for Basil before him had mitigated the severity of other codes. Yet in a way it was revolutionary. All European monasteries before Benedict had been more or less slavish imitations of the Egyptian models. Benedict, however, dared to take the elements furnished him by his predecessors and to relate them and apply them in a fashion which would be suitable to the European climate and temperament. This is illustrated by his allowing differences for different seasons; in allowing the weight of the clothing and the measure of food and drink to vary with different localities, and with the amount of work to be done.\(^2\) He made good use of the feeling already instilled by the Roman Empire - the feeling for law and its equable application to all alike. This brings us to the second feature of the Rule, its precision.

The day was completely divided into periods of a

\(^{1}\) H.von Schubert, Geschichte der Christliche Kirche im Frühmittelalter, p.64.

\(^{2}\) Rule, chaps. 39,40,55.
specified length, and the occupation of each period indicated. The hours for labor, for instance, are clearly indicated in Chapter 48 of the Rule, the "Magna Charta" of Benedictine labor:

From Easter to the first of October, on coming out from Prime, let the brethren labour till about the fourth hour. . . . Let None be said somewhat before the time, about the middle of the eighth hour, and after this all shall work at what they have to do till evening. . . . From the first of October till the beginning of Lent, let the brethren be occupied in reading till the end of the second hour. At that time Tierce shall be said, after which they shall labour at the work enjoined them till None. . . . On the days of Lent, from the morning till the end of the third hour, the brethren are to have time for reading, after which let them work at that which is set them to do till the close of the tenth hour. 1

In our own terminology, this would mean in summer, labour from about six thirty to nearly ten, and again from about two until five. 2 In winter, one period of work lasted from about nine until two thirty, with about fifteen minutes out for Sext at midday. During Lent, the period was from nine fifteen to four, with a similar period out in the middle of the day. This is infinitely more satisfactory than, for instance, the so-called Rule of Columbanus, which, with characteristic Celtic poetry and indef-

2. Ibid., p. 280.
initeness, says:

Three labours in the day, viz., prayers, work, and reading, the whole to be divided into three parts, viz., thine own work.... secondly thy share of the brethren's work.... lastly to help thy neighbors.... Thy measures of work of labour shall be till thy tears come, or thy measure of thy work of labour or thy genuflexions till thy sweat often fomes if thy tears are not free.¹

The Rule of Benedict gave precision not only to the horarium, but also to the disciplinary management of the community. It is instructive, for instance, to compare the way he treats the question of handling a workman who errs in spirit with that of Basil. The latter says:

The Supervisors must give strict attention lest they violate the decree of him that said.... "He that wrought proudly did not dwell in the midst of my house," and lest when a man defiles his work by lazy shrinking from toil, or else by elation because of his achievement, they allow him to remain in his depravity in view of what they receive from him, not permitting him to attain a perception of his own sin..... for his blood shall be required of his hands, as it is written.²

All of which glows with an earnestness and Scriptural piety, but does not indicate a definite manner of procedure for the often perplexed Supervisor. Benedict's prescription is, "If any be puffed up by his skill in his craft, and think the monastery indebted to him for it, an"
such a one shall be shifted from his handicraft, and not attempt it again till such time as, having learnt a low opinion of himself, the abbot shall bid him resume. \(^1\) "In a word," says Abbot Butler,

> St. Benedict's (Rule) was emphatically legislation, as not one of its predecessors could claim to be ....... "It is a monument of legislative art," is Dudden's estimate, "remarkable alike for its completeness, its simplicity, and its adaptability." \(^2\)

2. Benedict's conception of the monastic life: Relations of the active and contemplative life.

Benedict's basic conception of the monastery was that of a band of soldiers under strict discipline in the "service" of God: "Constitutenda est ergo nobis dominici schola servitii." \(^3\) The word "schola" as Coulton points out, was used less of an academic than a military organization; it was applied in late antiquity to the Emperor's body-guard and to provincial garrisons. "Schola, therefore, in the Rule has the same connotation as Servitium: the dominici schola servitii was a code of military law, where the Lord was Imperator." \(^4\) In this "school" active and contemplative elements were nicely balanced. The "primary community service shall be the public celebration of the divine office." \(^5\) Benedict's own conception of the import-

---

1. Rule, ch. 57. More terrible still was the power of wielding the "knife of excommunication" which was vested in the Abbot. (Chs. 23-28).
2. Butler, ibid., p. 164.
3. Rule, Prologue.
ance of the "opus Dei" is contained in the famous words, "Nihil operi Dei Praeponatur" - nothing is to be given precedence over the common worship of God in the choir. So it is clear that the primary service of the monks was to be this worshipful occupation in the church; nevertheless, Benedict with his understanding of the practical limitations of human nature bent on worship did not make this the whole element in his general conception. Before a monk can pray well, or with equal and devoted mind perform the choral duties of his calling, he must have spent some part of the day in active pursuits.

The first commentators so understood the function of the active element in Benedict's own legislation: "Quia cognovit Beatus Benedictus has duas vitas, i.e., activam et contemplativam necessarias esse homini perfecto, ideo illas dividit per tempora et bene primum activam designavit, et postea contemplativam." The commentator goes one to use the allegory which became classical in monastic writings, in which the active life is compared to Leah, ill-favored but bearing sons to God, the contemplative to Rachel, comely of face but barren. Jacob is the good monk, who gets Leah first, instead of Rachel whom he expected.

1. Everything was to be dropped when the signal for the offices was given: "Ad horam divini officii mox auditus fuerit signum relietis omnibus quaelibet fuerint in manibus, summa cum festinatione curratur.... igitur nihil operi Dei Praeponatur." (Rule, c.43) When monks were working too far from the church to join the choir there, they were to celebrate the office where they were. (Ibid., c.50).

Ita et bonus homo non potest prius pervenire ad contemplationem, nisi exercitatus fuerat in activa vita......neququam enim ille poterit studiose lectione vacare, si prius non legitime opera manuum exercuit.1

An idea of the relative importance of the purely contemplative and active pursuits in the life of the Benedictines may be gained from the distribution of the various activities in the "normal Benedictine day in Summer" as given by Butler:2 Opus Dei, three and a half hours; (Studium orationis, one half); Reading, four; Work, six and a half; Sleep, eight and a half; Meals, one. "This would be for the summer; in winter there was but one meal, work and reading were somewhat less, the office was longer and so was the sleep, and there was the period of 'meditatio' after night office."

This schedule was not intended to be considered sacred or inviolable, however. Benedict envisaged the possibility of the poorer monasteries having to work more to maintain themselves, and not only provided that they were to be allowed to do so, but insisted that they were to consider themselves none the less true monks even if this work sometimes displaced other more specifically religious duties.

If however, the nature of the place or poverty require them to

labour at gathering in the harvest, let them not grieve at that, for then are they truly monks when they live by the labour of their hands, as our Fathers and the Apostles did.¹

Just what this extra labor was to displace in the horarium is not quite clear. The first Commentators thought it might be reading;² Butler thinks it may have been at the expense of their midday sleep;³ and this latter view seems to be implied by the succeeding sentence in the Rule: "Let everything, however, be done with moderation, for the sake of the faint-hearted."

3. Work in the Benedictine Foundations:

Labor in the Benedictine terminology included not only manual labor but also reading.⁴ However it is with the former only that we are concerned here. This sort of work was of two general kinds: the daily duties in connection with the operation of the monastery, required by the daily needs of the brethren; and the exercise of a trade in which various brethren might be proficient, whose product might be sold for the benefit of the monastery.

The former sort of labor included work in the garden,⁵ in the bake-house,⁶ in the mill,⁷ and field-work. The exact status of the latter is somewhat in doubt. The provision of Benedict in c.48 that monks, if they were com-

¹ Rule, c.48.  
² Expositio a Hildemaro tradita, p.479.  
⁵ Rule, chaps. 7,46,66.  
⁶ Ibid., c.46.  
⁷ Ibid., c.66.
pelled by poverty to work in the harvests seems to indicate that such work was not contemplated as a general thing.

Chapter 41 says: "From Whitsuntide, throughout the summer, if the monks have not to work in the fields..... let them fast on Wednesdays and Fridays till None;" this too seems to indicate that Benedict expected it would be the exception rather than the rule. However, chapters 7 and 50 seem to indicate that they did so labor. Butler's summary of the status of field-work is as follows:

Here (i.e., chapters 41, 48) the legislation is on the basis that in the summer there will be no field work, and provision is made for the case of their having it as for an exception. That at other seasons St. Benedict's monks were habitually employed in field work is clear from the Rule and from many places in Book II of the Dialogues..... St. Benedict intended that, if the monastery could afford it, the harvest should be gathered in by the hired labour of workmen able to work at the hours usual in Italy. (Butler had already explained that the horarium of the monks made it impossible to labor in the summer time in such times of the day as the heat of the sun permitted.) For the monks, there was work to be done indoors on the summer afternoons, or in sheds and workshops, or in the shade. And it is altogether likely that in St. Benedict's time, the copying out of books was already a source of income for the monastery.¹

A large part of the daily work of the monastery was in the kitchen. From this work no one was to be excused, "unless on the score of health, or because he is occupied in some matter of great utility." The brethren were to have a week's service in charge of the kitchen, and each one in charge was to have helpers. The one in charge was responsible for the cleanliness of the utensils entrusted to his care, and was to leave them clean at the end of his period; he was to clean the towels used for the washing of the brethren's hands, and was also to wash the feet of the monks, with the help of the server for the next week. There was a separate kitchen for guests, in which two monks were appointed to serve for the period of a year; these also were to have helpers when necessary; but when work was light, they were to take part in the other duties of the monastery.

The kitchen work was evidently among the least desirable duties of the monastery. Benedict takes care to mention that this work must be done "without murmuring," and that "thence great reward is obtained and charity is exercised." Hildemarus says naively: "Sunt nonnulli qui magis cupiunt aliam obedientiam exercere quam in coquina servire propter laborem." He enlarges upon the "reward" of this service - it is, he says, "apud Deum;"

1. Rule, c.35.
2. Loc.cit. Baths were allowed sick brethren as often as expedient; but "to those in health, and especially to the young, they shall be seldom permitted." (c.36).
3. Rule, c.53.
"charity" is strengthened in such work, because it is a performance of the Golden Rule.\(^1\)

The officiary for the internal management of the monastery was rather simple. Second after the Abbot was the Praepositus. There were also Deans, in charge of Deaneries, who were apparently chiefly spiritual guides, and who shared the burdens of the Abbot.\(^2\) There was a cellarer who had charge of the sick, of the children, of the entertainment of guests and the poor, and who was in charge of the physical equipment of the establishment.\(^3\) Brethren were appointed to serve successively under him to supervise the care of tools, and some to help with the care of the sick.\(^4\)

So much for the duties necessary for the orderly management of the establishment itself. As for the gainful trades exercised by the individual monks for the benefit of the monastery as a whole, chapter 57 provides that "such craftsmen as be in the monastery ply their trade in all lowliness of mind, if the abbot allow it." What these trades were we have little indication for the earlier days. We have already seen how manuscript copying came under this head, and probably was highly esteemed for its religious as well as its productive value. But no doubt the fundamental trades required in agriculture

---

3. Ibid., c. 31.
4. Ibid., chaps. 32, 36.
and building were all carried on by those who had learned them before entering the monastery. Building operations were constantly going on in the larger monasteries, so they became places where was nourished a tradition of skill in masonry and kindred arts.¹

But we are interested not only in what sort of work the Benedictines did, and how it was organized, but also in the reasons for their labor, the spirit in which it was to be done, and the evaluation put upon it. We have already considered Benedict's conception of the general relation of the active to the contemplative life, and found that the former constituted an essential part of the latter but was subservient to it. The indications given by Benedict as to the particular reasons for the exercise of labor fall in with this general plan. First of all, it was necessary as has already been explained to work in the monastery because a part of Benedict's conception was the economic self-sufficiency of the monasteries.

The monastery, however, itself ought, if possible, to be so constructed as to contain within it all necessaries, that is, water, mill, garden (bakery), and (places for) the various crafts which are exercised within a monastery, so that there be no occasion for the monks to wander abroad, since this is in no wise expedient for their souls. ²

² Rule, c.66.
This ideal persisted through the centuries in the more conscientious houses. At the beginning of the twelfth century, Hariulf in his cloister chronicle knew no better praise for the most esteemed of St. Riquier's Abbots, Angilbert (d. 814) than that the

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Monasterium igitur secundum} \\
\text{decretum regulae sanctissimi} \\
\text{Benedicti ita dispositum fuit} \\
\text{ut omnis ars omnesque opus} \\
\text{necessarium intra loci ambitum} \\
\text{exercerentur.} \quad 1
\end{align*}
\]

This ideal required a good deal of work for the maintenance of the monks, especially so long as the monastery had not become rich through the gifts of patrons.

Charity is still a factor in work, though by no means so largely as in Basil. It is also connected with fasting by Smaragdus' commentary on c. 4: "Convenit enim post jejunii amorem de pauperum admonet recreationem, quia tunc optime jejunamus quando ea quae ventri subtrahimus pauperibus erogamus."2 The same commentator connects it directly with work:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si enim apostoli coporale} \\
\text{opus faciebant unde vitam} \\
\text{corpus sustinet, quanto magis} \\
\text{monachi, quibus opportet non} \\
\text{solum vitae suae necessaria} \\
\text{propiis manibus exhibere, sed} \\
\text{etiam indigentiam aliorum laboribus suis reficere.} \quad 3
\end{align*}
\]

---

1. Chronicon Centulense II c. 7, ed. Lot. p. 56; quoted from Werminghof, Die Wirtschaftstheoretischen Anschauungen der Regula Sancti Benedicti, (Historische Aufsätze Karl Zeumer gewidet, Weimar, 1910) p. 38. There likewise is cited the work of Abbot Sturmi who changed the course of a stream in order to render the ideal possible.
3. Ibid., 834c.
St. Isidore of Seville, whose Rule was modelled on Benedict's, mentions charity as a motive for monastic labor, in ch.5.¹ The Abbot Stephen who also composed a Rule later than Benedict's says his injunction to labor is moderate compared to that of Paul, who asked that we labor to give to the needy, "But I say that you should surely (vel) labor for a sufficiency for yourselves."²

In Benedict's own Rule, there is no injunction to active charity, and he does not mention charity as a motive for work. Guests who came to them were to be sheltered and fed, especially "the poor and pilgrims, because in them Christ is more truly received." "For," Benedict shrewdly adds, "the very awe of the rich secures respect for them."³ Nevertheless, charity in Benedictine monasteries, is by their very nature, "intra-mural," and largely consists in the care of their own sick, the cheerful service in mean tasks, and the community of all goods, even those earned by individual brothers at their own trades. For the most part, therefore, it is practically equivalent to "self-maintenance."

The great motive for work is given by Benedict at the beginning of his chapter 48 on work.

\begin{quote}
Idleness is the enemy of the soul, and therefore the brethren ought to be occupied......
\end{quote}

---

¹. MPL, 103:561B.  
². Regula Sancti Stephani, c.38 MPL, 103:1184. But c.38 says that if they have a surplus it should be given to the needy who come to them.  
³. Rule, c.53.
in manual labor....and in holy reading.

Hildemar's commentary quotes in this connection the saying made famous by Cassian: "Laborantem monachum unus demon pulsat, otiosum autem mille." Abbot Ford frankly states the instrumental nature of the work of the Benedictines thus: "With Benedict the work of his monks was only a means to goodness of life." Thus it was to fulfill the purpose of the Rule which was "to bring men back to God by the labor of obedience from whom they had departed by the idleness of disobedience. Work was the first condition of all growth in goodness." 1

When we consider the spirit in which the work of the monks must be done, we see again the great emphasis on the obedience and humility which alone make the work worthy, the suspicion of pride in workmanship which renders it unacceptable, already manifested in Basil. If anyone was puffed up by his skill, or thought the monastery indebted to him for it, he was to be changed to another occupation. 2

The work is to be done "without murmuring" and the monks "are not to think themselves ill-used." 3

The same care, even respect and reverence for tools and utensils which we have met before appears in Benedict's Rule, and in several places, so that it must have been a matter of real concern to the writer. 4

References:
3. Rule, c.57.
4. Ibid., chaps.53, 48.
5. Ibid., chaps.32, 35, 46.
statement appears in his injunctions to the cellarer who is to "look upon all the vessels and goods of the monastery as if they were the consecrated chalices of the altar.¹ This is a highly unusual phrase, almost startling in its religious evaluation of common things. I think, however, that the sacredness of these possessions came not from the holiness of the work in which they were used, so much as from the holiness of the life to which the users were dedicated. The tools belonged to the House, the House belonged to God. In the later Middle Ages, there are frequent gifts of land, and moveable property, including bondfolk, not to such and such a monastery, but to such and such a Saint, the patron of the monastery. Everything belonging to the foundation was regarded as the personal property of the saint, and was thereby sanctified. While that could scarcely have been true in Benedict's day, yet I think the principle on which these tools were regarded sacred were the same, though it was not personalized in a patron saint. Another analogy is that of the "Patri-monium Petri" which had begun to take shape under Gregory the Great, in the same century in which Benedict lived.

We read again that the products of the monastery's labors were to be sold somewhat cheaper (aliquantulum in villis) than those made by lay people, "ut omnibus glor-

¹ Rule, c.31. Smaragdus says on this chapter: "Nosse etiam debent fratres quia quidquid in monasterio tractatur, sive in vasis, sive in ferramentis, vel cactera omnia esse sanctificata." MPL, 102:861c.
This represents, I think, the same principle as was enunciated by Paul, when he bade Christians work that they might be respected by those who were without. The monks were to keep free from any suspicion of avarice or of seeming to seek unduly for profit, and were so to recommend their religion to secular folk.

In the light of the foregoing, it appears that Benedict viewed and used labor much as had his predecessors in the monastic life. He enjoined it for the same reasons, hedged it about with the same safeguards, and estimated it just about as highly as they. Labor is an essential part of the religious life, and as such it is holy, just as were the tools with which it was performed. It is the performance of a duty essential to self-maintenance; but it/of more positive value as an instrument of charity, even if that charity is somewhat limited in extent. Labor repels that enemy of the soul, idleness. Again it is of value because without it, the monk cannot maintain the proper attention to prayer and liturgical service. In all this, it remains an instrument - a necessary one, but still only an instrument. It is helpful, even necessary to prayer, it is closely connected with prayer, but it is not itself prayer.

1. Rule, c.57. Hildemarus improves on this prescription of Benedict, and says that not only should goods be sold cheaper, but a higher price should be paid for the things the monastery must buy: "Expositio," p.530.
2. Cf. the responses to be said by the "septimaniarii" as they enter and leave the week of kitchen service. Rule, c.35.
3. To Isidore of Seville, (d.636) work was so little like prayer that he bade his monks chant Psalms while working, "ut mens non avertatur a Deo." Reg. S.Isidori, MPL,103:562.
How long were the prescriptions of Benedict maintained? In the confused age which followed his time, documents are scarce, and it is difficult to tell. One of the cardinal points of the reform of Benedict of Aniane, however, was the restoration of the manual labor of the Rule; it must have fallen into desuetude before then. A very early instance of deviation from Benedict's ideal that monks should maintain themselves by the labor of their own hands is several times cited by the party which later grew up defending the "dispensability" of this portion of his Rule. The example is that of St. Maur, a personal disciple of Benedict who founded the famous monastery in Gaul. He and his monks, say Peter the Venerable and Rupert of Deutz, finding that they did not need to labor for their maintenance because of the generosity of a patron, devoted themselves entirely to "spiritual works." 1 The tradition on the matter is not as reliable or as definite as we might wish, but it seems not improbable that as early as the "first generation" of Benedictines, there were some who dropped manual labor as non-essential to the monastic life.

1. Petrus Venerabilis, Epistolae, I, 28. MPL, 189:129; Rupertus Tuitensis, Commentaria in Reg. S. Ben., MPL 170:515. Andreas Chesnius appends to the passage in Peter's letter, a quotation from the life of St. Maur, regarding the noble patron's relations to his monastery: "Rorigo, venerabilis comes me....a rectituidine regularis tramitis exorbitaret .......semper providentiam.....tam loco.....tam congre-gationi vigilanti cura in omnibus adhiberent." (Liber Miraculorum beati Mauri, auctore Odone Fossatense, I, 3.)
Butler believes that agricultural work ceased to be a part of the ordinary monk's day in the course of the eighth century, and that it was replaced largely by the copying of manuscripts. The change took place, he says, co-incident with the clericalization of the monks. The ordination of the monks was "the thing on which more than aught else depended the changes which came over Benedictine life." Butler finds his warrant for believing that most monks were ordained so early as the eighth century, in the information given in Warnefield's commentary, (c. 775).

2. Ibid., p. 292.
3. Ibid., p. 293. I cannot confirm Butler's statement from personal observation, for I did not read the Commentary with that point in mind. Nor am I prepared to say it is unwarranted to conclude that the same thing is true of the monks generally of the time. However, that such generalizations are extremely hazardous is shown by some data given by Mabillon. (Praefationes in Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti, conjunctim editae, Venetiis, 1740, pp. 136, 137.) He finds three abbots in the eighth century who were but deacons, and one only a sub-deacon. These were "ordained" doubtless, but presumably if the presbyterate held so little attraction for Abbots, the monks of more ordinary mould would feel even less impelled to take orders at all. In the reign of Louis the Pious, it was necessary for Pope Eugene to order all Abbots to become Priests, so little zeal did they show for entering the Presbyterate of their own accord. And three years after Louis' death, forty Deacon-Abbots are found. This, says Mabillon, is not from paucity of Priests in the monasteries; but certainly the fact is not without its significance for all that. Even Butler does not affirm that "it became the established rule that monks should be ordained" before the year 1000 (p. 294).
We remember that even Augustine felt it unnecessary that monastic clerics should work;¹ but we cannot help feeling that Benedict's provision that even a priest should "keep the Rule in all rigour and that no mitigation will be allowed him" is a sounder one, and that, while it is permissible for a secular priest with parish care on his hands to be free from the necessity of earning his own bread, to make the same provision for monastic priests is a fundamental departure from the original lay character of monasticism.

Warnefrid is not only our source for the presence in the monastery of priests, but also of servants. According to Butler, even Benedict intended that hired labor should be used for some of the field labor.² Warnefrid indicates that they were employed as a regular thing, not only in field labor at extraordinary times, but in the kitchens and gardens of the monastery itself and as a regular thing.³ Nevertheless his exposition of c.48 of the Rule shows that daily manual toil was still a part of the recognized program of the monks, at least in his own monastery.

We are not without indications that manual toil per-

3. "Debet enim illi (i.e., Celleriario) Abba constituere isto modo, verbi gratia: sub cura tua sunt infantes, hospites, infirmi, pauperes, servi, etc. And again: "Ille Celleriarius admonet suos manipulos ut illi servitores non negligentes infirmis servitias praebere." Comm. in Reg. S.Ben. c.31.
sisted in some of the Benedictine foundations. At Arce, for instance, work was enjoined between the reading of the Chapter and Tierce, and again after the midday rest. For Monte Cassino in the early tenth century, we have this indication: Abbot Aligerno granted "to the many monks of the monastery who are old and infirm and cannot labor with their hands" revenues of a manor, a vineyard, and five mills for their sustentation. Martène in his commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict cites the following as examples of communities which kept up the practice of manual labor, all from the earlier Middle Ages: the disciples of S. Finianus of Bangor; the monks of Fulda, (in a letter of Boniface to Pope Zacharias); and the monks of Vallumbrosa (in the Life of S. Aiberti); the disciples of Robert of Arbrisello (Life by Baldricus Dolensis); and, in the eleventh century, William of Hirsgau, who (according to the Chronicle of Trithemus, an. 1082) with his monks spent nine years in building their own monastery.

3. But Boniface's letters show that as riches grew, servants were employed at Fulda for meaner tasks. (v. Schubert, op. cit., p. 626.)
4. MPL, 66:703. The building of a monastery was sometimes considered a special task. William of St. Theodorie feared bodily labors for his monks, as too exhausting to the soul (though for pious men, that may have the same value as fasting) yet he thought the monastic buildings ought not to be constructed by secular hands. (Ibid., col. 713.)
Nevertheless, these were the exception, rather than the rule, and so far as practice was concerned, there was a continual tendency to diverge from the ideal. But how ineradicable that ideal was, is shown by most of the periodic reforms which swept over monasticism and lifted it to its former levels, at least for a time. The thought of work was inseparable from the conception of the monk at his best.

4. The reform of Benedict of Aniane:

The earliest notable reform was that of Benedict of Aniane. His basic idea was a return to the strict observance of the Rule of Benedict of Nursia. His works on the basis of the Rule of his predecessor are composed (or, more accurately, compiled) on the assumption that that Rule is in no need of improvement or supplement. Consequently they add little to our knowledge of the way that Rule was observed. Inasmuch as his reform came contemporaneously with the latter part of the Carolingian renaissance, we are possessed of other literary monuments of its aims and progress. And from these we learn that Benedict himself worked with his own hands; that he succeeded in restoring in a measure the manual labor of the monks; but also that he gave impetus to a movement which

1. Cf. the opinion of Butler, already recorded (ante, p.135) that in general monks ceased to labor in the eighth century. Coulton equates the period of manual labor with that of monastic missionary activity (i.e., frontier conditions), saying there was little in England after the Norman conquest, and almost none after 1300, save for a brief period of reform. (The Mediaeval Village, Cambridge, 1926, pp.208,210)
was destined not long afterward to crowd out real manual work: namely, liturgical duties for the monks. From this angle, it becomes evident that he was not as purely a restorer of primitive Benedictine customs as he thought.

The results of the Reform were formulated and published by the Council of Aguilesgranae in 817. The council was called by Louis the Pious, consisted of Bishops in his realms, and was presided over by Benedict of Aniane himself. The "Capitulare Monasticon" may safely be taken as embodying the results of his efforts at reform. The first two chapters provide for learning and understanding the Rule of Benedict. The fourth and thirty-ninth deal with work:


The "Statuta Murbacensia" embody the results of the application of these principles to one particular monastery. The relation of the first one regarding labor to the Capitulare is patent: "Ut fratres in coquina, in pistrino et caeteris officiis artium propriis manibus laborent, et vestimenta sua lavent." (This is referred to an "antiqua consuetudo.") Provision was made for the training of artisans among the

2. Ante, pp. 22, 23 and n. 1
monks themselves, in order to preserve more fully their separation from the world;

Interim vero, quo haec taliter geruntur, instruenda sunt foliones, sartores, sutoras, non forinsecus sicut hactenus, sed intrinsecus, qui ista fratribus necessitatem habentibus faciant quae induciæ usque Calendas Septembres proximas dandae sunt.¹

Provision was made for all to help in the kitchen and at the fish-pond until competent supervisors could be chosen to serve a year at a time; these supervisors were still to have monks to help them. So did Benedict of Aniane attempt to restore manual labor to the monasteries he reformed. But it is doubtful whether he restored it as completely as the Rule intended it should be practiced. Narberhouse gives it as his opinion that field work was an exception to the arrangements under the Capitulare Monasticon.² There is one interesting instance where the monks themselves asked to have field-work restored to them, after it had been for some time in the hands of hired laborers. It comes from several years earlier than these capitularies, but it may be that the work of Benedict had influenced them. The request is written by the monks of Fulda to Charlemagne, and is included along with other suggestions for the reform of abuses arising from the lax administration by the Abbot:

¹ Consuetudines Monasticae, pp. 83, 84.
Ut ipsa monasterii ministeria per frates ordinentur, id est pistrinum, hortus, braciarium, coquina, agricultura et cetera ministeria, sicut apud decessores nostros fuerunt quia devotius et dignius per frates omne exercitubur officium quam per laicum aut servum malevolum.¹

This may well have been due to the influence of Benedict of Aniane, for he was as afraid of idleness for his monks as was the first Benedict; and saw that danger increased by the presence of servants to do much of the heavy and menial work of the houses.² He is recorded to have freed all the slaves on lands given to the monastery, an action quite unusual in the annals of monastic ownership of land.

Si quis possessionibus suis aliquid conferre monasterio vellet, suscipiebat; sin vero servos ancillasque copulari niteret, refugiebat, nee passus est quemquam per idem tempus per cartam monasterio tradid, set ut fieri liber, imperabat.³

Another disciple of Benedict's who manifested sympathy with the slaves was his contemporary, Smaragdus.

1. Supplex libellus monacharum Fuldensium Carolo Imperatorio porrectus, XVI, Consuetudines Monasticae, Vol.III, p.76. Martene says of this petition (Comm. in Reg. S.Benedicti, MPL, 66:715) that it was because of the scarcity of servants; but it seems rather to have been because of dissatisfaction over the quality and temper of servants than because of their scarcity.

2. Narberhaus, op.cit., p.26: "Deshalb wird die persönliche Handarbeit der Mönche auch in Zukunft unter allen umstanden beibehalten." For work of Benedict with his own hands, see Vita, auctore Ardone, 14, MPL 103:360; 32,368.

3. Vita, 14, MPL. 103:360.
who, in a treatise addressed to the King of the Lombards (possibly Charlemagne, certainly either him or his son, Louis) asked that the slaves in the whole kingdom be freed. At about the same time Bishop Jonas of Orleans (821-843 A.D.) was preaching an equalitarian doctrine:

Let the rich and mighty folk, taught by these sentences (some he had quoted from the Bible and from Gregory’s Moralia) and those of other holy scriptures learn that both their bondfolk and the poor are by nature their own equals.

At the same time it must be said that Alcuin, as holder of four Abbacies was also holder of twenty thousand serfs. He was reproached with this by the Bishop of Toledo and did not deny it, but said he had never bought one for his personal service. This enormous figure too doubtless included not only slaves proper, but also agricultural serfs and coloni.

1. Via Regia, (see ante, p. 23) c. 30, MPL, 102:967, 968: Vere obedire debet homo Dec. Et inter alia praecipita salutaria, et opera recta propter nimiam illius charitatem unusquisque liberos debet dimittere servos, considerans quia non illi eos natura subegit, sed culpa; condicionem enim equaliter creati sumus. Simul et considerantes quia si dimiseritis dimittentur vos, Nam et vos, domine, conditionale opprimit jugum." That there were slaves in Smaragdus’ own monastery of St. Thierry, and possibly after the Via Regia was written appears from a charter of privileges confirmed by Louis (817) in which the men on its lands "tam ingenue quam servos" are protected from episcopal interference. (Veterea Analecta, etc., ed. J. Mabillon, Paris, 1773, p. 356.) Smaragdus does not therefore stand convicted of hypocrisy however for Abbots had long been forbidden to manumit the house’s slaves by canon law. (Synod of Agde, (506) canon 46, Cf. Postea, p. 143, n. 1.)

2. The whole passage is translated from Coulton, Mediaeval Village, p. 231.

The growth of slavery in the monasteries is a matter of some obscurity. It is probable that it came slowly, with the growth of their lands, where Abbots were not as high-minded or as self-denying as was Benedict of Aniane. Even by the time of the first Benedict, monasteries in the West had slaves, as is shown by the legislation of the second Council of Epaon (517) which forbade Abbots to manumit slaves:

For it is unfair (it says significantly) that while the monks perform their daily labor in the fields, there slaves should indulge in the idleness of freedom.¹

The Church at large sometimes encouraged manumission on the part of the laity as a "good work" but she herself tended rather to put obstacles in the way of her own bondpeople obtaining their freedom. Evidence is not wanting that the Church even took advantage of the manumission she induced the laity to make, by establishing a sort of patronage over their freedmen which in time came to mean almost as heavy a bondage as that from which they had formerly suffered.² Coulton,³ Tawney,⁴ and Troeltsch⁵ all agree that the disappearance of slavery and serfdom in Europe was due not to efforts of the Church in that di-

---

1. Canon 8, Quoted from Brecht, Kirche und Sklaverei, Barmen, p.75. Cf. Reg.S.Isidori, XVIII, MPL, 103:570a., where the reason given is that the slaves were not the Abbot's, therefore he had no right to manumit them.
rection but rather to the efforts of the bondmen themselves, and the operation of economic forces. On the other hand, it is possible that servitude under the Church or on monastic lands was lighter than under secular lords. Early Church legislation is not wanting enjoining the better treatment of slaves than was given them by non-Christians. And during the Middle Ages several councils enjoined kindly treatment of slaves on ecclesiastical and monastic owners. We must, it is true, not take the egalitarian utterances of such exceptional men as Benedict of Aniane and Jonas and Smaragdus as typical; but on the other hand, it remains true that so far as there was any proclamation of the rights of the oppressed in those days, it was to be found in the ranks of the clergy, secular or monastic, and more often in the monastic ranks than in those of the hierarchy. And the concurrence of these three men within so short a time constitutes a remarkable revival of an earlier and nobler tradition, a tradition which, however, poorly lived up to, was never completely lost.

It has already been pointed out that the Council of Aquisgranae did not legislate a complete return to

1. Ibid., p.68. For example, the Council of Epaon already cited; that at Chalons, 813 A.D.; that at Toledo, 675.
2. Brecht warns against taking such utterances on the natural equality of man too seriously in any case, op. cit., p.26. Those of Gregory the Great in Letter VI, (MPL 77:803f) are contradicted by Letter 102 (ibid., col.1026) directing that a runaway slave be sent back to Rome. Gregory also revoked the orders which had previously permitted the elevation of slaves to the clergy. Yet the Church remained conscious of the inconsistency between her theory and practice throughout the Middle Ages. (Troeltsch, Social Teachings, I,p.133.)
Benedictine labor, in that field-labor was not envisaged, and only tasks about the house, laundry, etc., were specifically mentioned. According to a fragment of the history of that Council, it even prohibited the monks of priestly rank from engaging in heavy labor:

Statuerunt episcopi concordante domino papa ut monachi a gravi opere et labore propter honorem sacerdotii cessent, et loco laboris ad horas psalmos quosdam nominatīs provivis et defunctis fidelibus cantent cum orationibus ordinatis.

Yet Capitulary 3 had declared "Ut officium iuxta quod in regula sancti Benedicti continentur celebrant." Now certainly the offices decreed by Benedict had not made field-work impossible; it must be something else that was responsible for this prohibition of work. Butler says in the beginning of the order there was no daily Mass, it was celebrated only on Sundays and solemnities. By the time of Warnefrid, there was daily Mass, but no other addition to the canonical office. Warnefrid in his dedicatory letter to Charlemagne ascribes the simplicity of the original Benedictine offices to the fact that the complexities in the Roman Church liturgy had begun only with Gregory the Great or Honorius, and

---

1. MPL, 66:719.
3. Argument from silence, Benedictine Monachism, p. 283. For Masses on Sundays and Solemnities, Rule, 35, 38.
4. Butler, op. cit., p. 294, where he refers to Warnefrid's Commentary, chaps. II. 35.
says corresponding additions were made in the monasteries "ne a Romana ecclesia discrepare videntur." In the time of the Carolingians the Abbots were divided among themselves on the question as to whether the monasteries should follow their own primitive tradition or the more elaborate Roman one. A sort of compromise seems to have been reached by which on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays the latter usage was followed, and on the other days, the simple Benedictine requirements only. This would account for the differing reports as to what the Council at Aquisgranae actually decreed. Benedict of Aniane himself furthered the development of monastic liturgy by introducing the fifteen gradual psalms before the vigils and night offices, and probably also that of saying the office of the dead each day. The influence of Cluny in the tenth century carried this tendency still farther.

All this had a direction bearing on the question of labor, for even though Benedict of Aniane thought himself to be restoring the primitive Benedictine tradition, he was nevertheless illustrating a tendency which was more or less constant in the history of that tradition, a tendency to change the nice balance of active and contemplative life established by the founder in favor of the

2. Note by Albers, Ibid., p.81.
3. Butler, Benedictine Monachism, p.295. Traces of this increase in liturgy may be found in the Life of Benedict of Aniane, MPL, 103:378,379.
latter element. Work was being replaced by liturgy. Cluny will scarcely resist this tendency at all; Citreaux will do so for a time, but it too will slip back into liturgical employments to fill up the time left vacant because the monks no longer have to work with their hands.

The results of the reform of Benedict of Aniane, so far as work was concerned, may be summed up as follows. Benedict himself was an enthusiast for hand work, and himself engaged in it. It was prescribed for his monks at the Council of Aquisgranae, and, if Murbach is to be taken as typical, a real effort was made to carry out his prescription. Conscious of the dangers of idleness, which in turn was fostered by the presence of servants in the monasteries, Benedict made an earnest effort to rid his lands of them, and so gave rise to a brief and fruitless "abolition" movement. At the same time, he encouraged the increase of liturgical duties for the monks, which to some extent in his own day and to a greater degree later were to crowd manual labor out of the horarium.
CHAPTER FIVE

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY IN THE CLUNIAC HOUSES
1. The source and aims in the Cluniac Houses:

It has already been intimated that the reform movement from Benedict of Aniane was to some extent the source and inspiration of that which radiated from Cluny. Starting where Benedict of Aniane left off, the Cluny movement did not succeed in getting back so closely to the Rule of Benedict of Nursia. The primary objectives of the reform were poverty, obedience, silence, humility, continence, hospitality, and psalmody, especially the absence of personal possessions. These sound like pure Benedictinism; but the means they took to achieve those ends were somewhat different from those of the first Benedict, and moreover, the modifications which they took over from Benedict of Aniane they further developed. The necessity of such a reform

3. Ibid., p.51
was crying aloud at the beginning of the tenth century.
In spite of his interest in intellectual, legal, and
economic development in his realm, Charlemagne had done
little really for the moral condition of the monasteries.
Louis the Pious was more attentive to this aspect of
religious life; but the confusion which followed the
partition of the Empire had swallowed up the gains he
had made. Of the far-reaching changes wrought by the
movement which had Cluny for its centre, both in mon­
astic life itself and in the religious life of western
Europe, there is no need to speak here. We shall pro­
ceed at once to the consideration of the influence of
the reform on work and economic activity.

2. Work of the brethren and servants in the monasteries:

So far as the personal hand-work goes, the brethren
were still to perform certain tasks, especially house
and kitchen tasks. In Farfa, they serve at the table,
they work in the kitchen, but there they have the help
of boys; in Subiaco, at least, they might be excused
from cooking, but not from all the kitchen work if they
were clerks, and not sufficiently good cooks to do their
work well.\(^1\) They light the fire at daybreak, and do

\(^1\) "sed si forte clerici fratres ad hoc apti non fuerint,
coquet aliquis conversorum adeo compositus, ut nullum
scandalum ex ipso inveniat...ita tamen ut......omnes
faciant officium coquinae lavando scutellas, etc., per
totam septimam. Et etiam portat aquam et ligno et cetera
huiusmodi humilitatis opera cum omni fervore, quia
de his, ut Sanctus Benedictus dicit in cap. 35, Maior
merces acquiretur." Consuetudines Sublacenses, Cons.
the cleaning at the end of their week's service in the kitchen, "secundum capitulum regule patris nostri Benedicti 35."¹ In Farfa, the monks still wash one another's feet, but the feet of guests are washed by famuli.² It appears that there were also tailors near at hand at Farfa for mending the clothing, but it is not stated whether they were brethren or lay workmen.³ At Farfa, the monks go forth to labor in the fields, but the burden of the directions in the Consuetudines is all on the responses and Psalmody which must accompany the departure, the work, and the return.⁴ The whole tone of the sections on labor indicate that it was no longer the serious business on which the daily bread of the monks depended.

It is very evident that servants and hired labor play a large part in the work mentioned in the Consuetudines. For the duties about the cloister itself we find frequent mention of the "famulus" or house servant. In the Farfa Consuetudines, these famuli make the fire (p.10), bring the napkins which the priest uses in celebrating Mass (p.67), give certain signals in connection with the altar service (pp.68,69), help the brothers who receive

¹. Op.cit., p.205. Subiaco seems to have required more housework of the brethren than most of the other Cluniac houses.
². At Farfa only the cleaning of the wash-basin is mentioned.
¹. Ibid., p.180.
⁴. Ibid., pp.144,5.
guests (p.181), help with the sick and aged (pp.186,190), and help the cellarer (p.190). From these various duties it appears that he was not only a servant, but also had a quasi-ecclesiastical status. Hoffman suggests that the introduction of laymen to perform some of the intimate services of the monastery was productive of disorder, so they were assimilated into the lower church orders, in order to maintain discipline more effectively.1 As such they were the precursors of the peculiarly Cister-cian institution of "Conversi" or lay-brothers. Their admission caused a gradation in the ranks of the cloister-dwellers that was quite foreign to the equality which Benedict would have kept unqualified.

3. The development of the priestly and liturgical elements of the religious life in the Cluniac houses:

For Rupert of Deutz,2 the glory of monasticism was the priesthood.3 And he implies that most of the monks are actually priests in his time:

Nam quia monachi sunt, et beatus
Benedictus monachis ordinavit
opus manuum pene obliyiscuntur
quod sacerdotus sunt.4

It would be hard to find in a single sentence a clearer indication of the opposition between the clericalization

---

2. For Rupert's Commentary, see ante p.24. Rupert was a Cluniac-minded monk, who was expelled from his monastery at Luttich for his convictions. He was later re-instated, and became Abbot of Deutz in 1120. He lived until 1135. Hauck-Herzog (3rd. ed.) 17:229-43.
which was the tendency of the times and the lay-working conception of Benedict. A little later, the Praemonstratensian Abbot Philippe de Harvengt (c.1170) says:

in our own day, this license (from the hierarchy to celebrate public Masses) hath so grown that you may scarce find, I say not only Abbots, but even Monks, who are not in Holy Orders.\footnote{"De Continentia Clericorum," MPL, 203:774ff, quoted from Coulton, Mediaeval Villages, pp.210,211.}

Along with this clericalization of the monks went an enormous increase of liturgical duties and an exaggerated esteem for the value of the "opus Dei." The Abbot Odo sang on his journeys, and compelled his companions to join in the psalms with him.\footnote{Sackur, op.cit., I,56. (Vita Odonis,II,5,19.)} In Benedict's Rule in winter there were three lections from the Scriptures; in summer, only one piece from the Old Testament was to be said aloud. But in Cluny, Genesis was read through in a single week; a hundred and thirty eight Psalms were gone through in the twenty-four hours.\footnote{Sackur, op.cit., I,57, and nn.6,7; and p.56.} Rupert of Deutz recognized this discrepancy between the early and his own times, and employed the argument already used by Warnefrid, that the Roman Church had not yet established her system of stations and times.\footnote{Ante, p.145. Rupert's Commentary, II,14, MPL. 170:509.} A curious and rather grim illustration of this reverence for the services is the fact that the sick, when they were unable to rise themselves, were to be carried by servants to the Church and if they died

\footnote{1. "De Continentia Clericorum," MPL, 203:774ff, quoted from Coulton, Mediaeval Villages, pp.210,211.}

\footnote{2. Sackur, op.cit., I,56. (Vita Odonis,II,5,19.)}

\footnote{3. Sackur, op.cit., I,57, and nn.6,7; and p.56.}

\footnote{4. Ante, p.145. Rupert's Commentary, II,14, MPL. 170:509.}
there, it was cause for rejoicing, for without doubt, their souls went immediately to bliss, having passed away in such a holy place.\textsuperscript{1}

That all this elaboration of ritual had its effect on the hand-labor of the monks can hardly be doubted. The mere element of time spent in the church would almost make it impossible to do any serious work outside. In the Consuetudines Fructuaria, labor is a minor concern, being provided for only in summer, and at most times, it was largely replaced by reading.\textsuperscript{2} In Subiaco, Masses and Offices crowd the reading period out of the morning into the afternoon period designated in the Rule for manual labor.\textsuperscript{3} In the same monastery, the private masses were said in the morning work period. It may be that the monastery was paid for these masses by lay people, and regarded them as "work." Those who were not saying Mass were to work at cleaning vegetables, or in the garden; at cleaning the house, or binding, writing, and correcting books. "Quo tempore exercitii non dissolvent se in verbis, sed oreint aliquos psalmos scilicet pro mortuis."\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} "In gratum nulli apparere debet hoc factum, quia saepe vidimus in eodem die fratrem finire ex hac luce et ad Christum transire, etiam in ipsa ecclesia exalare spiritum. Qui de talibus dubitet, quod non statim ad regna polorum penetrare?" Consuetudines Farfae, Consuetudines Monasticae, Vol.I, p.186.

\textsuperscript{2} Fructuaria was a Cluniac monastery whose Consuetudines date from the 11th century. On work there see Consuetudines Monasticae, Vol.III, p.80.


\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p.195.
So it is abundantly clear that manual labor for the monks themselves occupied but a minor place in the regime of the most famous Cluniac houses.\(^1\) What of it which remained has been transformed into a mere occasion for further liturgical ceremonies. The verdict of Dr. Eberhard Hoffman in his valuable monograph, *Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterzienserordens*, appears eminently justified:

Die Discipline Farfensis, der Ordo Cluniacensis und die Con­stitutiones Hirsauensis enthalten zwar noch ein Kapitel "De Opere Manuum,"... allein sieht man sich diese Kapital näher an, so kann man sich des Eindruckes nicht erwehren, dass die Handarbeit sich zu einer religiösen Zeremonie entwickelt hat. Die Hauptsache war das Abbeten der grossen Anzahl Psalmen, welche für diese Übung vorgeschrieben war. Man war ernster Handarbeit allgemein abgeneigt, hielt sie für unvereinbar mit der Würde des Mönches und war auf diese Weise von der Auffassung Benedikts abgekommen.\(^2\)

And again, "So erklärt sich leicht, dass die Körpereiche Arbeit, zu einer blossen Zeremonie herabgesunken, auf die den besseren Standen entsprachene Mönche nicht mehr die nötige Anziehungskraft ausübte...."\(^3\)

Another element which took the reality out of the work of the monks was the huge amount of land which came

---

3. Ibid., p.40.
into their possession. These gifts were undoubtedly an indication of the high esteem in which the Cluniacs were held, but it was none the less destructive of the very qualities for which they were esteemed. This super-abundant land they were forced to let out on various terms, and the income from this procedure kept them from all necessity of maintaining themselves by their own labor. The tenants of these lands were also required to minister to the needs of the monks.¹ For instance, one of the nearby tenants of the monastery of St. Bertin served in the kitchen; another in the mill, and in the brewery at bringing wood. Another had no obligation throughout the year unless the roof of the monastery leaked, when he was required to mend it.² In short, the monasteries were not only becoming clericalized, but also thoroughly feudalized, implicated in all that feudalism involves of furnishing protection, legal and military, in return for services. Thus they were at the same time freed from the simpler labor of earlier days, and drawn into the current of mediaeval life, economic, political, and military.

They performed signal service in all these fields, but in proportion they were diverted from the ideal of withdrawal, humility, and peace, which had once been

¹ Sackur, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 413.
their idealism was carried over into their activity in these fields, to the betterment of society as a whole. And if their original ideal suffered some damage, it is not entirely to their discredit that they accepted the responsibilities of land ownership in as hearty and competent a way as they did; and the society which their original ideal had left almost entirely out of account gained where the ideal suffered.

4. The Cluniacs as administrators of large agricultural holdings:

The prestige and confidence which the Cluniac houses enjoyed on the part of the nobles of the time is clearly reflected in the large gifts of land which were made to them, especially in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. There were times when the total of gifts fell off indeed, due to famines and wars; but as each gift was added to the total preceding donations, the holdings of the monasteries became astonishingly large. Of these gifts, some were of land already under cultivation, and the monks needed only to continue the operations already going on; but a large part of them consisted in fallow, waste, and superfluous lands.\(^1\) Often by the terms of the gift, the monks were required to

put these lands under cultivation. And indeed they
had a feeling that the "land of the saints" ought not
to remain waste and uninhabited. Consequently their
services to the extension of agriculture were consider-
able. They frequently made efforts to get people to
settle on these waste lands, who should put it under
cultivation. There was sometimes difficulty in finding
these settlers, but they preferred having their lands
under cultivation to having they lay idle. Hence they
sometimes exchanged empty land for which they could
find no settlers, for other tracts.

In spite of their efforts in this direction, however,
they were unable to see to the cultivation of all their
own lands. Hence they entered into various arrange-
ments with other managers to rent out some of their holdings.
And it was this sort of transaction, carried on at first
by means of rent in the form of goods but later with
money, (as it began to come again into use as a medium
of exchange) which gave the monasteries importance as
financial centres. The sources leave us in no doubt that,

1. Sackur, "Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte französischer
ulotharingischer Klöster," etc., in "Zeitschr. f. Soc. u.
129, from the "Chartes de S.Florent": "Sed quia ipse
locus nudus atque indigens bonis omnibus nobis videbatur,
vix illorum postulationibus assensum praebimus. Tandem
vero ne sanctorum locus incultus et sine habitatore remaneret,
illis multa promittentibus, locum suscepiimus."

p.187, n.175: The monks of Fécamp received from the Bishop
of Bayeux 100 hospites and 30 homines franci and gave him
in return a piece of land.
among the tasks of the reform Abbots, these economic activities were esteemed as highly as those of a more specifically ecclesiastical nature. For his industry and success in clearing, cultivating, and building on waste land, Abbot John of Gorze receives high praise from his biographer. With evident gusto the writer enlarges on the fish in the artificial ponds, the flocks of cattle and sheep, and the fowls, which furnished the tables plentifully, and the agricultural tools the Abbot so prudently acquired for the continuance of their maintenance. In like manner Sigebert de Gembloux praises the diligence and success of Abbot Olpertus in managing the temporal affairs of his Abbey.

3. Ibid., c.89.
Thus, by the attention the more energetic Abbots paid to the upbuilding of the material prosperity of their monastery, and the share of this attention which was bestowed on lands hitherto uncultivated, the productivity of the lands about them was greatly enhanced, the population increased, and markets and villages sprang up with the monastery as a centre.¹

I cannot do better, in concluding this section, than to quote at some length from Sackur, by way of summarizing the economic accomplishments and importance of monasticism in the age of Cluny:

In the place of the former scattered and run-down land-holdings of the second half of the 9th century, arose new, unorganic accumulations of loose possessions and rights which monasticism sought to organize and round out. Through more intensive administration the greatest conceivable profits were drawn from them, and so the loss of economic strength which had been suffered during the great confusion of the preceding age, was retrieved. Many free peasants who had lost their possessions found a new existence as Censuali or Hospites of the monastic economic system; free craftsmen and merchants formed the population of the Abbatial cities. The new centres, through the protection which they offered, attracted a multitude of people to their service and raised more and more the ranks of the free peasants. With consciousness of their humanitarian obligations, the Abbots created for their subjects,

on the whole, a freer, more independent and humane existence.

But the economic importance of the monastic reform is not exhausted in the colonization of broad stretches of waste lands, and the absorption of small holdings. The Abbeys were not less influential in their whole circle of influence in the capacity of social centres, and financial organizations. From the rents, from the sale of their superfluous production, great amounts of capital accumulated, which were made available for the growing needs of the common people and the nobility, and were applied to the purchase of more land, and at the markets went for the necessities and the clothing of the brethren. Through loans on moveable property, through insurance and pension activities which they undertook, the monks carried on enterprises helpful to the peasants and nobles, which of course brought rich profits to themselves, because the pledges often remained in their possession, and the services of the monks gave occasion for ever increasing gifts. In any case, the circulation of money was furthered by their activity, to fill in the gaps in the social order; all this in a time when the spiritual life was still more dependent on the material basis than today. 1

Thus, though work, in the sense of manual labor in which Benedict had enjoined it, was nearly completely given over, in the sense of management of productive enterprises, it was continued. This was somewhat illogical for management of large possessions, if anything, was less compatible with the monastic state than manual labor;

and the same objections which were urged against manual labor - i.e., pre-occupation with ecclesiastical services, the clerical status of monks, etc., - might have been urged with even greater reason against administrative activity. But, from the social viewpoint, it is fortunate that they were not applied in this instance, for by assuming the responsibility of management, the monks were probably performing what was at the time a greater social need than manual labor. Sackur's picture of the benevolence of monastic management, regarding the underlings seems to me to be optimistic, for all too often it was a system of exploitation whose benefits to the exploited - like those of that other famous system, the Roman Empire - were only incidental. Yet it remains true that the monks, by reason of superior ability, training, and sense of Christian obligation were better fitted than any other class to hold in their hands the destinies of peasants and bondmen.
CHAPTER SIX.

WORK AND MANAGEMENT IN THE CISTERCIAN ERA.
1. **The objectives of the Cistercian reform:**

The Cistercians sought, in general, a return to the strict observance of the Benedictine Rule, as had Benedict of Aniane and Cluny. They succeeded better than the others had done in cutting away the accretions to the office, retaining only the daily recitation of the Offices of the Dead, in addition to the Psalmody and Scripture reading prescribed by Benedict. A thorough-going effort was made to eliminate all indulgences which had crept in since Benedict's day in the use of food, drink, dress, and conversation. This succeeded too well to be really a simple return to the letter of Benedict's Rule, though it is understandable in view of the laxity against which it was a reaction. Among the mitigations rejected as unworthy of the monastic life was the taking of rents and tithes which had been

---

2. Article, "Cistercians," loc. cit. When Bernard reproached Peter the Venerable (in their famous controversy on the merits of their respective Orders) with having departed from the Rule, Peter answered him that he (Bernard) was in no position to reproach him with that, for, if the Cluniacs had allowed mitigations to creep in, the Cistercians also had deviated on the side of over-strictness. (Epp. Petri Ven.I, 28, MPL, 189:114)
the cause of so much laxity among the Cluniacs. The Cistercians intended to work all their own lands themselves, though, as will be seen later, the actual work was to be performed largely by the "lay brothers" or "Fratres conversi." Nevertheless emphasis was laid in the early days of the order on manual toil of the rudest kind by the monks themselves. The Cistercian ideal had but little place for scholarly or priestly activities. They were not to assume parish activities or preach. At the beginning of the thirteenth century it happened that they were the only order available for missionary activities, and so by Papal orders, they undertook a good deal of it; but in the middle of the same century they willingly gave over this task to the Franciscans and Dominicans. Before the middle of that century the General Chapter forbade the monks to take charge of parish churches or assume the cure of souls.

2. The work of the monks themselves and its influence. St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable:

Indications that the monks worked hard in the fields are numerous:

A novice of Clairvaux wrote enthusiastically of finding the monks there employed "with hoes in the garden, forks and rakes in the meadow, sickles in the harvest"

fields, and axes in the forests."

Brewer, in his introduction to Volume IV of the Opera of Giraldus Cambrensis (which introduction contains one of the best accounts of the Cistercians in English) quotes the following concerning their work and the impression it made on the peasantry of the neighborhood:

Then began abbots and monks to get their daily food by the labour of their hands, eating their bread in the sweat of their face, and planting in their blood the vineyard of the Lord of Sabaoth. The people of the province flocked to them from every quarter, some to assist and some only as spectators; for the stolid populace wondered to see a set of people in their cowls at one time engaged in divine service, at another time occupied with rustic works.

The biographer of St. Bernard relates how, in spite of health ruined by excessive austerities, he continued to do heavy work, denying himself mitigations which they would have been glad to accord him, and carrying wood he himself had cut, or digging in the earth. When his strength finally gave out, he took the lighter but more disagreeable tasks, "ad viliora opera confugiens, laborem humilitate compensabat."

Bernard's spiritual labors, not only for his own Order, but for the Church at large are well known.

1. Quoted from J.W. Thomson, The Cistercian Order and Colonization in Mediaeval Germany, Amer. Jour. of Theology, 1920, p. 76
4. In the reverently eloquent words of his biographer: "Quae.....per totum Christianum orbem constituit domos seu civitates refugii.....? Quae schismata Ecclesiae non sedavit? quas confudit haereses? quam pacem inter dissidentes
And even his "De Consideratione" is not without its exhortation to active effort for the Church. This labor and suffering he drew from a consideration of the labors and sufferings of the Son of God; and from his consciousness of fellowship with Him, he drew his reward. Yet in spite of this the natural affinity of his heart drew him to the contemplative life as the superior one. So he says in the Apologia ad Guillelmmum:

Jam vero de labore manuum quid gloriamini: cum et Martha laborans increpata, et Maria quiescans laudata sit; et Paulus aperte dicat: Labor corporis ad modicum valet, pietas autem ad omnia? Optimus labor, de quo propheta dicebat Laboravi in gemitu meo.

And again, in Sermon 50 on the Song of Songs: "How many times without doing harm do we leave reading for manual work!"

---


3. c.IV, fin.MPL. 182:907.
How many times we abstain from celebrating the Holy Sacrifice of the mass to give ourselves to the administration of temporal things! It is a reversal of the order, I agree, but necessity knows no law."Bernard like all the truly great mystics resisted the temptation to devote himself wholly to the contemplation and the divine mysteries which he preferred above all, and gave himself alternately to them and to ministering to the needs, temporal and spiritual, of those about him. But the Order as a whole inclined to find its calling primarily in the opus Dei and study, remaining perpetually in their cloister, indifferent to the needs of others, and unwilling to undertake a labor sufficient to maintain themselves. Hence the incorporation of the Fratres Conversi, who were to do most of the manual work, and those things requiring contact with the outside world; hence, also, their indifference to the spiritual needs of even the Wendish heathen groups about them in N.E. Germany. Monasticism remained self-centered until the coming of the Friars.

Still the standard set by Citeaux for the monks themselves was high; and Clairvaux was not without its influence.

2. E. Hoffman, Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterzienordens, (Freiburg, Schweiz, 1905) p.44.
on some of the older houses. The Cistercians were not slow about pointing out to these older and laxer foundations some of the respects in which they came short of their ideal for monks, and it must be confessed, sometimes justified the epithet of "Pharisee" which was freely bestowed by those who were the objects of this sort of attention. The Reform Statutes of Peter the Venerable for the Cluniac houses, coming as they did after the misrule of his predecessor, the rapacious Pontius, and after Citeaux had been for nearly a half century a model of order and strictness, may be counted as representing the most striking instance of the Cistercian influence beyond the limits of her own Congregation. No doubt the hortatory letter of Bernard, called the "Apologia ad Guillelmmum" had something to do with the reform at Cluny, in spite of the eloquent defense of their usages by Peter in a letter "ad Bernardem." 

The 76 Statuta enjoined greater strictness in food and drink (X-XV); in clothing (XVI-XVII); and silence (XIX-XXII); but most important for our purpose was an attempt to restore the manual labor of the Rule "at least

1. For instance, in the Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem monachum, the Cistercian charges the Cluniac thus: "tibi et ceteris tui ordinis monachis poetica figmenta adeo placent ut in eis studeatis et lectiteatis... etiam in illis horis quas S.Benedictus sacrae lectioni et manuum operi designavit..." (Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, Vol.V, p.1574)
2. Workman, p.237
to some extent." Bernard had charged the Cluniacs with being unwilling, even on the commands of Scripture and the Rule to "withdraw hands delicate with leisure from the bosom for work."¹ The Statute on manual labor (XXXIX) had almost an apologetic tone, and gives a rather unflattering picture of conditions in the Order:

It is decreed that the ancient and holy manual labor be restored both in the cloisters themselves and wherever (it can be done) honestly and apart from the gaze of secular folk, at least to some extent, so that at all times, except feast days, when it is not permissible to work, the brethren be always occupied in some useful work.

The reason for this ordinance is that, idleness, which, according to the Father Benedict, is harmful to the soul, has laid hold on the great part of our (brethren), especially of those who are called conversi, to such a degree that, both within and without the cloister, except for a few who read and the rare ones who write, they either sleep against the walls of the buildings, or, if I may say so, from the rising of the sun to its setting, nay rather till night, spend almost the whole day (and that with impunity) in empty, idle, and (what is worse) slanderous words.²

Statute XXIV decrees that the sick shall no longer be tended by servants, but by the monks themselves, or at least by lay-brethren.³

Bernard also reproached the Cluniacs with differing not at all from "seculars" in that they had castles,

¹. This is Peter’s own statement of the accusation against him. Ep. I 28, MPL. 189:114.
². Ibid., 1036-1037.
³. Ibid., 1032.
villas, farm-servants, and slaves and bond-women.¹ That they actually had the bond-servants appears clearly from a note appended by the commentator, which contains a quotation from a Royal writ issued by Ludovicus, to the monastery, which protects the men slave or free, from restraint against their will. Peter admits that they have bondservants, and justifies their possession by appealing to the permission accorded by Benedict of taking gifts with an oblate child, which permission, he says, excepts nothing, "neither land, nor villas, nor serfs, nor slaves, nor bond-women."² However, he repudiates the charge that they are in possession of these bond-folk, like secular masters, for these treat their serfs unmercifully, laying extraordinary and cruel burdens upon them, forcing them often to take refuge in flight, and some times selling for vile money "those persons whom Christ redeemed at such dear cost, that it with his own blood."³

Monks, on the other hand, even if they have these (serfs) have them not like that, but far otherwise. For they use only the legitimate and due services of the underlings for the support of life, not imposing anything insupportable... They hold their bond-men and women, not as bond-men and women but as brothers and sisters.⁴

¹. Ibid., col. 142.
². Ibid., 144.
³. Ibid., 146.
⁴. Ibid., 146.
Such is a picture of the work-life of the Cluniacs as influenced by the Cistercian strictness. But that strictness did not long survive the first rush of enthusiasm. The Cistercian order was immensely popular, both on the Continent and in England, and received great gifts of land and enormous accessions of membership, both of which tended to the decline of the early ideal. Coulton says the labor of the monks lasted only about a generation from 1130, to 1160; but this seems to me to be extreme. Not counting the fact that the Cistercians must have worked from the beginnings before the century began, Dolberg gives an instance of the Abbots themselves working with their hands in the middle of the thirteenth century.  

It appears from the General Chapter Statutes of 1215 that the Order did not even then cultivate all its own lands. A decree of 1396 orders Masses said for the more abundant glory of God, "since (the brethren) are not so much occupied in manual labors as in the beginning of the order." The Masses for the dead, which had been paid for by relatives, but were neglected, were ordered resumed. Here is an instance in which, clearly,  

3. Quoted in Dolberg (see above) op. cit., p.221; he also refers to Statute 6 of 1432, according to which the fasts which had been lightened in summer because of heavy work is to be restored "quia vero hujusmodi laboris necessitas nostris iatis temporibus, ut plurimum non incumbit, laici etiam scandalizantur non nunquam, ex fractione jejunii antedicti."
the work disappeared first, and to fill up the vacuum, liturgical practices were instituted afterwards. It is at least a possibility that that was the case in the process of clericalization in monasticism as a whole, which began before the time of Hildemar and reached its height in the Cluniac houses. On the other hand, it may have been that a genuine belief in the superiority of liturgical to manual services caused the latter to be crowded out by the former. It appears impossible to determine which was cause and which was effect. At any rate, there is a close connection between the two. The reforms, one after another, started out enthusiastically to do both; when zeal waned, it was the manual labor which went, and the liturgical and priestly service which remained.

At any rate, it is clear that the tremendous economic importance and influence of the Cistercian monasteries was due not so much to the labors of their own hands, as their direction of the labors of the lay-brothers on the lands which were given to them, or on which, as a "frontier colony," they settled. To this institution of "lay-brothers" or "fratres conversi" we must now turn.

---

1. "The clearings and drainings, the agricultural improvements, insofar as they are attributable to monks at all, are due almost entirely to the monastic brain and purse which set the peasant's arm to work." Coulton, Mediaeval Villages, p.214.
3. The lay-brothers: their position in and importance to the Cistercians.

The lay brothers formed a sort of semi-monastic caste, who were bound to the fundamental vows of poverty, chastity, obedience, and silence, but who were not obliged to keep the Benedictine Rule so far as liturgical services and reading were concerned; consequently they could spend their time working in the fields. The purpose of their introduction was to enable the monks to keep the Rule more strictly. They aided in this in two ways: by assuming charge of marketing, and all other duties involving contact with the outside world, they obviated the necessity of the monks leaving their cloisters; and by doing all or most of the work in the fields, they gave the monks the required time for the Opus Dei and reading.¹

The term conversi was not new to the Cistercian order. It had been used since early Benedictine times to distinguish monks who came to the order late in life from those who were given as "oblate" children. It happened that they were usually without the early educational advantages given by the monks to the oblates within their walls since childhood, so it gradually came to mean an uneducated brother - "idiota." The "literati" in time came to be excused from manual labor to teach and preach; the idiotae, ¹

because of ill-feeling had also to be excused from the heaviest toil, and their work limited to the lower altar-services and some house-work. Outsiders were taken in as Famuli to do the meanest hand-work; they, not being bound by vows, introduced disorder and set an evil example to the monks. In time the conversi, or as they were also called the Fratres barbati, idiotas, seem to have been assimilated to the state of these famuli, and the famuli themselves given a semi-monastic status, to aid discipline. 1

Hoffman quotes the classical passage for their incorporation as a recognized part of the Cistercian organization. It is from the Exordium Parvum, the brief history of the beginnings of the Order appended by Abbot Stephen Harding to the Charta Caritas, their constitution of 1119, when he sent it to the Pope for confirmation. It is as follows:

Tuncque definierunt se conversos laicos barbatos licentia Episcopi sui suscepturos eosque in vita et morte excepto monachatu ut semetipsum tractaturos et homines eiam mercenarios, 2 quia sine adminiculo istorum non intellegebant se plenarie die sive nocte praecipita Regulam posse servarent; ... Et cum alibibi curtes ad agriculturos exercendas instituissent decreverunt ut prae diciti conversi domos illas regerent, non monachi, quia habitatio monachorum secundum Regulam debebat.

1. Hoffman, Das Konverseninstitut, pp.22,23. The half-monastic, half, servile condition of the famulus in Farfa and the other Cluniac houses as shown in the Consuetudines Monasticae is very noticeable. Hoffman also points out that the term "conversus" is applied to such men once or twice even before the Cistercian era. For the history of the term, see also, Mabillon, Praefationes, pp.512,513.
2. These "mercenarii" were day-laborers who were taken on when
esse in claustro ipsorum. 1

The conversi were primarily the workmen of the community, especially after the ideal of work for the monks themselves died out. They were to work from sunrise to sunset in the fields, dairies, forests, or quarries. In winter they did wood-work, tanned hides, made shoes, cut stones for building, etc. 2 The master of the conversi was himself a lay-brother. 3 Experienced conversi were given charge of the various granges belonging to the monastery. 4 But apart from those who achieved these managerial positions, their lot was one of unmitigated toil. We would today look upon it as a very hard one. Hoffman is of the opinion that they were better off physically under the monastery's regime than they would have been under a secular lord. 5

As for the monastic status of the conversi, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were subject to most of the disadvantages of that state without its corresponding advantages. Once a conversus, a man could never become a monk. 6 They were, in 1181, excluded from participation in the choice of the Abbot. 7 They were not allowed to own private property, and were to have no deal-

the number of "conversi" were not sufficient to perform the needful work. Hoffman, p. 83.

1. Ibid., p. 27.
6. Ibid., pp. 51, 52.
7. Ibid., p. 53.
ings with women.¹ They promised obedience until death.² In return for this, they were to have food and shelter, protection from the exactions of secular lords, and burial in the monastic grounds. They were taught a few prayers and provision was made for them to say them daily, and to take communion seven times a year.³ They were not allowed to own a book, nor were they taught to read and write. Hoffman cites a story told by Caesarius of Heisterbach (Dialogus Miraculorum, dist.V, c.16) about a conversus who was taught by a priest. He began to read and copy other books secretly. The Devil appeared to him and told him he was one day to be Bishop of Halberstadt. When the then Bishop died, he started off on a stolen horse for the city to fulfill his ambition, but was apprehended and hanged.⁴ This is a very illuminating story, revealing as it does the attitude of the monastic and priestly class toward the dangers of learning for humble folk. The conversi were not, according to the General Chapter's Statute of 1234, even to be called "Brother," without a proper name, but simply "conversi."⁵

Hoffman's judgment concerning the institution of the Conversi is that it was "a fortunate resolution of a difficulty, one quite corresponding to the spirit of the Rule,

¹. Ibid., p.60.
². Ibid., p.59.
³. Ibid., pp.54,63,64.
⁴. Ibid., pp.54,55.
which enabled the Monks to avoid the intercourse attendant on commerce."¹ He even goes so far as to say that it preserved Benedict's abolition of the world's distinction between free and unfree, for the conversi enjoyed "the privileges and immunities of a mighty order."²

But when we consider the rigid distinction which was maintained between monks and conversi; the few privileges of monastic status which they enjoyed, the really unbrotherly treatment which they received, as of a superior to an inferior class, we may well hesitate to accept this opinion. They did take on duties which enabled the monks to spend more time in "keeping the Rule;" they did perform services which sheltered them from contacts with the commercial world, but this, far from preserving Benedict's spirit, introduced a cleavage of classes within the monastery itself; and furthermore the whole institution of the conversi was based on the assumption that monks could not do all necessary work themselves and still keep the Rule. But Benedict had specifically said that monks are never more truly such than when they live by the labor of their hands as the Fathers and the Apostles did.³ If the conversi were really treated by the monks, in life and in death, just as themselves, with the exception of monasticity, as the Exordium Parvum stipulated, then there was a

¹ Op.cit., p.45
² Ibid., p.5.
³ Rule, c.48.
vast gulf between those who were monks and those who were not. More probably the system itself was essentially undemocratic, even un-human.

4. The economic accomplishments of the Order:

Whatever reserves we may make in granting the equalitarian importance of the "Konverseninstitut," it is one of the plain facts of history that they helped the Order to attain to the highest rank as a productive organization. The enterprises in which they engaged included nearly all the branches of economic activity known to the time: at the head of the list stands agriculture; grain and fruit-raising, the care of live-stock and viticulture were undertaken with tireless activity and skill; some of the products of their lands were sold in a raw state, thus developing marketing; others furnished the materials for various industries, such as weaving, tanning, shoe-making, and milling; the products of these industries, in turn, were sold over a wide radius; even mining, of copper and salt, was undertaken, and turned to profit for the monasteries. ¹

1. Hay and other fodder was raised and cut for cattle, meat was pickled or salted down, bacon smoked, sausage

---

¹ I have used Thomson's informative article freely for the data in the following pages. For the copper-mining see p.90. "By the late middle of the fourteenth century, nearly a dozen Cistercian cloisters were working the Müneburg salt deposits." (Ibid., p.34)
made, and the hides dressed and tanned. From these enterprises shoe-making, saddlery, and wool-carding naturally developed. The numbers of stock carried off by plundering nobles show to what degree and with what success this industry was developed.¹

The progress of the making and sale of wine by the monasteries is interesting. In 1134, no wine could be disposed of to outsiders. By 1181, they were seeking a market wherever it could be found. In 1202, Pforte disposed of two hundred tuns of wine. Some of the cloisters even had a saloon. At first, these were required to be outside the walls, but in 1257 they were within the cloister itself. Unseemly words or conduct, especially dicing, were forbidden.²

High praise has been given to the Cistercians for their promotion of the highly technical craft of weaving. They also helped to develop better commercial methods through regulations which governed the sale of raw wool, restrained re-selling at a higher price, and took precautions against the sale of imperfect or shoddy goods, etc.³

Reinfield in Holstein is a typical example of a Cistercian milling corporation. In 1237, four hides of land and a mill in Badow were bought. In 1258, another mill at Börsow, for 244 marks; in 1275 a

1. Ibid., p. 84.
2. Ibid., pp. 87, 92.
3. Ibid., p. 86.
conversus was sent to Nelitz to manage a mill there. In 1272 mention is made of a house in Parcheim (near Neu-Brandenberg) which Reinfield was using as a granary. The Count of Schwerin at one time, being hard up for funds sold the milling monopoly of the city to the local Cistercians for the sum of 1,264 marks. It is interesting that the deed mentions both water mills and wind-mills. Doberan in Mecklenburg bought the mills at Parcheim and Flau for 885 marks in 1282; between 1287 and 1292 those at Güstrow for 2,050 marks; in 1298 the mill at Gutten for 310 marks; the deed in each case giving the monks a milling monopoly. In order to prevent the establishment of other mills, the monks 'cornered' the water rights. The cloisters at Mecklenburg and Neuencampen did this and farmed out the water rights for a good revenue.

The expanding radius of the commercial activities of the cloisters indicate how successful they were in producing more than they could consume.

Before 1157 no inmate was permitted to go more than a day's journey from the cloister to buy or sell. In that year 4 days' journey was the limit. The Cloisters along the Baltic in the 13th century ship their goods by sea to Lübeck and the Danish ports. As early as 1221 the Cistercians in Livonia had tapped the trade of Russia, for in that year Gregory IX ordered the Bishop of Riga, the Abbot of the Cistercian monastery there, and the provost of the city, to discontinue trade with Novgorod.

1. Ibid., p. 83.
unless the Russians ceased molesting the Finns, who had lately embraced Christianity.¹

The remarkable productivity of the Cistercians was not due to the fact that they took over lands already highly cultivated, and merely continued operations already started by other land-owners. It was one of the recognized principles of the Order from the beginning that they should take up land far from the dwelling places of men. The Exordium Parvum which describes the incorporation of the conversi, also gives the course which they followed in founding their new houses: "Suscepturos quoque terras ab habitations hominum remotas et vineas et prata, silvas aquasque ad faciendos molendinos ad proprios tamen usus et ad piscationem et equos pecoraque diversa-que necessitati hominum utilia, et......curtes ad agriculturas exercendas instituissent........"² The smiling valley which came to be called "bright" because of the way it blossomed under the industrious hands of Bernard and his monks, was before their arrival called the "Valley of Wormwood."³ And the change wrought in that valley is but typical of numerous instances in which the monks made a desert to blossom as the rose. Not only did they deliberately pick out the most desolate and unproductive

¹. Ibid., p.91.
². Hoffman, op.cit., p.27.
sections of comparatively well inhabited France and Germany, but they founded numerous cloisters in the wild territory but recently wrung from Slavonic peoples to the north and east of the Elbe. The young and vigorous Order had a pioneering spirit which was lacking in the Cluniacs and the Benedictines. As the Elbe formed the frontier between the old and the new Germany, so it formed the frontier between the older Benedictinism and the newer Orders.\textsuperscript{1} Thompson describes the Silesian district, from a picture given in bad Latin verse by a writer of the fourteenth century who "pictures the country as a land of fen and forest, inhabited by wretchedly poor and lazy Poles, who used the forked trunk of a tree for a plow, drawn by a pair of scrawny cows or oxen. The people lived without salt or metal or shoes and pitifully clothed. Nowhere was a town to be found. Markets were held in the open air, where barter took the place of coin."\textsuperscript{2}

Into such districts as this, the Cistercians with their splendid organization and energetic and intelligent methods, were well equipped to bring improvements and economic advance. However much or little they may have labored for the spiritual benefit of the wretched peoples among whom they lived, their monasteries performed a service

\textsuperscript{1} Thompson, op. cit., p. 74. But earlier the Benedictines had themselves done some pioneering. Mabillon names some of their accomplishments in his \textit{Praefationes}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 78.
that is in modern missions considered an important part of Christianization, by becoming centers of agricultural teaching.\(^1\)

The monasteries added immense tracts to the arable lands of their possessions by extensive drainage operations. These were necessary almost without exception in the lowlands where they built: Bernardus valles amabat! The swamps of Wendland were drained, the water was stored up in reservoirs, used for mills, and for fish-ponds, and the former bogs turned into productive fields. The remains of dykes are found near all the foundations in the Hartz mountains and Thuringia.\(^2\)

The drainage operations at Walkenried, which resulted in the emergence of the famous "Goldene Aue" from an ancient lake, were marvels of water-engineering.

In 1144 Count Christian of Rothenburg a-d. Saale gave a portion of the boggy area near the village of Gersbach to the Cistercians of Walkennied, and later much enlarged the tract by subsequent grants. At the same time the Archbishop of Magdeburg exempted from payment of the tithe all the land which they might redeem. Within four years, there was meadow where once there had been morass only. The monks then turned their attention to the lower Räeth. In the last years of his reign, Frederick Barbarossa... gave permission to Jordan, a monk of Walkenried, to drain the whole region of the lower Räeth....Not many years

---

2. Winter, op.cit., Vol.II, p.169. Winter stresses not only the material advantages the Cistercians conferred on the environs, but the "moral consecration which they gave to work, even if this is not original with this Order." (p.168).
afterward the monks of the Goldene Aue had mills in operation at Rithof, Bernigen, Gersbach, Windelhausen, and Kaldenhausen.1

Much of the country which was not bog was covered with woods. The monks carefully planned which trees should be cut down and which should be left standing. They left the tops of the hills covered to feed the springs and prevent floods. They knew or discovered that ground which supported hardwoods was best for agriculture. 2

The brothers were pioneers in gardening and vineculture especially in northeast Germany.

When a brother went on his wanderings he always took with him plants and seeds, and slips of trees, and brought home whatever herbs and seeds he thought would flourish in the locality of his monastery.

While admitting that the Cistercians, because of their admirable organization and "large-scale" production advantages, achieved success in agriculture, animal husbandry, and the industries growing out of them, we must beware of admitting exaggerated claims for their

2. Ibid., p.70.
services to agriculture, or their superiority in this respect to laymen. Professor G.G. Coulton of Cambridge University had laid himself open to the charge of scepticism regarding the accomplishments of the Mediaeval Church; and this charge receives some color from the largely unfavorable tone of the documents to which he refers and the conclusions he draws from them. Yet with it all, it must be admitted that his documentation is so thorough as to be almost unexceptionable, and his "animus" is understandable in the light of the too high and too easily won generalizations about the Mediaeval Church made by what he has called the "plaster saint" school of history. He has performed a salutary service in his presentation of the actual mediaeval material, thereby calling current generalizations to account. In chapter XVII of his Mediaeval Village, he takes issue with the judgments of Montalembert and Dubois on the services of monastics to agriculture. 1

The activity of the monks in the dissemination of plants and fruit trees, Coulton acknowledges. The Warden pear came from Burgundy, and was popularized in England by the monks of Warden in Bedfordshire; the transportation of the Reinette Guise apple from the same center

1. G.G. Coulton, Mediaeval Village, (Cambridge, 1926) pp. 217, 218. Montalembert's book is, of course, The Monks of the West; the other, Abbé Dubois, Histoire de l'Abbaye de Morimond, Paris, 1851. The latter has "the fullest description of monastic benefits to agriculture" (pp. 216-50), but "In the whole of chapter XXIV he gives only fourteen references, only one of which is to a mediaeval document."
as far east as Poland is also due to the Cistercian houses along the way. But the most picturesque story of such a transplantation of fruit trees comes from the realm of secular activity. The services of monasticism to the drainage and tillage of the land is also beyond doubt:

In the early times of Benedictinism, and again in the first days of the eleventh and twelfth century reforms, a great deal of forest, heath, and swamp was given to the monks, who improved a considerable fraction into arable or pasture. Boniface and his contemporaries were often real backwoodsmen; so were the Cistercian lay brethren, and occasionally even choir-monks.

Yet even in drainage operations we must not suppose the monks were alone. In England, Italy, Normandy, and Germany, much of this sort of work was done by great lay lords.

Even in Flanders, which is generally quoted as a strong case, the monks were neither the first, nor apparently, the greatest drainers. The counts attracted settlers by gifts of farms and the Cistercian abbeys brought energetic collaboration to their side of the undertaking. This perhaps indicates the real balance of merit; the monks were very valuable and active middlemen. They were instructed and intelligent enough to see what princes had done and were doing; active enough to set the peasantry to work, and sometimes even to

1. Loc.cit.
set them an example. But where the documents give us details we nearly always find the monk calling in the adventurous peasant pioneer.¹

Comparing the excellence of monastic agriculture to that of secular establishments, it is Coulten's judgment that there is no evidence to show that the former was any better:

In the Low countries, where the rotation of crops was known early, there is far more reason to attribute this to the superior freedom of the peasants, and the economic necessities of the great towns which they fed, than to any direct monastic influence. The historian of the Belgian abbey of Liessies implies that the agricultural improvements of the later twelfth century came not from the monks, but from the peasants' own experience and industry.²

Using a comparison of the yield of the fields of the Norfolk monks, with the estimate given by Walter of Henley in the same century of what should constitute a proper crop, it appears that the average yields were less than the normal expectation.³ Insofar as the monastic lands were not tilled by the monks or the lay brethren themselves, there is evidence to show that the terms on which the villeins were bound to do the work were so hard on lay and monastic estates alike, that only an inferior quality of work could be got out of them. In some cases

¹. Ibid., pp.221,222.
². Ibid., p.214, and n.1.
³. Ibid., pp.214,215.
the arrangement proved so unprofitable, that in despair, the servile duties were commuted to payments of money rent. Improvements were then generally manifest.

The holdings which (the inhabitants of Carcassonne) had bought from the lords and bishops were at first barren or half-tilled; but the labour and the money of the purchasers had improved them.....In 1487 the prior of Romain-motier, finding that the greater part of the land (at Villorbe) remained untilled by reason of the servitude commuted the feudal dues for fixed money rents, thus abolishing a system which discouraged the tiller by absorbing the fruit of his labour.1

5. The later defense of the abandonment of manual labor:

No doubt since the earliest days there were those who felt that work was not a specific part of the monk's life, and who pled the demands of the contemplative life as a reason for not assuming it. Stories from Egypt and Syria, and the treatise of Augustine witness as much for the early days. During the early Middle Ages Benedict's Rule had so completely informed the monastic mind that no serious attempt was made in theory to deny the force of his injunction of work. The Commentaries of Warnefrid and Hildemar assume that Benedict's Rule 48 is to be observed. Although that elementary human disinclination to toil, and even that deep-rooted characteristic of

1. Quoted by Coulton, Ibid., p.436.
some genuinely religious tempers—longing for quiet contemplation and the performance of liturgy—led to the abandonment of labor in practice much earlier, it was not until the twelfth century that an articulate apologetic arose which tried to justify the abandonment of labor in theory, and even sought to prove that it was not an indispensable part of the Benedictine Rule.

The first of this "anti-labor" school was Peter the Venerable, who, in spite of his reform Statute which prescribed a restoration of manual labor "at least to some extent,"¹ was convinced that the objects Benedict intended to attain were better achieved through some other means than manual labor, and that it was indecent for the monks and priests to have to earn their living by their own hands. He commences his polemic by saying that we must only inquire not what Benedict said about manual labor, but also why he said it.² He finds that it was in order to flee idleness, that enemy of the soul, that labor was enjoined; hence if a better way of avoiding idleness can be found, if not only can, but ought to be done. And there are such works as prayer, reading, and psalmody, unless indeed, God values works because of their rudeness. But it was Mary whom the Lord commended, rather than Martha; and he commanded us not to labor for the meat that per-

1. See ante, pp. 169, 170.
isheth, but that which is eternal:

Ergo, si orando, legendo, psallendo, injuncta religiosse implendo, vel alia quaelibet hujusmodi bene agendo animus occupatur, Regula....perfecta servatur, quoniam haec operando, monachus non otiosus, sed bene negotiosus in omnibus comprobatur.¹

If anyone object that monks need to labor to support themselves, it is not hid from anyone that it is unmeet, and impossible: impossible because they are nourished only by vegetables, unmeet, because prayer, reading, and meditation should not be left to perform vulgar and rustic works:

Annon videtur indecens, imo indecentissimum, ut fratres, qui assidue in claustro morari silentio, orationi, lectioni ac meditatione ac caeteris regulae praescriptis et ecclesiasticiis ministeriis intentissime operam dare praecipiantur, his omnibus dismissis rusticationi et vulgaribus operibus intendant; et qui....coelestium subtillium contemplationes ornare debuerant, ut....mundanorum operum nimias occupationes, eos an intimis extra trahentes sustineant?²

But if it is alleged that in the old days the monks were no better nourished than now, we must remember that in these times men are more delicate, and unable to sustain such great labors, for then the world was stronger but now it is growing old and near unto death! (Ah, Peter! the rest of your apology might have been accepted, but this

¹ Loc.cit.
² Ibid., 144,145.
rather spoils it all!)\(^1\)

Rupert of Deutz, another twelfth century writer on the subject, advances the same argument in his Commentary on the Rule. He puts the question thus:

\[
\text{De illa regulari ordinacione operis}
\text{manuum utrum propter semetipsam}
\text{jussa sit, tanquam necessaria saluti}
\text{an propter aliud admissa tanquam}
\text{solatia latura necessitat?}\(^2\)
\]

He decides, of course, it was "not a precept, but only a permission, or counsel of patience."\(^3\) If Paul and Barnabas said we should work with our hands, Peter said, "It is not meet to leave the word of God to serve tables." St. Maur, an immediate pupil of Benedict’s, did not require his monks to work with their hands, but they lived on the munificence of rich believers. Rupert compares the rich who help support the monks to the cedars of Lebanon which were given by God for the birds to rest in, after soaring in heavenly regions. If it is good to avoid idleness by hand-work, it is better to avoid it, and none the less "with the Word of God to take Sabbath rest in holy leisure."\(^4\) Why did not Benedict say something about this? At any rate we know that Benedict’s Rule was,

\---

1. About the same time Abelard, in that at one with his enemy Bernard, expressed himself as believing that the prescription of labor in Benedict’s Rule was absolute: "\text{de labore proprio vivere debemus, quod unum vere monachos efficere beatus Benedictus meminit.}" Opera, ed. Cousin, Paris, 1849, Vol. I, p. 572.


3. \textit{Loc.cit.}

4. "\text{Optimum autem, et otiositatem effugere, et nihilominus cum verbo Dei, sancto otio sabbatizare.}" Ibid., 515.
as he himself says, a "little rule for Beginners." This is not said by way of excusing idleness, but merely that a better occupation (meliorem occupationem) might be exercised in the monastery.

Rupert devotes the whole third book of his Commentary to proving that the abandonment of manual labor, and the wearing of colorful and costly garments (which things are more compatible than their opposites with the character of priests which the monks now bear) are not violations of the Rule, but rather aid in better carrying out Benedict's intention than his own prescription of manual labor and few and simple garments. This argument of Rupert's shows how completely the original idea of the layman-monk had been swallowed up by sacerdotalism.

At the end of the thirteenth century Richard of St. Angelo, a monk of Monte Cassino, repeats much the same arguments. What is particularly interesting about the reasons he gives for the abandonment of manual labor is his frank assertion that Benedict had prescribed it because it was then necessitated by the poverty of the monasteries, but now that the monasteries are no longer poor, the necessity no longer remains:

Quia tempore quo ista ordinatio facta fuit, monasteria non abundabant in divitis, et sic opporbebat fratres
This same argument is repeated by Haeftensius (writing in 1644), who does not ask whether it be lawful to dispense with labor, but significantly phrases his question the other way: "Whether it be lawful for a monk to work with his hands?" He decides that it is lawful, but in Coulton's words: "devotes seven folio pages to proving that, however lawful, it is not necessary." Besides the usual arguments that the priestly offices of monks and the multiplication of services which has arisen since Benedict's day are better occupations, he goes on (as quoted by Coulton) to say: "They (that is, the early Benedictines) were compelled to labour by their lack of lands and possessions, and because they could not beg alms for so great a multitude." (The expedient of the Mendicant Friars is in his mind here; such a thing as begging would never have occurred to the early monks.) But nowadays monks are no longer poor, and "the occasion of idleness is generally removed if their time be transferred to theological studies, writing, and commenting on the Holy Scriptures." 2

When Rupert of St. Angelo and Haeftensius argue

1. Quoted from Marténe's Commentary on the Rule, MPL, 66:705.
2. Quoted from Disquisitiones Monasticæ, in Coulton's Mediaeval Village, p.213.
that there is no obligation for monks to work when they are not compelled to by poverty, it seems very probable that they are touching on the actual root of the periodic decline of labor in the monasteries. For such decline seems, in general, to have kept pace with the wealth of the monasteries. It may be correlated, as in Butler, as with the clericalization of the monks, or/in Coulton with the period of missionary activity; but the former of these may itself be a consequence rather than a cause of declining labor, and these both the results of growing wealth; the period of missionary activity is likely to be fairly co-terminous with the age of poverty. There is an interesting juxtaposition in an anecdote of Abbot Olpertus of Gembloux, which tells how he worked with his own hands with his monks because "he knew it to be of monks to live by the labors of their hands after the example of the fathers and apostles, and as the necessity of poverty required and the mind of obedience persuaded him to it." The monastic ideal esteemed labor for more reasons than that it was a necessary means of gaining a living, but history shows that that esteem did not long survive this necessity. It is scarcely to the point to ask whether Benedict would have required his monks to

work when the corporation was wealthy, for it probably never occurred to him that such a state would ever come about. But it did come about in the case of innumerable individual houses,¹ and in the case of whole Orders, like the Cistercian. Augustine had already noted that the industry and frugality of the monks enabled them to attain a surplus of worldly goods.² This remained true in the Middle Ages. Furthermore, the religion of the mediaeval monks brought them wealth in other ways than by impelling them to labor. As the idea grew that by giving to holy men, the soul of the giver would receive benefit, gifts increased tremendously; and these took the form not only of land, but of certain economic privileges, such as exemption from tolls, etc., all of which increased monastic wealth.³ This wealth, in turn, destroyed the very religion which had brought it about. As a monk of Prüm wrote: "Faith brought us this wealth; but the daughter has devoured the mother."⁴ In the destruction of religion, labor was apt to be one of the first casualties, though, fortunately, the careful management of large possessions did not always cease immediately.

Carelessness and wastefulness crept into the adminis---

3. For several examples of innumerable possible examples see Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion, Vol.I, p.389.
4. Quoted by Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion, Vol.II, p.16, from H.v.Eicken, Geschichte u.system v.Mittelalterliche Weltanschauung, 1887, p.473; v.Eicken does not give the reference. Cf. similar vivid statements by Cassarius of Heisterbach, given by Coulton, loc.cit.; Also Trithemius,
trative functions of the houses also as slack or corrupt 
Abbots were elected; witness the predecessor of Samson at 
Bury St. Edmunds, as we have his story in the Chronicle 
of Jocelyn of Brakelond; or the unworthy Pontius of 
Cluny. But as a rule, a certain sense of responsibility 
toward monastic property survived longer than actual 
manual labor. I believe, then, that we are justified 
in concluding that there was a close connection between 
the decline of manual labor in the monasteries and their 
wealth, although this is not true to the same degree of 
productive activity in the sense of management.

But to return to the Cistercians, and to conclude 
by way of summary let us say: that in the early days of 
the Order, rejecting tithes and rents, and dispensing with 
the work of serfs and slaves, the monks themselves worked 
hard. But this ceased after a time (the length of which 
is difficult to determine) among the Cistercians, as it had 
among the other Orders. And even from the beginning, 
"keeping the Rule" meant for them the observance of the 
liturgy, reading and strict claustration, rather than 
the nice balance between active and contemplative life, earning 
their own living if necessary. This led to the incor-
poration of the conversi, who did most of the work. Through

Opera Pia et Spiritualia, (Moguntiae, 1605), Homilia 
VII: "De labore monachorum manuali," p.435: "Integretas 
namque observantiae regularis abundantiam peperit rerum 
temporalium, sed paulatim divitae monachorum puritatem 
ordinis funditus extinxerunt."
the instrumentality of the lay-brothers, directed by their own intelligence and energy, the Cistercians attained the apex of monastic productivity. They added largely to the area of productive land, and contributed measurably to agriculture and industrial advance, though the extent of this contribution was not as great as is sometimes supposed.
CHAPTER SEVEN

WORK AND BEGGING IN THE FRANCISCAN ORDER.
1. In the life and thought of Francis:

It is not easy to characterize the Franciscan movement clearly and briefly. It was full of contradictions, which only the radiant personality of Francis himself resolved. It differed profoundly from preceding monasticism, and Francis intended that it should. He steadfastly refused to bind himself and his companions under any of the then existing Rules. The chief difference lay in the greater sense of social responsibility acknowledged by the Friars, which resulted, among other things, in the abandonment of strict claustration. The Franciscans felt that they had found the spirit and mode of the life Apostolic, which demanded sharing and hence contact with men. Francis began his religious life much as had Anthony, Pachomius, and Benedict, by an almost solitary search for the way of peace. But he did not rest in solitude, nor was he content with a withdrawn community. He deliberately resolved, after the crucifix at San Damiano spoke to him, that his life should not be lived unto himself, but be at the service of all that were in need. ¹

¹. I Celano, 8, 14.
It was, in a sense, a lay movement. Francis discouraged the learning necessary for the priesthood; again, he rejected monastic garb, and, as Benedict had done before him, simply clothed himself and his followers in the roughest, meanest garments to be had. With this Francis retained his extreme veneration for the hierarchy, and the Holy Catholic Church; and the two forces within him led to many anomalies in the relationship between the Order and the Church. Again, their life was largely devoted to contemplation (in no literature do visions and raptures play a more prominent part), and yet, inasmuch as they were to be serviceable to all in need, so far as they were able, especially in communicating the joyous news of the life they had found, activity also had a large place in it. Austerities formed a part of their life which strikes us today as extravagant. Francis was harder on the "Brother Ass" which was his body than he would have been to any four-footed ass he might have met. Yet Franciscans were to eat neither too much nor too little to be strong for prayers and tribulations, and good works.

Another radical difference from the older monastic constitution was the concept of corporate as well as

---------------------
1. "Making for himself a right sorry and rough tunic.... and took for a girdle a rope." Three Companions, 25.
2. For the mortifications among the Friars, see I Celano, 15,16,19; II Celano 14.
personal poverty. We have seen what a stumbling block

\[ \text{corporate wealth was to the maintenance of other Orders;} \]

but Francis introduced along with absolute poverty, the

\[ \text{practice of begging for daily bread, which prevented the} \]

first innovation from having the result on work that

\[ \text{might have been expected. And the provision for absolute} \]

poverty itself sprang out of too complete an indifference

\[ \text{for things to allow him to stress production in any} \]

sustained form. Francis himself both worked and begged;

\[ \text{and he enjoined both on his followers. Work was to come} \]

first, and begging only afterward, but the pull of spirit-

\[ \text{ual gravitation was inevitably toward the latter and} \]

away from the former. Thus the Order is rightly called

\[ \text{a "Mendicant" Order, though it became so to an extent which} \]

exceeded the original intention of Francis. I do not

\[ \text{believe that Sabatier's dictum: "Francis did not dream} \]

of creating a mendicant order, he created a working order, }^1

\[ \text{can be substantiated. Neither working nor begging was} \]

\[ \text{------------------------------------------} \]

1. P. Sabatier, *Vie de S. François d'Assise* (édition définitive,

\[ \text{Paris, 1931 p.157. In support of his statement, Sabatier} \]

quotes from the *Rule of 1221* (c.8): "Nullo modo fratres

\[ \text{...querant....pecuniam vel eleemosynam." But he has} \]

omitted (without indicating as much) a very important

\[ \text{word. The text as published in the Boehmer-Wiegand ed.} \]

of the *Opuscula* (*Amalekten Zur Gesch.des Fr.v.A. Tübingen,

\[ \text{1930, pp.6,7) reads: "Nullo modo fratres...querant....} \]

pecuniam vel pecunie elemosinam." - "Let the brothers in

\[ \text{no wise seek money or alms of money." The context, also} \]

plainly shows that Francis is here expressing his character-

\[ \text{istic aversion to money, and directing the brethren, even} \]

when begging to refuse to take money. He makes an exception

\[ \text{when they are begging for lepers. Again Sabatier mentions} \]

that the lazy Friar was dismissed by Francis with the pictures-

\[ \text{que epithet "Brother Fly," (II Celano, tr. Ferrers-Howell, London,} \]


\[ \text{205) because he would not work. But in both citations he is} \]

dismissed because he will *neither work nor beg*.}
laid down by him as a fundamental principle of action for his Order. Rather did he visualize them doing the one or the other from day to day as circumstances dictated. Work was to come before begging; yet even in Francis' intention, the Friars were to be so often occupied with preaching that they would scarcely have time to be much engaged in economically productive labor. So when Sabatier says (loc.cit.) "Work was the Rule, begging the exception," I do not believe he can be confirmed.\(^1\) The mind of Francis is much better expressed by Miss Scudder when she says: "Labor was more or less secondary to him, he saw in mendicancy a deeper abasement, and, therefore, a higher joy."\(^2\)

The Franciscan legends reflect Francis' own supreme indifference to ways and means of acquiring daily sustenance. When food and clothing are mentioned, it is more often as being given away, and we are left to guess how they were first acquired. Nevertheless, we have some indications from the early part of his career. During his unsettled period, he worked as a scullion in a monastery near Assisi, and got neither pity nor broth.\(^3\) After the vision at San Damiano, he began to repair the masonry of broken-down churches nearby.\(^4\) While he was begging stones in Assisi, he was taunted by his brother,

\(^1\) Brother Giles is, so far as I have been able to discover, the only brother who is reported to have engaged in gainful work.
\(^3\) I Celano, 7.
\(^4\) I Celano, 8; II Celano, 6.
who said to a fellow-citizen: "Bid Francis sell thee at least one penny worth of sweat." Francis replied: "I will sell right dear that sweat unto the Lord." The more distasteful the service, the more Francis was joyed to do it; his service to the most repulsive of the outcasts of the time, the lepers, is one of the most touching and admirable of all his life. On a preaching tour, he would sometimes carry a broom and sweep out unclean churches. Or when he found poor people laden with wood or other burdens, he would help them, giving the support of his own shoulders even though very weak. It will be readily seen from these examples of the work of Francis that they would not be apt to be remunerative, hardly sufficiently so to supply even his simple needs.

Whatever the motive of Francis' work was, it was not the thought of material recompense. His hatred of money is well illustrated by the story of the brother who once touched money with his hand, whereupon Francis bade him take it in his mouth and lay it on a dunghill. The familiar motives of obedience and humility appear. The service of the lepers was not only valued because of the good it did them, but because of the humility the repulsiveness of the task engendered.

3. Ibid., 56, p.228.
5. II Celano, 35. This motif appears several times in the documents: Cf. ibid., 36, 38. Three Companions, 35, 45, 73. Regula Prima, 8; Regula Bullata, 4. (Analekten, et. pp.6, 21)
In the beginning of the Order he wished that the Friars should abide in leper houses to serve them and there lay a foundation of holy humility.¹

It was Brother Giles who said: "It is greater merit to do one thing by the will of another than two by one's own will,"² but that probably reflects Francis' own feeling about the matter. Certainly Francis did not harbor, but rather feared pride of workmanship, as is shown by the story of how he threw away a vase of wood which he had made because he was too proud of it.³ Certainly charity would play no large part in the Franciscan motive to work, for in their thought system it was as blessed to receive as to give; and while their charity was limited only by their possessions, yet that limit was a narrow one. There is never any hint of attempt to earn more that more might be given to the poor. "They were assuredly," says Miss Scudder, "sobered by no modern sense of the dignity of labor, or of definite duty toward production."⁴

The familiar monastic motives appear in the Testament: "Not on account of greed, but for the sake of example and to avoid idleness."⁵ And so in the rationale of their labor given by Thomas of Celano: "That we may be less burden on people, and that our heart and tongue may not wander off into unlawful ways through indolence."⁶

². Quoted in Scudder, The Franciscan Adventure, p.296.  
³. Ibid., p.39.  
⁴. Ibid., p.40.  
⁵. C.5, Analekten, etc., p.25.  
⁶. If Celano, 120.
Thomas does, it is true, give us one as yet unheard note. Speaking of Francis, he says:

He used to work and labor with his hands, suffering naught of that best gift of time to run to waste.

This is, of course, but an explicit expression of the assumption on which the monastic schedule had been so thoroughly worked out by Benedict; but the expression itself reminds us of Basil's reference to the powers of work as God's gift, or of a more modern phrase, 'the stewardship of time.'

In general Francis enjoined work for the same reasons as his monastic predecessors; only it occupied an even more subordinate place in his ideal than in theirs, and he did not at all systematize the work of his brothers. On the contrary, by allowing begging, and by utterly condemning material possessions, he introduced a note of casualness and irregularity that had hitherto been lacking.

Francis started begging by asking for stones for the repair of San Damiano. Meanwhile he was being fed by the priest of the chapel. But he became afraid that the priest, who, in the kindness of his heart was giving him good food, was pampering him too much, so he started to get his food as well as his stones by begging, lest he

1. Loc. cit.
should slip back into love of luxury. As the heading of the corresponding chapter in the Three Companions puts it, he "began to conquer himself by going for alms." Evidently what suggested the first begging for alms was not immediate hunger, but rather a yearning for complete humility. This is confirmed by a phrase he used at the Portiuncula while recommending begging to his brethren: "That shame in begging which does not draw back the foot is holy." Nevertheless, in general it was need which furnished both the impulse and the measure of their seeking for alms. Francis considered obtaining alms beyond need theft, and the need for one day was to limit that day's begging.

In the two Rules, particularly that of 1221, and the Testament, Francis insisted that the brothers who knew a trade should follow it, and that those who did not know one should learn. The second Rule, that of 1223, was something of a compromise with the ecclesiastical officiary, and weakened the prescription somewhat by saying, "Let the brothers to whom God has given the grace to work, work." It was when circumstances pre-

1. II Celano, 9.
2. c.7.
3. II Celano, 41.
4. Regula Prima, 9, (Analekten etc. p.7) "Et cum necessa fuerit, vadant pro elemosinis."
5. Mirror of Perfection, 12.
6. Ibid., 19.
7. "Omnes fratres.... apud alios ad.... laborandum non.... present.... nec recipient aliquid officium.... sed sint minores et subditi omnibus..... Et Fratres, qui sciant laborare, laborent et sandom artem exerceant quam noverint, si non fuerit contra salutem anime et honeste poterunt operari. Et pro labore possint accipere omnia necessaria preter pecuniam,
vented their earning enough to keep them that they were to resort to begging. In the first Rule, permission to beg is included even in the chapter on labor. In the Testament, which probably represents Francis' views more accurately than either of the Rules, certainly than the second, he mentions recourse to "the table of the Lord," but only if they had not been given the reward of their labor. It is possible that he had seen the permission to beg abused, and so made it plainer that work was to be their first dependence, and begging only a supplementary expedient.

From the foregoing it will be seen that when the Order, after a little, fell away from labor, and depended on begging for maintenance, it was undeniably a lapse from the ideal of their founder. But I believe it is but just to say that it was not so serious a lapse as their departure from poverty; nor do I think the lapse from labor so serious a decline among Franciscans as it was among the Benedictines. The relinquishment of labor by the Order was deplorable, but we must not lose perspective. It occupied a less important place in Francis' mind than it had in the mind of Benedict. Francis allowed his Friars

Et, cum necesse fuerit, vadant pro elemosina siue alii pauperes. Et liceat eis habere ferasamenta suis artibus opportuna." Regula Prima, 7 (Analekten, et al. p.5.)

Ch.5 of the Second Rule (ibid. pp.2122) reads, in part: "Fratres illi, quibus gratiam dedit Dominus laborandi, laborant fideliter et devote, ita quod, excluso, otio, animae inimico sanctae orationis et devotionis spiritum non exstinguant."

The Testament (ibid., p.25): "Et ego manibus meis laboram, et volo laborare. Et omnes alii fratres firanter volo, quod laborant... Et quando non daretrur nobis pretium laboris, recurramus ad mensam Domini, petendo elemosinam ostiastim."
wider scope in serviceable activities than had the other. They might be eminently serviceable, for instance, in preaching to the folk around them, which was not at all a part of the Benedictine's duty. So the Franciscans, when they stopped working, had other services quite specific to their ideal, which they could still perform. But when the Benedictines stopped working the time had to be filled by increasing liturgy which was quite outside the scope of the Benedictine ideal.

From an economic viewpoint, also, the loss was less in the case of the Franciscans, who, from the casual nature of their work, even supposing their ideal to have been maintained, would scarcely have made a dependable contribution to the economic life of their age. Moreover, conditions changed since the sixth century, when Benedict incorporated labor in his scheme for the religious life. Then, due to the confusion attendant on the decline of the ancient civilization, not only cultural but even economic life was in a fair way to be swallowed up, especially when to the contempt of the ancient world for work, was being added that of the barbarian. Then it was of immense significance that monks should keep the character of laymen sufficiently to remain economic producers, and it would have been disastrous had she failed to
keep within herself recollection enough of that ideal to revive it from time to time in its pristine purity, and so keep alive a tradition of skill and industry in the productive arts. But in Francis' century, it was different. By this time, towns had sprung into being, which, with their crafts, their guilds, their trade, supporting and supported by an industrious bourgeoisie, were in part a testimony that the monks had not labored in vain, and in part a sign that their usefulness in the economic world would henceforth be less and less. So, though from Francis' own point of view, it was undoubtedly a sort of apostasy when his Friars stopped working, from the point of view of economic history it was not nearly so significant as it would have been had Benedictinism completely lost the spirit of work so early in its history.

2. The controversy over work in the Order. Angelo Clareno and Bonaventura.

The documents of early Franciscanism, as already suggested, pay little attention to the material side of the life of the Brotherhood. The Little Flowers mention in one place how Francis appointed Brother Masso to be almoner, doorkeeper and cook (though what a doorkeeper would have to do in their free life, is hard to imagine);

---

but the other brothers thought it a shame that the holiest of them should have all these burdens, so they asked Francis to distribute them. Then there is the hilarious tale of Brother Juniper, who was appointed cook; but he thought to himself: "What an unprofitable care is this for one friar to be lost in the kitchen and far away from all prayer." To obviate this necessity for awhile, he determined to cook enough food for a fortnight. He did this, throwing fowls with their feathers, eggs with their shells, and a huge quantity of other things all in one pot. But the brethren were more edified than nourished when they came home that night. 1

Brother Giles is the only one of the friars who seems to have made a point of working. "He was minded to live by bodily toil, even as he was ever wont to do since he entered the Order...." He carried wood and water, gathered olives and walnuts.

But seldom did friar Giles work the whole day through, for he always bargained to have some space of time to say the canonical hours, 2 and not fail in his mental prayers.

He evidently had high esteem for labor, for he is reported to have said, "The youth who refuseth to labor, rejecteth the Kingdom of Heaven," 3 and "I would have thee know, my brother, that the noblest art in this world is the art of working well." 4 This last may refer to "good works" as

1. Ibid., p.144f.
2. Ibid., pp.151, 152.
4. Little Flowers, Everyman, p.165.
The passage is ambiguous. But it probably includes manual work as well, and so argues that it enjoyed high esteem in the mind of Brother Giles. Yet it must be noted that Giles himself begged; and that his attitude toward work seems to have rather exceptional than otherwise place among the Friars.

We cannot here enter into the story of the dissension which rent the Order, after Francis' death, into two parties. That is no part of our present purpose, and it has been frequently told, most recently and with fascinating vividness by Miss Scudder in her recent book, The Franciscan Adventure. Suffice it to say that in general the party called the "Conventuals" which relaxed the strict observance of the Rule, except in the matter of begging, deliberately rejected the wishes of Francis in the matter of manual labor. This party found its most eminent apologist in St. Bonaventura. In the ranks of the strict or "Observant" party, on the other hand, champions of manual labor were not lacking. Of these the most interesting and the most eminent was Angelo Clareno.

Angelo was so in earnest about the strict observance of the Rule that he formed a company of Poor Hermits who with him followed the rule as completely as they knew how. But Angelo, for all his poverty and simple devotion to

1. Ibid., pp.150,153.
2. At the time Il Celano was being written, the author has to complain of those "who will not profit through action, and cannot through contemplation, plying their jaws more than their hands." (c.121).
Francis was not an unlearned man. He was one of the few Latins of his day who knew Greek, and he had used it to good effect in his study of the fathers and the beginnings of monasticism. Basil especially he admired. His apologetic for labor, in which he put the best of his thought, and which expressed one of his deepest enthusiasms, is at the same time a gathering up of all that was best in both western and eastern thought on the subject. Coming as it did among the last of the long series of such defenses, it offers a fitting summary of them all. This apologetic is best expressed in his exposition of the rule, which was written between 1318 and 1328, a century after Francis' time.

First of all, Angelo tries to stop up the loophole left by Francis in that unfortunate expression in the Second Rule: "Those to whom God hath given the grace to labor," by so defining grace as to make it clear that everyone has it:

Neminem exceptit (Franciscus) habentem gratiam, id est, artem, et potentiam et scientiam. Propeterea in suo Testamento dicit quod hic, quod nesciunt laborare discant.

Then he goes on to cite approvingly the first Rule, which

2. Expositio Regulae Fratrum Minorum, auctore Angelo Clareno, ed. Fr. L.Oliger, Quaracchi, 1912.
is more to his liking than the second, to show how earnestly Francis wanted his Friars to work. He describes the place labor had in the monasticism of Egypt:

Et hunc omnes sancti docuerunt discipulos suos quia opera fideliter et devote propter Christum et eius legem implendam facta, veram contemplationem cum perfectione virtutum pariant et demonum temptationes expellunt et nequitias superant et a torpore et negligentia protegerunt, et affectum spiritualis devotionis et fervorum diletionis Dei et proximi nutriunt et in complacentia Dei et obsequio perseverare faciunt. Otium verum anime inimicum et corporalis requies apud Deum abominationi esse a patribus diffinitur, quibus anima accidia captivata in oblivione Dei et bonorum negligentia vivens, vacua virtutibus et gratiae donis, in infidelitate detenta suggestionibus non repugnat propter ea diem in diem procrasrinat et salutis verba non suscipit.

It will be noticed how this passage sums up the characteristic ideas in the monastic evaluation of labor, namely, (1) its helpfulness in conquering temptation; (2) its aid to the devotional life, whereas idleness on the contrary is a great danger to the soul; and (3) its role as a nourisher and supporter of charity toward the neighbor. This last element was not very prominent in western monasticism. It reappears in Angelo by reason of his study of Basil. He enlarges on it by quoting Basil's characteristic emphasis:

1. Loc. cit.
We notice too that Angelo has hit upon the place in Basil where he has set forth the highest evaluation of the powers and materials of labor as the gift of God, and the possibility that those labors may, if done in a prayerful spirit, be pleasing to Him. He has also seized upon the conception of the works as a sacrifice to Christ, as that conception was brought from Egypt by Cassian:

Et illa opera non ut humana negotia sed tamquam Domini sacrificia ad ipius laudem etlectionis Dei proximique perfectionem implendam Domino iugiter offerentes.

Truly this is a worthy consummation of the long series of monastic treatises on manual labor. It reaches the highest altitude possible to monasticism. For all through monasticism labor has been, indeed can be, no more than a means to an end, perhaps two ends, charity and contemplation. That this second is still normative in Angelo appears from the end of his chapter on manual labor.

1. Ibid., p.113.
2. Ibid., p.116.
in the Exposition, in which he speaks of a sort of hierarchy of values at the head of which stands prayer and devotion, in which and on account of which the rest are carried on, and to which they are reduced:

Inter quas sancte orationis et devotionis laboriosa operatio primatus tenet, a qua et in qua cetera regulantur et ad quam et propter quam relige operationes virtuose et meritorie reducuntur et fiunt.1

I have left the consideration of Bonaventura's ideas on work until after that of Angelo's, though he preceded in time (third quarter of the thirteenth century), because he represented the main tendency in the order, a tendency not toward idleness for he was a tremendous intellectual worker, but a tendency away from manual work, which lesser men tended toward idleness, and which was to mark the passing of the defense of labor (with a few exceptions such as Angelo) to non-monastic circles.

Miss Scudder remarks how the early Franciscans were taken from different classes of life: many of the first ones coming from the lesser nobility, or the richer merchants. That such men were induced to undergo the hardships and the labors of the early days speaks much for the attractive force of the ideal. There were plebeians among them too. Brother Giles, who was so eminent for

1. Ibid., p,122.
his love of work, was from the working classes; the simple Juniper was a cobbler, and the masterful Elias had been a mattress-maker. But before long "the literati became more numerous than the nobles, above all, lawyers." ¹ It is in the interest of learning that Bonaventura makes his plea that manual labor is not obligatory for the Friars, even as Mabillon was to do after him. He uses much the same method as Peter the Venerable had used, that of arguing that the ends which the founder had sought were better obtained by other activities than by manual labor. It is true that all men are obliged to do some sort of work, as Genesis says: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread," but not all men are capable of the same kind of work.

I confess that it is true that were a man so strong in spirit and body that he could labour physically and none the less serve the Church in other ways, he would live with great perfection. But who is fully capable of this since heavy labour that the truth may be known and loved so makes one sweat?²

And when the two cannot be performed by one man, a monk must take care lest by labor he destroy the spirit of prayer.

Bonaventura insists on the precaution of Francis:

Some are so active in manual labor that in them the devotion of prayer is harmed, which, since it was perilous, and since the active ought always to

¹. The Franciscan Adventure, pp. 30, 31.
². Quoted from ibid., p. 166.
be subservient to the contemplative life, our most holy Father gave us this injunction that those who wished to labor should labor so as not to extinguish the spirit of prayer and devotion.¹

He goes on to insist, depending upon the second Rule, that only those who had the grace were required by Francis to work. Bonaventura's conception of the Order was that of a community of scholars, among whom none who could do this more important work of writing, teaching, and preaching, were to be compelled to do manual work. In the Constitutiones Narbonenses which he promulgated in 1260 for the governance of the Order he had only this to say about work:

We ordain that the Brothers, both lay and cleric be compelled by their Superiors to be occupied in writing, studying and other suitable works.²

Nevertheless that the brothers did certain light house tasks is apparent from the De Tribus Quaestionibus, where he says:

It is of the brothers to seek alms, to cook, serve the sick, wash dishes (Bonaventura himself is said to have been found washing dishes when he received the Cardinal's hat), and to work at all humble duties, which are sweeter to the brothers than many official dignities.³

What are the reasons for which the Friars are supposed to work? They are three: the avoidance of idleness, the stimulation of devotion, and the provision of necessities.

¹ Epist. de Tribus Quaestionibus, Opera, Vol.VIII, p.334.
² Rubr. 6. Opera, Vol.VIII
All three of these are better served by "studium sapientiae" than by "manual labor." Manual labor does not cast out idleness of heart, but the pursuit of wisdom occupies the heart itself; likewise, study arouses a mood of highest devotion, and it is even better than hand-work for getting a living, insofar as it consists in the labor of preaching and teaching. Since then, it fulfills all these purposes better than manual work, it ought to be preferred above it; and in any case the Order cannot be justly accused of not working, so long as it pursues this wisdom.

In spite of this subordination of manual production to study and contemplation, Bonaventura in one place, theoretically and somewhat dimly seems to perceive a divine element even in the "mechanic arts." It is in the treatise "De Reductione Artium ad Theologiam," the title itself is significant for it suggests that the processes of even the humblest trades have a connection with the "Queen of the Sciences." In the treatise, at one place, he takes the aims and motives of human workman as a key to the aims and motives of the Creator in making man.

Every workman aims at making what is beautiful, what is useful, and what is stable. If finally we consider the result, we shall find... that we contemplate no less than the union of God and the soul.

3. Published in Tria Opuscula, Quaracchi, 1925. I have not been able to obtain this work, and am indebted for my knowledge of it to Miss Scudder's analysis, The Franciscan Adventure, pp.415-418.
The implication is, I presume, that a workman has imparted something of himself to what he has made, hence there is possible a sort of union between them.

Every workman does his work either that he may profit by it, or that he may be praised for it, or that he may take pleasure in it. Just so, God made us to these ends, that His work should praise Him, and serve Him, and that He might rejoice and rest in it.¹

"Considering therefore the boundlessness of mechanic art as to the process of work, we shall contemplate there the Word Generated and Incarnate, that is, Divinity and humanity, and the unity of all our faith."² This is mystical language indeed; but the intent seems to be to intimate that there is a similarity between the human creative process and the divine Creation. Bringing even material stuff into useful form, after the pattern of concepts within the human mind, unites, as it were, mind with matter, and so in the creation of man, God has made man in his own image. Through the Incarnation, the creature is able, though lowly, to reciprocate in some measure, the delight of the Maker. That Bonaventura should thus have used the human productive process as a clue to divine mysteries argues that he was not wholly lacking in appreciation, though for himself and for the Order, he preferred the pursuit of wisdom in books and contemplation, rather than in the shaping of things material, however, "beautiful, useful, and stable."

¹. Loc.cit.
². Quotation by Miss Scudder from Bonaventura, Loc.cit.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE MONKS YIELD UP THEIR TRUST TO OTHERS.
1. Disappearance of labor from monastic literature and life:

Under the influence of Bonaventura and the other leaders of scholarly inclinations, and the Papal Bulls which early released the Brothers from the strict observance of Francis' Rule and Testament, the Franciscans soon declined from the early ideal. Among the inevitable changes was the abandonment of manual labor and the substitution of begging as almost the sole means of support. Manual tasks were relegated to lay brothers. By adding mendicancy to economic unproductiveness, the Friars laid themselves open to attack, and the attacks became so numerous as to become a distinctive feature of the literature of the age. Some of these came from the more conscientious of the Friars themselves; but others came from non-monastic ecclesiastics or even lay-people. John Gower, for instance, (d.1408), an Englishman of whose life little is known, but who was certainly not in Holy Orders, attacked the monks in general, and the Friars in particular, with

1. Most of the early Ministers-General were University of Paris men. Scudder, op.cit., pp.104,105,133.
2. Among the most famous were the "Quo Elongati" (1227) and the "Exit Qui Seminat," (1279).
3. Scudder, op.cit., pp.323,331,n.9. But the English Observants had a rule enjoining manual work on even the Clerical Brothers as late as 1294.
great bitterness. And one of the counts in his indictment was their idleness; mendicancy was another.

This multitude of friars is not necessary for the good of society. David says of them that they neither take part in the labours of men, nor endure the rule of the law: they toil not neither do they spin, and yet the world feeds them. It is vain for them to plead the merits of Francis, when they do not follow his example.¹

He "tells us that the friar was not one of those who earned his place in heaven by laboring like Adam; yet in these times of scarcity of labour, it would be good for society if he would turn to the plough."² The genial satire of Gower's friend and better known contemporary, Geoffrey Chaucer is familiar. Chaucer did not single out the Friars particularly; his most unforgettable picture is of a monk of one of the older orders:

A monk ther was, a fair for the maistrie,
An outridere that lovede venerie.

What should he studie and make hymselfen wood
Upon a book in cloystre alwey to poure
Or swynken (toil) with his handes and laboure
As Austyn bit? how shal the world be served?
Lat Austyn have his swynk to him reserved.

The older orders did not, it is true, add mendicancy to their economic uselessness.³ But as the bit from

2. Idem, Mediaeval Village, p.212.
3. The Cistercians, for instance, were averse to begging. The Statutes of 1211 take measures to prevent "this scandal." (Thesaurus Novus, Vol.IV, p.1310.)
Chaucer's Prologue to the Monk's Tale hints, they had ceased to have influence in the intellectual world, or to work. Manual labor seems to have been abandoned almost completely. Coulton points out that

Surviving monastic account-rolls show that the monks not only did none of their own kitchen and housework, but that there were often more servants than brethren in the house; the monks did not even shave themselves or mow their own cloister-garths, or do their own garden-work.

It may safely be said that in the matter of work, the influence of monasticism was at an end by the early fourteenth century. Angelo Clareno was the representative of a tradition that was passing to other hands. The services of monasticism in this respect was over. They had done valiantly, preserving and exemplifying it through a millennium of confusion and ill-applied energy; but now the age was ripe for earnest work on its own account. The lesson the monks had taught so long was beginning to be learned, in religious circles, by the sects, who in so many respects resembled monks "in the world;" or by those semi-religious, semi-economic associations, the craft-guilds. These two sorts of organizations, in turn, flourished chiefly in the towns

which were nurseries of a growing spirit of industry and which were taking the economic leadership away from the necessarily agricultural monasteries.

It may seem at first sight that those scholastics of eminence, who, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, treat labor seriously in the "Summas" and who are also members of one or the other of the Mendicant Orders, might well destroy the force of this observation, or at least prove exceptions to it. But the opposition is apparent only. For the fact that they were members of a monastic order had only the slightest and most incidental influence on their writings. Their viewpoint was not monastic; they wrote neither as, nor for, monks. They wrote, rather, as "Doctors of the Church," in whom met the Christian-Platonist tradition of Augustine, and the newly re-discovered thought of "the Philosopher," Aristotle. There is a vast difference, for instance, between the Abbot Olpertus toiling with his monks at making a fish-pond, "because he knew it to be of monks to work, and because necessity and the mind of obedience impelled him to it," and Thomas Aquinas toiling in his study over a "Summa" in which, as a philosopher, he says labor is incumbent on the race "de lege naturae," while contending, as a member of a Mendicant Order, that it
was not enjoined on every individual.  

Thomas' teaching on labor does really introduce an important advance. By basing the racial obligation to work on natural law, he both dignified it and laid the foundation for the teaching that all value is produced by labor, which was so characteristic of the schoolmen's thinking on the subject. But it was not as a monastic that he won to this advance, but rather as a student of Aristotle. Insofar as Thomas permitted his monastic affiliations to influence him, it had the contrary effect of leading him to deny that the natural law, according to which labor was incumbent on the race, applied to every member of that race. To this must be added Thomas' formulation of the "organic" conception of society, which furnished theoretical justification of the already ancient tendency to separate the world into workers and pray-ers, and for contending that the pray-ers ought not to have to work. The conception is not without a certain grandeur, nor does it

1. The "natural law" on which the obligation to work is based is that by which he is endowed with reason which sets him apart from the beasts, and enables him to gain what is needful for himself, M. Maurenbrecher, Thos. v. Aquinos Stellung zum Wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit, p. 31, n. 2, pp. 32, 63. Doubtless this obligation to work rests on divine and positive law as well; but because the natural law is in some cases incumbent on the race, but not all members of it, work is not required of all individuals, ibid., pp. 64, 65; cf. M. Weber, The Protestant Ethic, etc., p. 212, n. 8.

completely lack confirmation in the experience of society. It envisions society as an organism, the "corpus Christianum," divided by divine providence into different groups, each of which contributes to the welfare of the whole according to its specific functions. And the "officium" of each individual, which he is to perform by virtue of his "status" or group-membership, is determined by natural causes.¹

In the organism, the services of the individual are gathered up into the whole; then from this centre, their influence again flows out into individual members.²

Each of the different groups into which society is divided, performs a specific function for the whole. Artizans, for instance, perform their function, the production of useful things, for the whole body, and likewise the monks theirs, the acquisition of merit through prayer and penance. The service of each is shared by the others; there is a sort of vicarious productivity on the one hand, and vicarious repentance on the other. This conception, of course, had the merit of socializing the value of the monks' "officium," but it also had the effect of making it unnecessary to contend even in theory that they ought to work.³

¹ M. Weber, op. cit., p. 211, n. 5. Weber emphasizes that there is a difference between this conception and the later one of a "calling." Maurenbrecher, op. cit., p. 67.
³ Furthermore, it justified the claim of the monks to a share in the products of the economically fruitful classes. On the other hand, the hope of sharing in the merits gained by monastic prayers was what induced lay-folk to endow monasteries so liberally.
A conception which socialized the value of praying in this fashion ought logically to have issued also in a religious evaluation of work. But in Thomas, it got only so far as a gradation of occupations, with the opera servilia at the bottom, ascending through the artes liberales to prayer and contemplation as the highest of all.

Manual labour is left to the lower orders; this is in part an unavoidable concession to the natural conditions of Society, and in part it is due to the influence of the aristocratic outlook of Aristotelianism.

Other scholastic writers who were also Friars treat of this subject of work, and enlarge its boundaries by means of the concept of "industria" to include the growing volume of trading operations, and even the lending of money at interest. In this concept of "industria,"

1. Weber, p.212,n.8; A.Tilgher, op.cit., p.39; Maurenbrecher, op.cit., p.67; work in its laborious aspects, Thomas regarded as punishment for sin, Troeltsch, op.cit., Vol.I,p.321 (though before the Fall, it was "delictabilis ex consideratione divinae providentiae et naturalis virtutis," Maurenbrecher, p.53.) Slavery also is justified as a punishment of sin, and for other reasons, ibid., p.79ff.
3. For Duns Scotus, see Tawney, op.cit., p.33; the "mendicant moralists," Bernardino of Silena and Antonino of Florence, Weber, op.cit., p.197. For the latter, also, B.Jarrett, S.Antonino and Mediaeval Economics, (St. Louis, 1914) esp.pp.66.68. S.Antonino was less aristocratic than Aquinas, and valued work more highly: "Ultima etiam felicitas hominis in operatione consistit," (C.Ilgner, Die volkswirtschaftlichen Anschauungen Antoninos v. Florenz, Paderborn, 1904) p.19. Of this work God is the "finis remotus et ultimus," (Ibid., p.20).
as Weber points out, "lies the seed of an ethos which was fully developed later in the Protestant worldly asceticism." But here again, the monastic influence was only negligible. When these men speak, it is the voice of the Church that is heard. The decrees of Canon law keep pace with their utterances. Bernardino of Siena was, it is true, an Observant Franciscan; but preaching was his chief work. As for Antonino of Florence, he spoke rather as an Archbishop than as a Friar; even so, the Order to which he belonged, the Dominican, had deliberately and from the beginning, rejected labor as a part of the brother's life.

2. The literary championship of work in non-monastic circles:

Placed over against the writings of these men, we have the numerous and bitter criticism of the orders for their non-productiveness, and the burden which they were placing on a society whose energies were more and more being turned toward production. Many of these, like Gower, limit themselves chiefly to the negative aspect of the question, simply berating the Friars for their beggary; others, however, move on from this to a more positive evaluation of work. Chief of these were

William of St. Amour, who took part in a famous disputation at Paris in which he attacked the Friars and defended work; Jean de Meung, who took much of his argument about work from William and incorporated it in his part of the Romance of the Rose; and William Langland, the author of the famous Piers Plowman.

William of St. Amour was a priest. He had been a Canon at Beauvais before going, about 1250, to teach at the University of Paris, but he was not a monastic. In 1254 appeared a Franciscan treatise which stirred his ire, and whose examination he demanded. Not content with this, he himself issued a book in rebuttal, called De Periculis Novorum Temporum, which was itself condemned and has disappeared, leaving us to gather what fragments of its arguments we may from answers made to it by Bonaventura. Indeed, the importance of William's arguments is not their volume nor yet their originality, but consists rather in the fact that they were made not by a monk, but by one of another profession. He vigorously attacks the begging of the Friars.

Replying to their second argument that to beg for Christ is of perfection, because it includes contempt of one's self, it is to be said this likewise is false, because to beg is care, not contempt.

1. Scudder, The Franciscan Adventure, pp.146,147. The arguments he advanced have been collected from fragments embedded in his adversaries' replies, and printed in the Prolegomena to Vol.V of the Quaracchi ed. of Bonaventura's works.
Again, replying to the argument that those who serve the people in spiritual things can seek sustenance from them, he replies, "According to this ridiculous reason, every one in the world could beg, since every one can pray."  

To beg, when it is possible to earn food by working, ...is not a work of perfection, but a work of sin, because it is against the teaching of the Apostle; nor did Christ ever beg, nor do we read this in the Scripture.

William's chief reliance in recommending work is "the Apostle" and Augustine. He recalls how Augustine had said it was proper to leave off spiritual works at the time for earning food by working. The command of Paul to work was not an "admonition" but a "precept," and hence binding upon all. This attack upon the Friars seems to be interesting chiefly from the fact that it was such, rather than in any new ideas it brings out, any new sanction applied to work. One would like to know, before attaching too high importance to it, how far it represented the personal conviction of the writer, rather than being simply a shaft at a vulnerable place in an opponent's armour. Did the ex-canon and University Pro-

---

2. Loc. cit.
3. Ibid., p.x.
4. Ibid., p.ix.
fessor himself work with his hands, we wonder? We do not know, of course, but the probabilities of the situation are against it.

Jean de Meung (c.1250-1305) in a long poem added to the original "Romance of the Rose" by Guillaume de Lorris, a real romance of chivalry, takes occasion to satirize a good many of the institutions of the day, under the guise of continuing the romance. Among the objects of his satire, the Friars stand high. Begging is his abomination; the monks who did not beg are favored with comparative approval, although he expresses forcibly the opinion that all celibates were shirking their duty to nature. He was a warm champion of the views of William of St. Amour. He mentions him in one place in his poem, although not by name, and manifestly borrows some of his ideas:

And I dare swear
Free of reproach that no man e'er
Hath found in any sacred book
(At least 'twere vain in ours to look)
That Christ and his apostles dear
The while on earth they wandered here
Went begging bread from door;
Nor they alone this thing forbore,
But straight forbade it, (thus 'twas taught)
By those of Paris, doctors fraught
With learning in divinity)
Though well they might excused be
Of begging, even though they should
Seek alms for daily livelihood.
And when their Lord was crucified,
Again industriously they tried
To win their needs by labor true
Of each man's hands; and after due
And needful sustenance they'd ta'en,
Unto the poor they gave amain
Of their abundance. Mansions they
reared not, but dwelt in cots of clay.¹

He goes on to insist that work is necessary for
all men (save the rich):

It well behoves each able man
That he with work quotidian
By might of arm should gain his bread
(Unless he be by wealth bestead)
Though of religion he be fain,
For God accounts no good work vain.
This rule it is which binds men all,
Save in some cases I recall,
The which I will relate whene'er
Time serves, and you will have to hear.
Yet, more, a man should sell his good,
And labor for a livelihood
If he forsooth, would perfect be;
This hath the Scripture taught to me.

Censured should be such men as dare
Labour forgo on plea of prayer.
Justly a man may put aside
God's worship to provide
By honest work for daily need
For of a truth all men must feed
And clothe themselves, and while they keep
Wigil of labour, prayer may sleep.²

Stout beggars should be whipped, the satirist thinks,
rather than helped. Alms should be kept for those whom
sickness prevents from working, or whom injustice has im-
poverished. The command to sell and give to the poor was

². Ibid., pp.147,148.
not meant to lead to mendicancy.¹ The man who works
is praised above not only beggars but also the rich
who are devoured by avarice, and above professional men
who "for lucre sell their souls - and both deserve right
well the gibbet."²

"The Working-People," says Miss Scudder,³ "are
embodied in the sturdy figure of Piers the Plowman, appear-
ing for the first time upon the world's stage, not as
buffoon, but as hero." Hitherto, literature had ignored
him altogether, or had appraised him as a very unpromising
figure indeed. Even writings of Churchmen, who might be
expected to have more sympathy than others with the down-
trodden peasant, are no exception. Coulton devotes a whole
chapter of his Mediaeval Village to church estimates of
the peasant and the examples he gives are almost wholly
scornful.⁴ William Langland, a clerk in minor orders,
was the first to break away from this tradition, and pre-
sent the peasant in a sympathetic light. Though he was
no hand-worker and confesses that he himself lived both in
and upon London (by singing for the souls of such as
helped him)⁵ yet Coulton can say of his work, "Piers
Plowman......so far as I know, is altogether unparalleled
in mediaeval literature for its sympathy with peasant

¹ Lcc.cit.
³ Social Ideals in English Letters, (Boston,1898) p.27
⁴ Chapter XVIII, pp.231-252.
⁵ Langland's Vision of Piers the Plowman done into modern
prose by Kate Warren (2nd.ed., London, 1899) Passus VI,
lines 1-108. This Passus is most interesting because
of its autobiographical material.
The work expressed, and doubtless in turn encouraged, the same popular feeling which burst forth about twenty years after the poem was started (1362) in Wat Tyler's rebellion. 2

This sympathy with the peasants comes out nowhere more clearly than in this passage:

Poor folk in cottages burdened with children and the landlord's rent. What they save by their spinning they spend it in house-hire, also in milk and meal to make porridge with to fill their children who cry for food. And they themselves suffer much woe in winter time, when they wake at nights to rise and rock the cradle, and also when they card and comb, and patch and wash and rub, and reel and peel rushes so that ruth it is to read or show in rime the woe of these women....as well as of any other men who suffer much woe, in hunger and thirst that they may turn the fair side outward, and are ashamed to beg. 3

William Langland did not go so far as to say that every man should work with his hands. He allowed place also for spiritual labor:

Kynde witt wolde that eche a wyght wroghte
Or in dyking or in delvyinge or travaillinge in preyers,

2. It was during this rebellion that John Ball uttered the famous couplet:
   "When Adam delved and Eve span,
   Who was then the gentleman?"
3. Piers the Plowman comes to us in three forms, known respectively as the A, B, and C texts. Some of the more important passages left untranslated in her main text, Miss Warren has put in her appendix. This quotation is from the C text, X, 71, ed. cit., p.131. All three texts are given in the ed. by W.W.Skeat, (London, 1886) from which I have occasionally cited.
Contemplatyf lyf or actyf lyf Crist wolde men wroughte,
The sauter seyeth in the psalme of beati omnes,
The freke that fedeth hymself with his feythful laboure
He is blessed by the boke in body and in soule: Labores manuum tuarum, etc.¹

But he protests against the tendency to value the contemplative life more highly than the active. Here is a most unscholastic reply to Thomas Aquinas. "The laborer's service to humanity," says Miss Scudder, "is revealed to him as a sacred thing. In labor and in poverty, honestly pursued and patiently borne, he comes to feel a divine, a redemptige power."² More than any specific passage that might be quoted, the implication of the whole poem tells in this direction. Miss Warren sees in Piers an allegorical figure of

Righteous living of the good life
of action lived in the world, as distinguished from the good life
of contemplation lived in withdrawal from the world.³

It is after the motley band seeking Truth have failed to find guidance from a Pardoner that Piers, who is plawing a field they are passing, confidently offers to guide them to it. But first he will finish his work, and furthermore he sets the Pilgrims to work to help him.⁴ Finally they set off in search of Truth, led by the Plowman; on the way they receive absolution from the

---

Pope. They are disappointed because of its brevity, but it declares:

All labourers living who live by their hands, and take wage honestly and honestly earn, and live in love and under law, because of their lowly hearts, shall have the same absolution that was sent to Piers.¹

As the journey proceeds, Piers becomes more and more a mystical figure. Indeed, the figure of the Plowman is (in the B text) once specifically identified with Christ: "Petrus, id est Christus."²

It would be a mistake to suppose by this extraordinary image Langland meant exactly to identify Piers with the Saviour of the world. To him the workingman is simply the best embodiment of the Christ idea.³

The poem is involved and the symbolism often turgid and unclear; but the general intent is clearly to exalt the workingman and his tasks. His poverty, his toil, his humility are real, and as such are worthy of reward before God, irrespective of the status of the toiler himself.

To these critics of the monastic orders and champions of work must be added John Wycliffe, who was a host in himself. Without allegory and in plain, straightforward sermons and treatises in English (and vigorous

¹. Ibid., p.108.
³. Scudder, Social Ideals, etc., pp.36,37.
English at that) he denounced the Friars and recommended work. 1 Wycliffe was a Priest, but not a monk. He quotes Scripture to prove that begging is unlawful, being "damned by God both in the Old Testament and the New." Paul labored, St. Clement ordained that Christians should not beg openly. St. Austen is quoted, "The same teches Benet to his Monks, and St. Bernard, and so does Francis to his Friars," 2 and Jerome states that man had to "travel" even in his innocency; though after the Fall work was a penance. 3

Wycliffe's Sermon for the 15th Sunday after Trinity is for the most part against being busy about material things, yet in it he does manage to say:

For if a man travelle for goodis of this world and hath right en­tent for to worshipe God, he serveth not the world, but it serveth him. 4

1. Whether his "Poor Priests" worked or not, we do not know. They seem to have included laymen; that they begged seems very unlikely, in view of Wycliffe's opinion on the subject. The Lollards were largely laymen. Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol.V, pt.2, by David Schaff, (N.Y., 1924) pp.319,358.

2. Wycliffe translated the Rule of Francis into English. It is published in F.Matthew, The English Works of W. hitherto unpublished, (London, 1880), pp.39-47. This is an indication of the sympathy between the Poor Preachers and the Observants, as is also W.'s complaint in his comment on the Rule that "false menours" at Rome are persecuting those who would keep the Rule to the letter. (Matthew's comment, p.39). The Lollards were frequently classed by ecclesiastical authorities with heretical sects such as the Beghards, the Beguines, the Fraticelli, etc. Schaff, op.cit., p.350.


And we remember that it was Wycliffe who, in his translations of the Bible, first introduced into general use the word "calling" in its present meaning, with all that implies of service to God in a worldly occupation. It is in the sects and the heterodox movements, and above all in Wycliffe that the real roots of the religious ethics which led the way to the modern conception of a calling lay.

3. The towns and their religio-economic organizations rise up as successors to the monasteries:

Here, then in these four men, William of St. Amour, Jean de Meung, William Langland, and John Wycliffe, we have four champions of labor. None of them are monastics, one is in lower orders only, and one is an out and out layman. This is important in itself, but it is of greater importance as an indication of the shift of the actual practice of work from the monasteries to other groups. This shift was partly cause and partly effect of the shift of the center of economic gravity from the country to the town which took place during the later Middle Ages. The growth of trade at once had nourished towns and undermined the economic importance of the monasteries.

1. Troeltsch, Social Teachings, Vol. I, p. 346; the word had hitherto been used solely in the sense of "heavenly calling;" the word "professio" is used often enough of the monastic life, but I do not recall having seen the word "vocatio" used in this connection. For the history of the word, see Weber, The Protestant Ethic, pp. 204, 211. It is here pointed out that Tauler uses the word Ruf in a way much like Luther's later Beruf, (p. 212) The non-monastic character of these men is to be noted.


The towns had grown into political and economic importance during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and were destined to be great centers of commercial and financial activity in the fourteenth and fifteenth. The progress of the merchant and craft guilds paralleled the growth of the towns almost exactly. It is not part of our purpose here to trace this growth in detail, but it should be mentioned that the guilds were religious as well as commercial associations.

The sects of the later Middle Ages are in many respects the successors of the monastic ideal, and, in respect to labor, might be said to be most specifically heirs of the monks and friars. If on the one hand the line between monks and ecclesiastics was being blotted out, and the functions of the priesthood were assumed by them more and more, on the other hand, there was a shading off into heretical sects, as is clear in the case of the Franciscans, whose "Spiritual Party," while orthodox enough in itself, always had its heretical fringe in the Joachimites and the Fraticelli.

3. Witness the large numbers, of Friars especially, who were called to administrative posts in the Church, for example, Antonino, who became Archbishop of Florence, (the example of Bernardino of Siena who refused the three Bishoprics in order to continue preaching, Encyc. Brit., III, 799B, was the exception rather than the rule); witness also the Dominicans who were "primarily and essentially clerics" and who are still called "canons." (Cath. Encyc. Vol. XII, p. 357A.)
The similarity and sympathy existing between Wycliffe's "Poor Preachers" and the Observant Franciscans is also to be recalled in this connection. It is this "sectarian fringe" of monasticism, and the sects which had no organic connection with it, who were the heirs of the tradition of labor, not because they were heretical, but because they were, in a sense, a revival of the lay-religious tradition, and because they represented a non-ecclesiastical and earnest type of Christianity, which had room for a certain kind of asceticism, which however, was practiced within and not in withdrawal from the world. In this respect the sects were both the heirs of the monks and the predecessors of the Calvinists, whom Tilgher in a fine phrase has called the "anchorites of the market place." 2

Not all of the sects worked. For instance, the Waldensians were stronger on begging than working. On the other hand the Humiliati of Upper Italy emphasized the obligation to work. Most of these belonged to associations of weavers which worked in a sort of communistic fashion. They kept what they needed for them-

1. For a comparison of sect-asceticism with that of monasticism, see Troeltsch, Social Teachings, Vol.I, p.332. K. Müller regards the sects as the result of the penetration of monastic ideals into lay circles, Kirchengeschichte, II 1, p.85. Troeltsch agrees but says: it may also be said that monasticism represents the ecclesiastical aspect of another type of association (op.cit., pp.431-2). This fits in with the picture of monasticism as the gradual ecclesiastical absorption of an originally lay movement.

2. Work, etc., p.57.
selves, but the rest belonged to the poor. Again it may be said that these people, belonging as they did to the lower classes of the towns, naturally would stress work, professional organization, and the love of labor. But here again, as in the case of the early monks, there is the influence of a tradition to reckon on, which made work a religious as well as an economic obligation.

Thus the monks, after a period of a thousand years, when they had been the sole repositories of the Christian tradition of work and had produced almost the sole methodical treatment of its place in human life, and had conceived that place from a religious point of view, now give over this trust to other hands, both in theory and in practice. When the Franciscans ceased to labor, save for sporadic renewals as with the Trappists in the seventeenth century\(^2\) the days of labor by the monks was

---


2. Their founder, De Rancé, whose works on the monastic ideal brought upon him a counter-attack from Mabillon on the part of the Maurists, did not object to studies from the point of view of labor alone. He protested because they did not fit in with his conception of the monastic life as essentially a life of penitence. He did not value labor so highly as had Benedict, for he required three hours labor to seven in the church, "herein reversing Benedict's apportioning of time" (Butler's Art. "Trappists," Encyc. Brit., 27:214A). However, Dubois (Hist.de l'Abbe de Rancé, Paris, 1869, Vol.II,p.79) says working time sometimes amounted to more. In any case they could scarcely have depended on their work to gain their whole living. It was chiefly regarded for its qualities as a penitential exercise, (loc.cit.) Cf. A. Didio, La Guerre de Mabillon et de Rancé, (Amiens, 1892) p.204.
over. When ecclesiastics outside the monastic orders and even laymen began to write against the unproductiveness of the monks and especially against the mendicancy of the Friars, the literary championship of work had passed to other hands. And when the sects of the towns began to apply a religious sanction to work, they donned, figuratively speaking, the scapular of the monks, which had originally been a real working apron, but which by this time had become merely a conventional part of the clerical-monastic garb. It is in the sects that the roots of the Reformation teaching on work and its religious worth are to be found.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.
The early Christian teaching on labor enjoined it as a duty, and valued it (1) because it fulfilled a recognized social obligation to "pay one's own way" and so made mission preaching easier; (2) it saved the individual Christian from the perils of idleness; and (3) it furnished the means of charity. It freed work from the odium attaching to it in the ancient world. On the other hand, it did not attempt to free the slaves; it did not proclaim the religious value of labor (save as a means of charity) nor the "dignity of labor." It laid the groundwork for these, however, by connecting it with two matters of intense concern to religion - moral discipline and charity.

Monasticism and its ideal contained many elements favorable to work: (1) it was a lay movement; (2) it was a protest against secularism, and so attracted the most earnest spirits of the age; its method involved withdrawal and economically self-sufficient units; (3) its ideal involved poverty and obedience well calculated to require and exact work; (4) it was essentially social and communistic within certain restricted limits and so both made work necessary and made it possible to regard it as charity of an intra-
mural sort; (5) its avowed purpose was to subject every detail of life to the achievement of Christian perfection, hence it could enforce labor as a means to that end.

Pre-Benedictine monasticism developed all the essentials of the monastic ideal and practice of work. The hermits of Egypt, due to the influence of Anthony, worked a good deal but casually, and according to their needs. The development of cenobitism under Pachomius brought increased perplexity and organization into monastic work; it was, however, still regarded less highly than austerities and prayer. Basil emphasized the charitable motive for labor. In his foundations work was regarded as highly as fasting and prayer. However, it was subordinated to the religious welfare of the monks.

Benedict did not advance the theory of labor, indeed, receded from Basil's charitable ideal. He did monastic work an inestimable service by incorporating it in his precise code, which was to be a reminder for centuries to come that labor is a true part of the monk's life. There was a general decline from the Benedictine ideal of labor by the eighth century, accompanied by the clericalization of the monks and the increase of liturgical duties. The history of the ideal in monastic history is the history of the struggle between Benedict's balanced ideal of work and contemplation and two enemies: wealth
and the exclusive emphasis on liturgy and contemplation which is characteristic of clerical monasticism.

Benedict of Aniane restored neglected labor to the monasteries under his control. He freed the slaves on his monastic estates, but he also furthered the clerical-liturgical tendency. This tendency was carried still farther by Cluny among whom labor became a mere formality due to their clerical emphasis and the growing wealth of the foundations. As holders of large lands, they performed services of a social, industrial, commercial, and financial nature for those around them, which further accrued to the profit of the monasteries.

The Cistercians revived work by the monks themselves. It early fell away and indeed never was work valued so highly as a religious exercise as it had been by Benedict. Work was relegated to the lay brothers. This feature of their order was developed to a point of great efficiency; by its help they engaged more successfully than any other order in agriculture, industry, commerce, and finance. They added large areas to the arable land of Europe, and improved agricultural methods. In the twelfth century there grew up a school of apologists for the contemplative-priestly ideal of monastic life, whose foremost exponents were Peter the Venerable, and Rupert of Deutz. Later Richard
of St. Angelo and Haeftenius took up their cause.

Francis enjoined work on his Friars for much the same reasons as his predecessors, but his emphasis on the humiliating aspect of work, his scorn of material goods, his encouragement of preaching and begging all combined to relegate work to a secondary place. In the history of the order even such importance as he had given to work passed away in the main body. The controversy between the two parties of the order forms the last episode in the long series of monastic writings on the subject. Angelo Clareno well sums up preceding arguments for work, and Bonaventura those against it. In the Conventual Franciscans and the Dominicans, the clericalization of the religious reaches its completion.

The scholastics combine ecclesiastical ethics of work with concepts taken from Aristotle, and present an advance in the theory of work in that they base it on the law of nature. Insofar as that law is not applicable to all alike, and they stressed a division of offices consequent upon their organic view of society, and clung to a hierarchy of values graded from the opera servilia upward to contemplation, the esteem was not much advanced. Fundamentally, they speak more as "Doctors of the Church" than as monastics proper. On the other hand, champions
of labor appear in circles outside of and critical of the monks, among non-monastic clergy and laymen. The practice of labor by monks sank to a negligible quantity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but was taught and practiced from a religious point of view by laymen of the towns, to some extent as organized in guilds, more completely as sectarian bodies. These are the true successors of the monks as the exponents of labor as a part of the religious life, and in this respect are the forerunners of the Reformation estimate and practice of work.

As a result of our study we may state the following conclusions:

1. Monasticism took over and transmitted without essential change the early Christian teaching on work. It found a specific place for it in its ideal; that place was, however, subordinate and instrumental to goodness of life, to charity, and to worship. It did not teach the "dignity of labor," nor did it give work a positive religious evaluation in and for itself - only mediately and as it performed the instrumental function indicated.

2. Monasticism in western Europe better than any other agency realized and preserved the early Christian teaching on work during a thousand years while the continent was slowly recovering from barbarism. It was in this respect
3. During this millenium she conferred important benefits on western civilization by her industry, frugality, and order, and the example she set for others in these respects; by the preservation, improvement, and dissemination of productive methods; and by the reduction of wild areas to the uses of agriculture. In according with conclusion 1, these functions were by-products rather than direct objectives of the monastic ideal, but they were none the less real and important for all that.

4. The esteem for and service of the ideal of labor in the history of monasticism varied directly as the poverty of the monks and the lay character of the movement.

5. The end of the period of monasticism's influence on work came in the fourteenth century, when she surrendered her trust to religio-economic groups in the towns, which in this respect as in certain others were the heirs of the monastic tradition.
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