LECTURES

ON

S. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX.

WITH

Appendix on the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.

BY

W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, M.A.,

VICAR OF S. MARK'S, REGENT'S PARK.

LONDON: 1107
J. MASTERS AND CO., 78, NEW BOND STREET.
1895.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. MASTERS AND CO.,
ALBION BUILDINGS, S. BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE.

DEDICATED

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

THE LORD BISHOP OF S. ALBAN'S.

NOTICE.

SOME apology may be needed for attempting to tell again an oft told tale. But the Life of S. Bernard can never lose its fascination although oft repeated. The following pages grew out of an attempt to study S. Bernard's theology, and were delivered as a course of lectures to a number of persons in S. Pancras who were anxious to read in the History of the Church.

An Appendix on the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M. has been added to show the marvellous change which has taken place in the attitude of a portion of the Church towards this subject since S. Bernard's day. The English Church is at one with S. Bernard against more modern teachings, in asserting that this new dogma forms no part of the Apostolic teaching, and has no support in Catholic Tradition for the first twelve hundred years.

CONTENTS.

CHRONOLOGY OF S. BERNARD'S LIFE.

A.D.

1091. Birth of S. Bernard.

1113. Bernard enters Citeaux.

1115. Foundation of Clairvaux.

1130. Election of Pope Innocent II.

1130—7. The Schism.

1140. Synod of Sens.

1145. Pope Eugenius III.

1146. Council of Chartres. (Crusade.)

1148. Death of Malachi.

1149. Failure of the Crusade.

1150. Writing of the De Consideratione.

1153. Death of S. Bernard.

LECTURES ON S. BERNARD.

LECTURE I.

S. BERNARD'S EARLY DAYS.

BERNARD, afterwards Abbot of Clairvaux,[1] was born at Fontaines, near Dijon, in the year A.D. 1091. The home in which he first saw the light was one of the feudal fortresses in Burgundy; externally fenced with the emblems of strife, but within, the abode of a deep, fervent piety.

A.D. 1091.

Tecelin, his father, was a soldier, but a man of profound religious convictions. In him Christianity subdued the spirit of a barbarous age, and placed him singularly in advance of the commonly authorized habits of his time. Tecelin was once challenged to fight a duel. All the details were arranged, the place and the hour were fixed. Strength and skill alike were in Tecelin's favour. But Tecelin was haunted by the uncomfortable suspicion that Christianity could not sanction this prevailing practice of the age. Accordingly the brave soldier dared to face the accusation of

cowardice, and to run counter to the then recognized standard of honour. For religion's sake he made such terms with his adversary as he knew would prove acceptable; and peacefully closed a dispute, which, if won by force, had brought him no little glory among his fellow men.

Such was Bernard's father.

His mother Aleth, or Elizabeth,[2] was a woman of the devoutest mind. She had been trained in a severe and ascetic school; and if permitted to follow the bent of her natural inclination would have entered the religious life. Her wishes, however, were not particularly consulted, and she was married at an exceptionally early age to the distinguished soldier whose character has been already indicated. Aleth was a woman of remarkable religious influence. Like Hannah, she dedicated her sons to religious life. Towards this end she laboured persistently throughout their childhood's training, which in her husband's continual absence in war, was left almost entirely in her hands. She laboured with unflagging devotion to imprint upon the heart of her six sons a high and severe ideal of Christian life and Christian duty.

Aleth accustomed her sons to frugal and simple fare, to a healthy contempt for self-indulgence, to a vigorous and earnest manner of living. The ideal in Aleth's mind was that of the cloister rather than that of the castle; and the interior of her home, under her firm but loving rule, assumed the monas-

tic and not the worldly form. The sweetness of the mother's character, the intensity of her religious faith, the consistent elevation of her life, and her complete devotion to her children, produced a marvellous effect in every life committed to her care. It is Aleth to whom the world owes Bernard's religion, and every one of Aleth's seven children ultimately embraced the monastic ideal of life. This was certainly not merely due to the spirit of the age, but to the training in the home. Like S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, and many another religious leader, both in ancient and recent days, it was to his mother that Bernard owed his faith.

But Aleth's labours were not limited to the circle of her home. She descended from the castle to the miserable huts of the vassals clustering round the nobler dwelling. She sought out the infirm and the needy, and with her own hands ministered to their necessities. The lady of Fontaines must have presented a striking contrast to the inmates of many another feudal house, and all who knew her loved and blessed her for her love and sympathy. In these ministrations to the poor, Aleth would sometimes take Bernard her son.

So Aleth lived; and the circumstance of her death formed the most appropriate conclusion to such a life. As she lay dying, too faint and feeble for utterance, they chanted beside her bed the sentences of the Litany; and when the words were reached, "by Thy Cross and Passion, good LORD,

deliver her," she raised her weak hands, signed herself with the sign of the Cross, and expired.

When it was known that Aleth had departed, the abbot of a convent at Dijon came to beg that she might be buried there. The ashes of one so good and true should rest in monastic shade. The abbot's request was granted. They bore the body on their shoulders, they streamed in long procession with Cross and lighted tapers, from Fontaines to the cloister at Dijon. And there Bernard's mother was committed to the dust.

In the deeply religious atmosphere of his home Bernard grew, giving from early days great promise of future mental power, and rapidly distancing his companions of an equal age. But what distinguished Bernard most was his singularly gracious and lovable disposition. Quiet, retiring, thoughtful beyond his years, fond of solitude, and reading, most happy when alone; he was growing up GOD-fearing, obedient, true, keeping the freshness of his baptismal grace unstained, and loved of all who knew him. Fair anticipations these of future moral beauty.

A.D. 1099.

Bernard's boyhood saw the commencement of the first Crusade. The names of Peter the Hermit, Tancred and Godfrey were on all men's lips when Bernard was eight years old. He must have heard of the triumphs of the Holy War, and the capture of Jerusalem, in 1099:[3] stirring events which could not fail to take effect on an ardent imagination. The Trouba-

dours, the wandering singers and musicians, must have constantly made these events the subject of their recitals. The Troubadours were the newsvendors of the twelfth century, and were to the popular mind what the daily papers are to the nineteenth century.[4] These were the days when our own Archbishop Anselm took refuge in France from the violence of Rufus, and accompanied Pope Urban II., and spoke at the Council of Bari on the differences which parted the Greek Church from the Latin, in a way which won all men's praise. But Bernard would as yet be too young to enter into these things.

The secular Canons of the Church at Chatillon undertook the work of Bernard's education, and, while he was still very young, his mother had made for him a monastic dress; thereby declaring the future which she designed for him.

Bernard responded well to the labours of those entrusted with his education. Studious and reserved, he devoted himself to literature with keen interest and delight. And all his life the results of classical training exhibit themselves in the fragments of Latin poets scattered freely through his writings. But the dominant element in Bernard's nature was religious. Bernard did not believe in mere learning. Everything, he said later, depended on the motive with which men accumulated learning. Its purpose must not be vanity, nor mere curiosity, nor anything of that kind, but edifica-

tion; the real good either of others or oneself. Some who learn are merely actuated by a desire to know; such curiosity has no moral worth. There are others who desire to know simply that they may be known, such vanity is piteous. Like the cynical poet,[5] they think that knowledge is valueless unless you can make the world know that you know. There are others who learn simply to turn their knowledge into gain. They want honour, or money. Such merchandise is a desecration. But there are some who learn that they may act upon what they know; that they may train up others and train themselves. This knowledge is good.[6]

So Bernard passed on to encounter the fierce temptations of youth and dawning manhood.

He disciplined himself with merciless severity, thereby to gain the grace of self-control. And all men know how Bernard plunged himself to the neck in an icy pool, and stood there half-lifeless and frozen to the bones; patient and content if, at the cost of much distress, he might quench the unruly passions of the flesh. Not one only conflict did he face, but many repeated trials again and again renewed.

And, in the midst of all these, Bernard heard a Voice, very awful and very clear, which called him out from contact with a corrupted age, saying, "Take My yoke upon you, and ye shall find rest for your souls."[7]

The monastery a secure refuge from many sore

perils rose before him as his ideal: a refuge for the weak, a discipline for the strong. Bernard made no secret of his desire. But the cloistered life was by no means the ideal which appealed as yet to his brothers. They resisted, they expostulated. Men were not born simply for themselves, but had a duty to the state and to the world at large. To take flight from the great world, and to be secluded in a convent, was to render oneself comparatively useless to mankind. Such a life might shelter itself under the name of "contemplation," but as a matter of fact it was a premium for idleness. Let the monks come out and work. Let them not expect to be supported by other men's charity. And besides, they asked, appealing to Bernard's sense of pride, it might be all very well for the illiterate and unknown poor to crowd the cells of meditation and to plough the fields, and cut down trees; but for a man of Bernard's ability to bury himself within those walls, was to waste his gifts, which GOD had bestowed upon him not for concealment in the narrow obscurity of a cloister, but for usefulness in the larger world.

Viewed in the light of Bernard's subsequent career, it is strange to find how strenuously his relations dissuaded him from entering it. So blind it is possible to be to another's true vocation. Could they have checked the zeal of Bernard's youth, what would not the world have lost! Per-

haps however in this way the reality of a vocation is tested, and a true vocation will triumph over the obstacles which mistaken friendship places in its way.

A.D. 1111. Bernard patiently listened to their appeals. He was influenced, but not for a moment convinced. Yet for the time their strenuous resistance prevented him from taking further steps. It was better so. The great ideal of a life of dedication gradually assumed a clearer and clearer form as the young man of twenty passed his days at Fontaines in dreamy reflection.

In after days he once described in an address the tumultuous conflict which passed within his soul during the months of indecision.

"I am not ashamed to confess that often, and particularly at the commencement of my conversion, I experienced extreme coldness and hardness of heart. I sought after Him Whom in my soul I was desirous to love; Who was able to restore warmth and life to my frozen heart. But no one came to my help to dissolve the icy torpor of my spiritual senses, and to bring on the warmth and fruitfulness of the spring. And thus my soul remained untouched and powerless, a prey to hard and hopeless depression and discontent. Who is able to abide this frost? Then on a sudden, at a word, at the sight of some piously-minded person, or at the remembrance of the dead, the HOLY SPIRIT would breathe upon me, and the waters

flow; then tears would be my portion day and night."[8]

The remembrance of the dead.—Here Bernard touches the influence of early training, which clearly pointed to the monastic ideal. Bernard's mind was full of tender memories of his saintly mother Aleth. He knew that as Hannah dedicated Samuel, so in her heart Aleth had dedicated her sons to GOD.

One day, full of most eager longings, pulled in two directions, yet secretly convinced that the crisis of decision was drawing near, Bernard entered a church, threw himself upon his knees and prayed with passionate tears for light, and guidance, and a right judgment. When he rose from his knees his decision was made.

And from that day he never faltered. Bernard was to pass through fiercest conflicts, and bear the burden of untold sorrows and anxieties, but never for a moment did the shadow of doubt rest upon his mind. He knew that he had made a right decision. The crisis of his life was ended. The light was come. The storm was broken, the uncertainty, the suspense, the unhappiness were passed away. A wonderful calm had entered Bernard's heart. In gladness and rejoicing he issued forth from the silent solitary sanctuary, and wended his way with the determined step and firmness of purpose of a man who knows that he has a mission in life, and that his destiny is fixed.

From the sacred presence therefore Bernard went forth with the fire of GOD in his heart. The flame which consumeth the mountains had kindled within him. He had found his work. His first labour was to convince the members of his own family. Here too was his first triumph. Evidently Bernard's was a strong personality—for by the grace of a singular moral ascendency he won over his five brothers one after another to accept with him the monastic ideal of life.

Galdric, Bernard's uncle, was the first to follow his nephew's convictions. Galdric was wealthy, of noble rank, and personal distinction. But at Bernard's summons, he abandoned everything, and threw himself heart and soul into a career of poverty and self-discipline. After this signal instance of persuasive power, Bernard's enthusiasm knew no bounds. He induced Bartholomew, a younger brother, to throw up his intention of becoming a soldier, and to join in a life of devotion. Other conquests followed. His brother Andrew had lately obtained military rank. Andrew rebelled vigorously against Bernard's influence. Bernard, however, ultimately prevailed, not so much through his own influence, as through Aleth's memory. The recollection of her wondrously Christian spirit guided her son's career long after she was dead. Next came Guido, the firstborn. Guido was a married man. He was also deeply implicated in secular work and duty. He was much older than

Bernard. He had a home of his own. He could not possibly shake himself free. The undaunted Bernard would not let Guido remain outside the charmed circle of devotion and sacrifice. Guido's wife herself solved the problem. Visited with a serious illness, she took it as an indication of the divine will. By mutual consent they parted ; she to enter a religious house, and he to learn religion under Bernard.

However the circle was not yet complete. Most difficult of all was Gerard. A brave soldier, a prudent person, immensely popular, Gerard would not listen for a moment to his brother's ascetic proposals. "I know," exclaimed Bernard, "I know that nothing but adversity will give you understanding. The day will come," continued he, with prophetic insight, "when a lance shall pierce this side, and open the way to receive the counsel of salvation which you to-day despise." And one day Gerard was at the wars, and fell wounded in the midst of foes. A sudden terror of death came upon him, and he cried, "I am a monk, I am a Cistercian monk." But he was taken captive and imprisoned. After a miraculous escape, Gerard fled to Bernard, and entered monastic life.[9] Thus Bernard's attractive character drew them all, as by irresistible authority, to himself.

One day, as they sat in the church, the words of the lesson, "He Who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of CHRIST," (Phil.

i. 6,) appealed to their youthful leader as a direct message from heaven.

So Bernard became to his brothers their father and spiritual guide. It was a singular picture, even in that religious period,—all these young men departing from the pleasures and pursuits congenial to their age, foregoing all the advantages of family and wealth, to embrace poverty and an austere life. What the future was to be, none as yet clearly knew. Monastic life was, of course, the ultimate goal; but as to the precise direction it should take, they waited for indications of the Divine will. Meanwhile they prepared themselves by ascetic practices. They retired to a house at Chatillon, where they lived practically as monks. Here they remained six months.

But Bernard's victorious spirit went far beyond the limit of near relationship and home; and in the overwhelming enthusiasm of his great decision, he went out and preached everywhere. It was like the advent of an apostle. Men grew afraid: so strong were the seductive influences of that burning and mighty zeal. Mothers would not let their sons go out to hear him. Lovers kept their loved ones out of the reach of Bernard's bewitching power, lest they should be carried away by force of the torrent, and abandon the world for a cloistered life. But neither maternal anxiety nor lovers' influence could keep the hearts of young men away from Bernard's teaching and Bernard's zeal. Within a

brief space the little band had grown from seven to thirty. They came to him from every class in the social order; both the masters of broad regions, and the lowly and the poor.

A.D. 1113.

At last the day came for the community of brothers to enter upon their dedicated life. Led by Bernard, they issued from their home, all except Nivard, the youngest, who was at play with the children in the street. "Nivard," exclaimed Guido the firstborn, "all the land of our inheritance is thine." "What!" answered Nivard; "heaven for you, and earth for me! that is no fair division." And when they were gone, the boy stole away from his father, and followed them; and no one remained in the deserted house but Tecelin the aged, and his daughter Humbeline.

Nivard's answer was the answer of a child, but of a child born in the ages of faith. His words reveal the intensely religious atmosphere with which the child life had been surrounded.

The pathetic figure of the aged Tecelin, deprived of his five sons in a single day, seeing the hope of perpetuating his family name altogether destroyed, left in solitude in his old age, and bowed with grief, is a fact which may not be passed over without notice.

And in the year from our LORD'S Incarnation eleven hundred and thirteen, says the Chronicler,[10] Bernard, the servant of GOD, now in his 22nd year, knocked at the gates of the Cistercian monastery,

where Stephen the Abbot received him. All the brothers were admitted, the youngest excepted, who, on account of his tender age, was sent back to his father, with a promise that, if, after two years he still desired it, the monks would receive him. After two years he returned, and was admitted.

LECTURE II.

BERNARD'S NOVITIATE.

THE monastery of Citeaux was deliberately selected. Hidden in the austere recesses of mountainous solitude, far away in a remote corner of Burgundy, it was famed for unswerving fidelity to the severe rule of S. Benedict. No concessions to a luxurious and self-indulgent spirit were found in the cloisters where Abbot Stephen presided. To Bernard's intense and fervid devotion this was Citeaux's greatest claim and chief attraction.

The Cistercian was a branch of the ancient Benedictine order—that great community to whose learning and care we owe the preservation of a considerable part of the literature of earlier times. The Benedictine order had already existed six hundred years before Bernard's day, having been founded by S. Benedict, c. A.D. 500.[11]

The Abbot of Citeaux, who, upon that memorable day welcomed the youthful Bernard to monastic austerities, was an Englishman, Stephen Harding, formerly of Sherborne, in Dorsetshire.[12] Harding had wandered across the world, to realize his spiritual ideal in the

A.D. 1113.

most rigorous convent he could find. He had visited the religious houses in Scotland. He had crossed over to France. He had entered Burgundy, resting for a while at the convent of Molême. But Molême had fallen from its pristine severity, and from fidelity to S. Benedict's ideal, and Harding was not satisfied.

The English monk ventured to insert a protest. By reason, exclaimed Harding, did the Supreme GOD create all things, and by reason does He rule them; and similarly by reason should man's life be governed. But since we have sorely departed from reason, authority is needed to bring us back. Hence Benedict's rule; as to which, although unable to grasp the reason for all its details, I am fully prepared to bow to its authority. Reason and authority, although sometimes apparently at variance, must nevertheless ultimately be found in harmony together. Nor can I believe that saintly men, GOD'S nearest followers, acted without reason in those matters, which bear the weight of their authority. Accordingly, urged Harding upon the community of Molême, either produce reason or authority for your departure from S. Benedict's rule.

Harding's protest was frequently discussed in chapter at Molême, and the Englishman's vigorous zeal succeeded in winning for the moment eighteen of the brothers and the Abbot himself. But the main body of the convent was unconvinced. So Harding and the Abbot, with eighteen brothers, de-

parted to found, under the sanction of the Archbishop of Vienne, afterwards Pope Calixtus II. (A.D. 1119—1124,) the celebrated convent of Citeaux, in which the rule of S. Benedict might be observed in all its literal exactness. Thus Citeaux was founded in the year 1098, when Bernard was but seven years old. But the rising house had its difficulties. Harding's companion, the former Abbot of Molême, a delicately nurtured man, soon found that the severe régime of Citeaux was too great a strain upon his physical strength. His first enthusiasm failed him, and he cast longing glances towards the comparative indulgence of Molême, devoutly wishing himself among his old community again. Nor was the convent at Molême slow to discover or to suspect their old Abbot's wavering of mind. They came and begged him to resume the presidency over them, and be their Abbot once more. So he with unfeigned gladness returned to the easier life, and all the brothers, excepting eight, re-entered the former convent with him. To the headship of these tried and tested eight, Stephen Harding in time succeeded. Such was the man who trained S. Bernard in the discipline of monastic life.

Abbot Stephen insisted on extreme simplicity. He was a born reformer. Poverty was their bride, and must rule in Citeaux. The cross upon the Altar there must be of wood, not gold; the candlesticks of iron, the vestments of linen, no gorgeous

texture, no brilliant colouring, but rigid severity, barren and plain. Mere æsthetic admiration had no place in the soul of Stephen Harding.[13] But all men knew that the spirit of fervent faith was there, and that exact fidelity to the rule of earlier ages was found within Citeaux's walls.

Yet Citeaux had a chequered history. The little community did not prosper; for although all men respected the blameless standard maintained within these austere recesses, yet the majority even of those who sought religious life were rather repelled than attracted by an austerity too great for them. The monks were growing old. Death thinned their scanty numbers every year. A pestilence decimated them; and no novices appeared before the lonely gates; no youthful, eager natures offered themselves, to enter the inheritance, and do their work, and perpetuate the severer life. A shadow of depression fell on Citeaux. The religious house was threatened with speedy extinction; even Abbot Stephen could not resist a feeling of bitter disappointment. One day there lay a monk of Citeaux dying. The Abbot approached the dying brother, and poured forth all the sorrow of his soul in the ears of the departing. Stephen reminded the dying monk that all this overwhelming grief had come upon them simply through their faithfulness to S. Benedict's injunctions. GOD had granted them hitherto no sign of His approval. The community was decreasing almost every day. Their

nobler standard of life must die with them, their reformation fail, unless speedy help were vouchsafed. The Abbot ordered the dying brother, in virtue of his vow of obedience, to take these words, after death, to JESUS CHRIST, and to bring an answer back to this lower world. The faithful brother promised obedience and died. Abbot Stephen sat in silence, his face buried in his cowl, and there seemed to come an answer from on high, in the old prophetic language; "Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold: all these gather themselves together, and come to thee . . . The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me: give place to me, that I may dwell."[14]

Then a sudden gladness filled the Abbot's heart, and he knew that the longing of his soul was granted.[15] Thus Bernard's advent, with his thirty companions, was felt to be a distinct response to the community's fervent prayer.

This deliberate selection of an almost extinct religious house is a singular illustration of Bernard's greatness. He avoided the majestic and famed Abbey of Cluny, where all things were on a vast and dignified scale, preferring to throw himself into a forlorn and unattractive cloister, and to become the means of its recovery.

Bernard entered the quietude of devotion, to be, as he supposed, lost for ever to the world. It was his ambition to be effaced from human memory.

Widely different, however, in the divine destiny of things, was to be his lot, and incomparably more useful. He was to bear witness for CHRIST before nations and before kings. Meanwhile the humble-minded novice, in the solitude of his cell, was searching the depths of his own character, and struggling to arrive at self-knowledge. Every day he solemnly asked himself the memorable question: "Bernarde, Bernarde, ad quid venisti?" "Bernard, for what purpose art thou here?"

He would be at times absorbed, and apparently lost in contemplation. Few trials were more repugnant to him than the interruption of idle visits and frivolous conversations. He was thankful when the bell summoned him away to choir. He said that on one occasion, after such idle converse, he could not recover his habitual calm, until, for twenty-five days, he had prostrated himself to the earth before the Altar of GOD, and then at last the vision of the glory of GOD returned to him.

Bernard seems at times to have been so wrapped in thought as to have become perfectly oblivious to outward things. After living a year in the novitiate cell, he did not know whether the roof was of open rafters or ceiled, nor could he recollect whether the eastern window of the church was of three lancets, or only one.

His obliviousness to outward things is further illustrated by the fact that he passed through some

of the most magnificent scenery in Europe without noticing it. For a whole day he passed along the lake of Lucerne, and scarcely saw it, or knew not that he saw; and when, at evening, his companions alluded to the lake, Bernard, to their amazement, asked them where it was. Abstraction to this degree from external things might be for some the crown of all their lifelong endeavours, but Bernard thought himself a novice still.[16]

It was one of Bernard's spiritual exercises as a novice to repeat every day the Seven Penitential Psalms, with special intention for his mother's soul. One day, whether by forgetfulness or weariness, he omitted to repeat them. Abbot Stephen's watchful eyes did not fail to detect the omission, "Brother Bernard," he said, "what did you do with the Psalms yesterday, or to whom did you entrust them?" Bernard did not lay himself open to that question a second time.[17]

During those calm and uneventful days Bernard spent hours in deep and uninterrupted meditation on the sacred mysteries of the Christian Faith. Here he drank in from the fountains of Holy Scripture his profound and wonderful knowledge of the love of GOD. He delighted to take some brief passage of the sacred books and bear it in memory into the fields or the woods, and there hour after hour reflect upon the words until his mind became saturated with the ideas conveyed,

and the depth of meaning began more and more to dawn upon him, and the mists which part us from heavenly things broke and lifted, and Bernard was face to face with Eternal Verities. Yet at the end of prolonged meditation Bernard did not suppose himself to have seen down half the avenues of truth, which indeed were there could mortal eyes discern them. But he had seen a little of the abiding and the true.

In after days Bernard declared that his happiest insight into spiritual realities was due to the calm days when he wandered alone in the forests, and his only teachers were the oaks and beeches.

Self-discipline was the young novice's constant aim. The soul had broken away from GOD, and as a nemesis the body was insubordinate to the soul. To restore this broken harmony was the purpose of the ascetic life. Bernard disciplined his mortal body without mercy. He followed, but to an excessive degree, the Apostle's injunction, to keep under the body, and bring it into subjection. Of food and sleep he took barely enough to keep body and soul together. He was ruining his physical health. In maturer life he practically admitted that this severity was zeal untempered by discretion, and asserted the duty of maintaining, as far as was consistent with higher spiritual needs, the divinely accorded talent of physical strength. But although the zeal was excessive, the motive was admirable. Bernard purposed to acquire self-

control. And the strength of will residing in that thin and wasted frame, the moral ascendency which his own self-conquest gave him, were reward enough for his complete self-sacrifice. He was only twenty-five. But his ardent pursuit of sanctity already marked him out distinctly even in the severe and disciplined circle of the cloisters of Citeaux, as one who could do nothing by halves, and who on entering the ascetic life meant to embrace it in all its rigour.

Abbot Stephen rejoiced in the good fortune with which at last his beloved community had been visited. Nor was he slow to recognize the commanding gifts, the strong personality veiled beneath that lowly exterior. With exceeding gladness he invested Bernard with the white robe of the Cistercian order. Meanwhile continually the fame of Citeaux increased, until at length Citeaux could not contain the numbers who sought admission into the circle of Bernard's disciples.

Evidently the time had come to throw out branches, and form dependent houses elsewhere ;[18] and Citeaux which had so recently trembled on the verge of extinction, found itself ruler of a daughter convent. Still Citeaux increased, and a second time brothers issued forth to found another branch. But Citeaux a third time overflowed. This time Bernard, notwithstanding his youth, was chosen to take the lead. It was remembered that Bernard with his thirty companions need not have come to Citeaux at all, that he might on his own authority

have constituted a religious house, that he had voluntarily abdicated the place of authority, and humbly entered Citeaux to be taught as a novice among the rest.[19] And therefore all men acknowledged the appropriateness of this selection. Citeaux owed its prosperity, nay its very existence, humanly speaking, to this youthful leader of men.

So Bernard issued forth. According to mediæval precedent, he came from the monastery doors with twelve disciples, after the Gospel pattern. Abbot Stephen placed the Cross in Bernard's hands. The remaining brothers of Citeaux accompanied their departing friends to the borders of the monastic precincts. Bernard and the twelve companions crossed beyond these limits, and left them for ever.

A.D. 1115.

Up to the far north Bernard led the way into the diocese of Langres, to the River Aube, to a valley, inhospitable, uncultivated, infested by robbers, called the Valley of Wormwood. With a true monastic instinct Bernard seized upon this spot. He would turn it into a spiritual haven, and a garden of the LORD. Here Bernard fixed the site for the new community. And in the midst of this desolate and dreary wild rose the walls of the famous cloister ever after to be known in Christian story by the sweet sounding name of Clairvaux. The valley of Wormwood was to become the valley of Light. This was indeed no poetic dream, but

here as in countless places actually realized. The fathers of the convents were the tillers of the soil, the cultivators both of lands and human souls. Under their charge the wilderness became literally a fruitful field, and the parched ground springs of water. Landed proprietors who saw in the monks nothing more than this, welcomed them as at least the heralds of knowledge and cultivation.

In the Valley of Wormwood the fathers of the new foundation were at first reduced to dire extremity. Privations and hardships untold came upon them from poverty, inclement seasons, and inadequate food. They wore the same garb in summer noontide and winter frost, and the old torn cloak was seldom exchanged for new. Their shoes grew thin, and fragmentary, and in default of leather, were held together by bits of cord.[20]

Sometimes the peasants, scattered far and wide in the thinly peopled region, would come and bring them offerings of food, and so minister to their most pressing necessities. But visits such as these were occasional and uncertain. While summer lasted things were not so bad; but since the community were occupied in building their wooden house, which beneath a single roof included everything—refectory, chapel, kitchen, and dormitory, they had not time to cultivate the ground, and when the winter fell, their sufferings were severe. They were forced to satisfy the cravings of hunger upon beechnuts, vetches, and upon any wild natural

growth, before they could win a more congenial harvest from the stubborn uncultured soil.

At first Bernard made too exacting and almost intolerable demands on flesh and blood; and although, in course of time, as he grew to understand men and the capacity of human nature, he softened and became more kindly and genial, it is scarcely wonderful if under stress of these privations the longsuffering community at times rebelled. They threatened to abandon the inhospitable vale, and seek refuge in the former home at Citeaux.

The simplicity of Bernard's faith would startle the economists of a later age. In the solitudes of Clairvaux it was his duty to provide daily food for a company of men, and the demands of such incessant provision taxed beyond endurance their slender stores. Bernard was equal to the emergency; he resorted to prayer. Then summoning Brother Guibert, he bade him ride to a distant town and buy salt for the household. "Where is the money?" inquired Guibert. "Indeed," responded Bernard, "I know not when I possessed any silver or gold; He lives on high Who has my purse, and my treasures are in His hands." Whereupon Guibert smiled. "If I go empty, empty I shall return," said the brother. But Bernard bade him go. The incredulous Guibert rode away upon his hopeless errand. Upon the road however he met a priest, to whom he

confided the necessities of his house. The priest touched by the simple tale, gave Guibert all he wanted, and adding a considerable sum of money, sent him rejoicing home. Bernard listened to the story of Guibert's adventure, and drew the moral. "Nothing," he said, "is more essential for a Christian than faith. Have faith, and it will be well with you all your days."

One day a brother from the Convent of S. Clement, some way off, visited the rising house at Clairvaux. Bernard offered him all they had, which was half a loaf of barley bread. Amazed at their privations, the brother returned to S. Clement's with a tale of their deep distress, and with the half loaf as witness. The sympathizing community were ashamed of their own abundance. They laded horses and asses with food, they filled carts with the common necessaries of life, and brought them as an offering to Clairvaux. Another time a woman brought them a hundred pieces of gold to be spent on better clothing. In this precarious way the first winter passed.

In appearance Bernard was slight and frail; his features bore the impress of severe study and self-discipline; his hair was light, almost bordering upon whiteness; his beard of yellow tinge, during his later years fading into grey; in stature there was nothing striking about him. Thus to outward gaze Bernard was in no degree remarkable.

When he appeared before the Bishop of Chalons

for ordination, the singular contrast between himself and his attendant Elboldo created much merriment at the palace. Elboldo, of mature age, of commanding presence, of strong noble physique, appeared far more suited for the office of Abbot than his youthful companion, slight and frail, and evidently the victim of habitual and deplorable ill health. The Bishop's household were a long time discussing which was the Abbot. But William of Champeaux, the Bishop, one of the ablest men of his day, the acute logician of the schools of Paris, soon discerned, beneath that careworn and undistinguished exterior, the burning zeal, the intense enthusiasm, of the religious. Strong friendship sprang up between them. The fatherly, kindly-hearted Bishop saw that Bernard was killing himself with his austerities. William of Champeaux even went so far as to make a pilgrimage in person to Citeaux, where he obtained permission from the authorities to take Bernard under his own care for a year. Armed with their authority, the Bishop of Chalons returned, and Bernard had to submit to this unwonted dictatorship. The Bishop had a small room erected outside the monastery, and there he ordered Bernard to live, excluded from the cares of the community, recruiting, as the Bishop fondly hoped, his imperilled if not shattered and ruined health.

But William of Champeaux if a clever logician, was an indifferent manager. With the kindest in-

tentions he placed the young Abbot under care of a quack physician, whose pretensions were only rivalled by his incapacity, and who in a short time made his patient's condition distinctly worse. But the uncomplaining Bernard bore everything with unruffled equanimity. He took whatever was prescribed him with the sweetest gentleness. Once he drank a quantity of oil in mistake for water. But perhaps his experience may in part explain Bernard's life-long incredulity with reference to medical skill. Nor could he resist a quiet sarcasm to a visitor. He supposed it was a merited requital, that he who formerly ruled over men, should himself be subordinated to the guidance of an ass.

Under this worthless treatment Bernard lingered for a year. But when once the year of obedience was at an end, the Abbot resumed his functions, and his austerities also. The Bishop's well meant experiment cannot be called a triumphant success.

Meanwhile Bernard's character grew in men's esteem. "When I entered that lowly cell," exclaims one of his contemporaries,—"when I entered that lowly cell, and contrasted the dwelling and its inhabitant, the place became sacred to me, as if I approached an altar of GOD." It was the golden age of Clairvaux, when in narrow circumstances, in cold and want, and often real distress, they laid the firm foundations of her future greatness.

Bernard used to continue praying day and night,

until his knees were weak through fasting, and his limbs would scarcely support his fragile frame. But, above all things, he would not have his austerities known. He wore sackcloth next to his flesh, but the moment the fact was discovered, he abandoned the practice, and returned to ordinary ways. His humility shrank from anything which might be misunderstood as ostentatious. His food was of the simplest kind. He rarely drank wine. A victim of distressing bodily infirmities, medical men wondered at the indomitable spirit which forced the body to tasks beyond its strength. It was, they said, like yoking a lamb to a plough. And indeed, it may be said that ill health was Bernard's lifelong portion, a daily element in his cares and duties, sometimes falling upon him in greater severity, sometimes mitigated, but always there, yet never checking his wonderful buoyancy and cheerfulness, never permitted to control his activity. Powerful will and strength of character carried him by the grace of GOD, through great emergencies, when it seemed as if he must have broken down.

Bernard was a lover of simplicity, but he was no friend to slovenliness and neglect,[21] widely different from the repulsive uncleanliness in which mediæval asceticism sometimes rejoiced. Bernard maintained that the dress revealed the man, and was often either the reflection of personal vanity, or the affectation of a shallow mind.[22]

What effect on human nature had all this soli-

tude, this austerity, this voluntary refusal of joy and pleasure? Was it unpractical? Was it an unjust rejection of life's duties and burdens and opportunities and disciplines?

Bernard's character may reply. This seclusion deepened him. This concentration of mind and all his faculties upon one thing braced and strengthened him. It resulted in marvellous detachment and unworldliness. It intensified his realization of the eternal and unseen. It enabled him to see the interests of time with a due sense of proportion. Few men ever understood life's responsibility more profoundly than Bernard understood it. What force the following warning against self-seeking and ambition must have had when confirmed by the silent witness of such an example!

"What will you take away of all your labour which you shall have done upon the earth? What will you return to our LORD for all which He has bestowed upon you? What increase will you bring for all your talents? Oh, if you approach Him empty-handed! the generous Giver, but the just Exactor! He will come, He will come, and will not keep silence. He will require His own with usury. Family distinction, bodily strength, beauty, intellect, learning—all these are glorious; but only so long as they are dedicated to Him. If you divert them to your own uses, there is one that seeketh and judgeth. Grant that you have your way; that you win men's praise; that you are

called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi; that you make yourself a name upon the earth. What will remain to you of all these after death, except memory alone? It is written, They have slept their sleep, and all the men whose hands were mighty have found nothing."[23]

Human longings, he taught, must be so regulated by holy love, that evil may be cast out, and the good things of the world sought only for the sake of higher good. Material advantages must be valued only for the sake of the soul, the soul for the sake of GOD, but GOD for His own sake. Being, however, what we are, the growth of this holy love begins at the lower stage.

a. We first love material things. That not being first which is spiritual, but that which is animal, we begin by bearing the image of the earthy. A man first loves himself for his own sake. This is the primary stage.

b. But when he sees that he is not self-sustained, he begins to seek after GOD, as necessary to his own continued existence. This is the second stage. He loves GOD not for GOD'S sake, but for his own.

c. One further step remains. By worship, by prayer, by meditation, by knowledge, by obedience, he comes to realize the loveliness of GOD. He has tasted that the LORD is gracious. He reaches the highest degree, which is to love GOD not for advantage, but for GOD'S own sake.[24]

The man who wrote in this mind was evidently

gaining clear insight into spiritual truth. His isolation from common life did not stunt the development of his soul, or render him less human or less capable of sympathy. It was a training for future usefulness. In the routine of study and devotion, far remote from the haunts of men, Bernard was gathering moral power, for future encounters with cities and with crowds. Bernard was not destined to pass his days in unmolested prayer. He was to issue forth into the midst of agitations and passions and worldliness and the endless distractions of the common life. But who shall say how much Bernard owed to those years of severe self-discipline and recollectedness? Who shall say how far his character was matured and ripened by the silent hours of meditation in cloisters, where all was done that could be done to foster religion and enkindle faith?

Here in Clairvaux was being trained a man who should direct the conscience of kings, and stir the religious heart of Europe by his burning words. This is a fact which must never be forgotten. Bernard's first training was his home, but his second education was the convent. If the one impressed his boyhood, by the other was his manhood braced and strengthened.

LECTURE III.

S. BERNARD AS ABBOT.

WHAT was the inner life of Clairvaux? What were its occupations? What was its general tone of thought? What were the ideas and the practices prevalent in the cloister under Bernard's rule? To give some answer to that question is the purpose of the present lecture.

Bernard's address to the novices breathed a tone of extreme austerity. "If," said he, "you would attain to the things that are within, leave here your bodies at the gates. They belong to the world; let nothing but the spirit enter here; the flesh profiteth nothing." And when the new comer, scarce escaped from more commonplace ideals, recoiled before this abrupt reception, Bernard hastened to explain that he had in view the evil passions of the flesh, and that these must verily be abandoned, and left without. Then, when it dawned upon him that he had begun too severely, Bernard softened his rigorous tone. Two gifts especially he strenuously cultivated—the spirit of sympathy and the grace of discrimination. And he shone in a new way, as, with characteristic rapidity, he gained

that insight into men's dispositions which was essential to his office.

Yet with all his devotion to austerity and self-discipline, Bernard was no advocate for entire seclusion from the common interests of human life. He would not have men introduce into the twelfth century the solitary hermit of an earlier age. When retirement from the community into complete isolation was upheld as the ideal, Bernard strongly dissuaded the Religious from any such attempt. To one who sought his advice upon the question, he replied that such zeal was certainly not according to knowledge. If it were urged that the soul was safer in the wilderness than in the crowded city and would serve GOD better where no distractions invade, Bernard denied it altogether. If the soul wills to do evil, solitude is no protection. There is an evil which no man rebukes, because no man sees. And when the gaze of man is withdrawn, the tempter comes more boldly. Life among others is in itself a protection. Do good, and they will not rebuke you. But by their very presence, evil is often suppressed ; or if it occurs, it is witnessed by many : it is rebuked, it is amended. Like the virgins in the parable, you yourself are either foolish or wise. If foolish, then you need the support of the wise. If wise, then the foolish have need of you. Choose which you will. Are you wise ? Then strive, by force of example, to obtain companions in holiness. Are you sinful ? then make repent-

ance where you are, lest you become weaker by isolation.[25]

And Bernard would teach that religious life must ever be a life of progress. There is, he said, no possibility of standing still. Not to long for progress is to fail. Men might conceal their indolence beneath an assumed humility, and express themselves as content to be what their fathers were : but no such resting place can be found. To be satisfied is to go backward. Nothing in this world continues precisely where it was. Man himself never continues in one stay. If there is not to be deficiency, there must be perpetual advancing.[26]

The candidate for religious life was repeatedly warned that entrance into a Community, so far from implying escape from all temptations, was rather the exchange of one set of trials for another. He was told that if the ascetic discipline was the more excellent way, it was sure to be for that very reason beset by Satan with peculiar difficulties. The more Satan realized that souls were escaping from his grasp, the more strenuously would he resist their advancement.

There were indeed in Communities peculiar dangers to which the common world was not so exposed. The very privilege of calm and devout contemplation, precious as it was, had its perils. Men got uplifted by pride, trusted too much to their reasoning faculties, and sometimes challenged

the very foundations of Faith. Fear, and reverence, and humility, and self-mistrust were essential to him who would approach the tremendous mysteries of the spiritual and the eternal. Caution, a sense of insufficiency, a knowledge of our ignorance were surely becoming in one whose created intellect was necessarily limited. Bernard following the great Catholic writers centuries before him, insisted repeatedly that reason has its inevitable limitation in the precincts of the Faith.[27]

Members of the College at Clairvaux sometimes forgot this. A certain monk reflecting upon the Real Presence, failed to understand *how* this thing could be. As if we must comprehend the explanation before we could believe the fact. For years this brother perplexed himself over the manner of the mystery, while he declined to rest in the simple fact. He had been an Abbot, but left his Abbey to enter Clairvaux. His former associates, aware of his difficulty, intreated him to return. He returned. But exchange of locality is not exchange of conviction. Still he doubted. At last however light came. He met the facts of Christianity in a humble spirit. He was contented to believe the fact although he could not understand the manner.[28]

That our comprehension was the limit of truth the Catholic teachers denied. "I believe," said Bernard, "in the Holy Trinity. I do not comprehend, but I believe."

By the intensity of his own convictions Ber-

nard in many ways sustained the weak in faith. A brother in the Community in Clairvaux ceased to believe in the Real Presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist. To his dulled and darkened vision there was nothing on the Altar but a little bread and wine mixed with water. Reception of these mere material elements could not profit, and therefore the monk abstained. His habitual refusal to communicate was of course observed, and being asked the cause, he told the simple truth. He had lost faith. Deeply distressed, he acknowledged that blindness had come upon him. Bernard evinced the keenest sympathy. An overscrupulous conscience had been sorely tormented by the temptation to doubt. "If you have no faith," he exclaimed, "I bid you, in virtue of your vow of obedience, to go and communicate in my faith." Thus bidden to act upon his vow of obedience, the monk obeyed. He communicated, and his faith became clear, and was never obscured again.

The following narratives illustrate the devotional standard which prevailed under Bernard's care.

The long devotional exercises of the religious life were liable to the danger of too rapid and mechanical a repetition. Anno, Archbishop of Cologne, whenever he was free from public duties, would say his offices with a priest who acted apparently as his chaplain. The good Archbishop was most reverent, deliberate, and devout. But

the chaplain rejoiced in running swiftly. So rapid was his repetition of the Gloria after the psalms, that only the names of the first and third Persons of the Holy Trinity reached the ears of the congregation. What he said seemed to be only, Glory to the FATHER, and to the HOLY GHOST. The Redeemer's name was not heard. The Archbishop was grieved, yet took no notice. But in a dream JESUS CHRIST appeared to him. The Redeemer seemed to the sleeper to hold up His right hand and count upon His fingers,—One, that is the FATHER; second, that is the SON; third, that is the HOLY SPIRIT. Since the Three Persons Who are one GOD are worshipped by the universal Church with equal adoration, why do you not rebuke your priest who takes away all honour from ME Who stand between the FATHER and the SPIRIT? On the following day the Archbishop warned the priest of the irreverent effect of his too rapid utterance. We may not trust in the multiplication of prayers and psalms. It is not the mere getting through a certain quota of religious exercises which is in the least degree availing, since it is not quantity about which GOD cares, but the reverent devotion of the heart. If a man can say much reverently, well and good; if not, let him at least be reverent, and it will not matter that his words are few.[29]

John, Prior of Clairvaux, was not exempt from certain weaknesses of the flesh. He could not keep himself awake in the long midnight services,

accordingly he invented a most ingeniously tormenting remedy. Over his stall in choir he fixed a little wooden hammer so arranged that if the occupant of the stall leant back too somnolently, the little hammer made a swift descent and struck him a blow upon the head. John found the remedy most successful, and was highly admired in the Community for his self-denying inventiveness.[30]

Very beautiful is the account which relates how Bernard once in the midnight office in the dimly lighted sanctuary saw a recording angel stand beside every brother in the church. One angel wrote in letters of gold, another in silver, another in ink, another with water which left no trace upon the scroll. And the moral was most clear. The writing in gold represented the intensity of a pure and strong devotion; the letters of silver a lower grade of fervour, and yet an intention good and right; and the writing in ink signified the more commonplace less fervid mind, the man who although destitute of nobler flights of devotion, still paid attention to the words he sang; the lowest of all, written as if with water, represented that useless and wasted prayer which did not come from the heart, had no purpose, and reached no destination. "Ah," Bernard cried, "if only the monks understood how the holy angels lament when they watch beside the negligent, and the unreal, and the indevout, how much more fervent they would become!"

Abbot Bernard strongly insisted on the power of intercession. When lying one day in his cell suffering from a sudden and almost intolerable access of pain, he intreated one of the two brothers who watched beside him, to go at once to the church and pray that his agony might be lessened. The brother excused himself on the ground that no such prevailing power would attend any prayer of his. Bernard bade him go as an act of obedience. In the church were three Altars, one of the Virgin Mother, one of S. Laurence, one of S. Benedict. And while the brother prayed, there came a vision to the suffering Abbot,—Mary, and Laurence, and Benedict all seemed to enter the narrow cell where he lay. They stood beside him, and touched his tortured frame, and in a moment the agony was gone.

The community at Clairvaux did not forget their dead. One night, when the body of a former companion had just been laid within the grave, a member of the order dreamed that the dead returned in deep distress and agony, from some region of suffering. In the morning he told his dream, and the community received it as a summons to prayer for the departed. They offered the Holy Eucharist daily for the repose of their brother's soul. The old monk dreamed again. Once more the dead appeared, but now with every sign of indescribable gladness and rejoicing.[31] Being intreated to say by what means he had been

set free, he bade the old monk follow him. And suddenly they were both within the walls of a sanctuary, where many altars were built, and at every altar stood the priest and his server, and all were offering before GOD the sacred Victim with profound devotion. "These are the weapons of the grace of GOD," exclaimed the dead, "whereby I am set free. This is the all-conquering mercy of the Most High. This is the Sacrifice which takes away the sins of all the world."

When this dream was related to the wondering brotherhood, they were greatly edified. And in virtue of what to them was most convincing evidence, they applied themselves with renewed zeal to the work of Eucharistic intercession.

But long before the foundation of Clairvaux, the celebrated convent of Cluny had laid great stress on the duty of prayer for the faithful departed. Frequent Eucharistic Sacrifices were offered in their behalf. At regular intervals during the year this practice was there maintained. And especially on the day following the Festival of All Saints, the memorial of the dead was offered at Cluny. Inaugurated in these monastic precincts, the observance of All Souls' Day spread gradually through Christendom, until it was adopted into the general usage of the Church.[32]

We have seen that it was the spirit of that age to chronicle every dream and every vision, and to attach immense importance to supposed commu-

nications from another world. Bernard was not altogether in sympathy with this reverence for dreams. A dying monk related to the wondering brethren that he had seen that night the glories of Paradise, and heard the sweet sounds of heavenly minstrelsy, and the song which greeted every Cistercian brother when he passed away from earth to GOD. He was specially commissioned in his dream to relate the vision to the community. So saying, he died. Full of the new revelation, a brother went off in haste to Bernard, and poured out the narrative of the wonderful dream. Bernard did not seem to be impressed. "Do you wonder at that, my brothers?" asked the Abbot. "I rather wonder at your incredulity, and the hardness of your hearts. Did you not long ago believe the word which came down from heaven, 'Blessed are the dead which die in the LORD: yea, from henceforth, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours.' To me it is clearer than the light. I am as certain of it as I am of my own existence, that every member of this order, who lives in obedience and humility, will hereafter be robed in immortality and glory."[33]

It was urgently proclaimed in the monastic ideal, that personal inclination must be subordinated to other men's spiritual needs. It was insisted that the regular offices, even the Holy Eucharist itself, should be postponed, if thereby good might be done to a brother's soul. It was never for-

gotten how a brother, desirous of making his confession, entered one day the sacristy to find the Abbot, just as the superior was vested, and prepared to celebrate. The Abbot thought that the Holy Eucharist should take precedence, and told the penitent that he would hear him at another time. But the brother went out, and did not return. He was not found in choir that day at vespers, nor did any one know where he was. After long search the unhappy man was discovered, dead. He had evidently laid violent hands upon his own life. The Abbot's sorrow was unbounded. It seemed to him that he had, although, of course, unwittingly, lost one of the flock entrusted to his care. And the lesson which all men drew from the melancholy event, was, that it is a dangerous thing for a priest not to give himself without delay to those who seek his aid in confession.[34]

It was also taught that no monk must be above doing the humblest duties. It fell to the lot of a certain monk to wash the plates and dishes for the community. He, however, thinking himself too good for a function which he did not relish, performed the work in a very slovenly fashion. The plates and dishes reappeared only half clean.

"Oh, miserable pride," exclaimed Bernard, "the very source of sin, the root of all evil! Who gave thee freedom to degrade my holy community? Depart; by the grace of GOD, depart. Let there

be nowhere in these precincts a place for thee for ever. Go back to him who, with thee and through thee, fell from heaven."

Then, turning to the offending monk, he added: "My son, listen to my words. I tell you, solemnly from my conscience, and before GOD, that if, with all humility, you fulfil this lowly duty, you will gain more good to your soul than if you served at the Altar, or even offered the Sacrifice."[35]

Now and then some turbulent spirit would rise within the cloister to destroy monastic peace. An unruly quarrelsome disposition would rebel against order, and distress all things by an irritable temper and a sharp speech. But Bernard could be firm. Such a one, he said, must be ruled by kindness, by private warning, by public rebuke, by severe words, by punishment, and by means more effective than these, by prayer to GOD for him. If, however, all remedies are fruitless, then we must follow the Apostolic advice, put away from among yourselves that wicked person. (1 Cor. v. 13.) He has broken the rule of obedience. Let him be his own master and depart. Nor need we fear that this severity is inconsistent with love. They went out from us, but they were not of us. It is better to lose one, than to lose unity.[36]

Another tale is told of a monk, who grew weary of Clairvaux's calm monotony. He must needs return into the greater world. He was seized with a singular craze—to get his living by games of

chance. The spirit of the gambler possessed him. Bernard attempted to reason with the man, but in vain. He thirsted for the excitement, and nothing would do but that he must go. So Bernard at last hit upon a strange expedient. He offered the brother thirty golden coins, and gave consent to his departure, on condition that the monk returned at the end of every year, to divide his profits with the Abbot. The senseless brother agreed. Forth he went to make his fortune as a betting man. Time passed on, and nothing was heard of him, until one day, shabby and crestfallen, he reappeared at the monastery gates. The dexterous Abbot gaily approached, and spread out his lap to receive his promised share of the gambler's gains. Needless to say, there were no gains to share. Reluctantly the man confessed that he had lost—lost everything—even to the thirty golden pieces which Bernard lent. "But," he added wistfully, "if you will receive me back again, you can have me instead of your gold." And the kindly-hearted saint extended his arms to the prodigal, and made the man eternally his own.

Monastic history resembles monastic architecture. The Gothic church exhibits, together with the accurate outline, the exact proportion, the beautiful, and the true, a strange medley of the quaint and the fantastic and the impossible, and the repulsive and the ridiculous. So it is in monastic history. It is full of wonderful reality. You see human

souls in the fearful intensity of struggle against the lower self. Accurate delineations, exact detail, historic truth, meet you continually. But strangely intertwined with these is the legendary and the childish and the painfully absurd, and the piteously wretched and the miserably unworthy. In other words, monastic history exhibits human nature just as it is, with all its contradictions. Together with the perfectly beautiful tale of ascetic devotion, is the ludicrous record of the jackdaw of Rheims, which is not a mere invention of the author of the Ingoldsby Legends, but actually a narrative of the twelfth century historian.[37] The Abbot laid his ring upon the table, whence the thieving jackdaw stole it away. The Abbot excommunicated the unknown offender. From that day the miserable bird drooped and lost its feathers, and walked about, the picture of wretchedness and dejection. The thief was self-convicted, the ring found in its nest, the excommunication removed, and the bird flourished again. All this the chronicler records as a sober warning against the danger of incurring excommunication.

Afterwards a terrible famine smote the lands round Clairvaux, and the community's slender resources were taxed to the utmost, to provide bread for the suffering poor. The brothers took a vast multitude under their special charge, and for the time being kept them alive. But there was a poor woman, driven under stress of hunger to practise

upon the sympathies of the richer by deceit. She carried in her arms a wretched bundle of moss and rags, carefully folded to represent an infant child. By her side two other children walked. And the pitying people who saw this forlorn family in the street could scarcely endure to let her go without ministering to her wants from their own already precarious store. At last charity failed, and the poor creature sank upon the wayside to die. The chronicler says that she was actually dead. Then Bernard passed along, and found the crying children and the unconscious woman, and the poor piteous bundle of rags remorselessly revealing the miserable deceit. Bernard sank upon his knees and prayed. And the woman opened her eyes as if from a trance; and seeing Bernard and the monks around her, she thanked GOD, Who had sent her back into the world at His servant's prayer, and spared her from the punishment which her sin deserved.

The College of Clairvaux was beloved by all men—their charity was proverbial. No poor supplicant was ever sent empty away. Hence the monastery was reverenced even by the outcast and the lawless. A strange tale, showing their moral ascendancy, is told in the ancient Cistercian record. A monk of Clairvaux was one day sent off on the business of the order, to a distant place. He rode upon an ass, and carried money in his purse to purchase various necessaries for the house. As he

passed through a lonely wood, he was attacked by robbers, who, as the historian expresses it, "left him nothing except his charity." The monk knelt down and prayed. The robbers rode away. One of them, however, impelled by curiosity, and wondering what their victim would do, came back to look at him. Still the monk was on his knees. And it suddenly dawned upon the robber that this was one of Bernard's brethren. He rode off immediately to his comrades, and communicated to them his suspicion. They were all afraid. Clairvaux was a name which extorted reverence even from this lawless company. Clairvaux had been merciful to the hungering and the outcast, and Clairvaux deserved a better requital than this. The robbers brought back the monk's possessions, and restored to him all which they had taken away.[38]

From very ancient times there has been accorded to certain personages, distinguished either by office or character, the singular privilege of rescuing a condemned criminal from death. The vestal virgins in Rome could procure a prisoner's release if they met him on the way to execution. And Bernard, in the twelfth century, claimed and exercised a similar power. He met in the streets a notorious criminal, on the way to execution. "Give him to me," said Bernard; "I want to hang him myself." The officer in charge regretted that the saint should waste his energies upon the worthless. "Father," he expostulated in amazement, "what

possesses you? The man is a perfect devil; why would you recall him from the gates of hell? He's not the sort of creature to be converted—" "Best of men," retorted the prudent saint, "I know very well that what you say is very true. The man deserves the worst he can receive. Don't suppose that I would have him go unscathed. *You* would give him a punishment far too short; but *I* would make him die the longest death. *You* mean to torture him for a few brief hours; but *I* would make him live long years, and crucify him every day."

The officer understood. He was no match for the Saint's logic, and he delivered the degraded criminal into Bernard's care. And Bernard took the cord into his own hands with which the miserable creature was bound, covered him with his own cloak, and led him away to the Brotherhood of Clairvaux. There in the household of faith they treated him as one of themselves. They showed him a new and a strange ideal of life. They taught him by deeds not words that mercy and unselfishness and generous love existed on the hard cold earth. They brought him into daily contact with some of the purest and noblest of men. And by slow degrees his frozen nature relented, and was touched and wakened and kindled by the warmth of brotherly sympathy. Because they believed him capable of good, he came to believe so too. They took this refuse which the world rejected, and transfigured

him into something new. He lived to be exemplary. Then they christened him and named him afresh, and his old name, whatever it was, is forgotten. At Clairvaux, in graceful allusion to his constancy in Christian life, he was known as Brother Constantius, whose humble goodness added lustre to those sacred cloisters, and who thus repaid the Abbot's loving care.

In this pathetic incident Bernard was certainly many centuries in advance of his time. Before an age quite reckless of the individual life, and forgetful of the possibilities which lay concealed beneath the most degraded, he set an ideal profoundly Christian. There are indeed sins which according to the Highest Sanction death alone can expiate. But there is much in modern European criminal codes which to Bernard's mind would need rectification. The effacement of the criminal so far as this world is concerned may be indeed the simplest way in which human selfishness can remove a perplexing problem from its path. Infinitely nobler is that ideal which aims at no mere self-protection but at the regeneration of the fallen and the lost. Bernard's sincere humanity was the outcome of a firm grasp of the principle of the Incarnation. And the Abbot of Clairvaux has a message still to deliver to the nineteenth century, and indeed any century yet to come, until the day when Christian principles are entirely carried out in life.

From the cloisters of Clairvaux came many a

message of gladness back to the common world, from men who had found therein the satisfaction of their deepest religious needs. Peace and serene joy were evidently their portion, and they must needs communicate the fact to the struggling multitudes outside. One ever memorable sentence expressing gladness of heart rings out from those monastic solitudes, urging upon the world the happiness of serving GOD. We are familiar with the phrase, GOD Whose service is perfect freedom. From Clairvaux they wrote,—Cui servire regnare est,—to serve GOD is to reign.[39]

And the fame of Clairvaux increased.

One night in Bernard's dream the little Community seemed to extend, until at last the whole valley was filled with dense masses of human beings, and there was no more space remaining. And Bernard rose with exultation, for he knew that it signified the expansion of the Order beyond all expectation. So indeed it happened. Bernard's virtues drew to the monastic gates crowds of the cultured and the wealthy, and men of rank and high office in secular life.

The College at Clairvaux became a refuge to the serious and the devout and the repentant. It would be a wonderful narrative of human nature could the story of each person be written who came to Clairvaux's gates: how Eschylus the missionary Archbishop sought rest and died there;[40] how Gunnar, a noble and a magistrate, resigned his

high office and sought Bernard's companionship; how Simon, Abbot of another order of the Black Friars, asked permission to become a simple monk in Bernard's Community; how a skilled physician, much sought after in those days, laid aside his lucrative post and joined the brotherhood.

Geoffrey of Perrone, a young man of noble birth, was one of the throng whom Bernard's personal influence attracted to Clairvaux. But Geoffrey's relatives had no desire to see the hope of their house extinguished in a cloister. They had widely different ambitions. Bernard however prevailed. He wrote in gentle sympathetic terms to the disconsolate parents, urging that if GOD has made their son His own, neither they nor their son can have lost by it. If they loved him they will rejoice that he has gone to his FATHER. The claim of GOD'S Fatherhood over all His children, as higher even than the claims of human paternity, comes very naturally from Aleth's son. It is Bernard's mother, it is Bernard's own reminiscences which echo here. To Geoffrey himself Bernard wrote in glowing terms of approval. He told Geoffrey that if there was joy in the presence of the Angels of GOD over one sinner that repenteth, how much more in the conversion of so many who, once distinguished in the world for learning, wealth, and ability, were by that very fact so much the more influential in worldliness. S. Paul had said that not many noble, not many

wise, not many mighty were chosen. But now the mighty power of GOD had converted these. Men are learning to despise ambition, to estimate rightly the worth of worldly wisdom, to abandon the longings of human love, to consider honours and dignities as valueless for CHRIST'S sake. The hand of GOD is in all this. Let Geoffrey persevere.[41]

A young Englishman on his way from Lincoln to the Holy Land, knocked at the monastery gate in 1129, but after a few days spent at Clairvaux, he did not wish for a holier land. He sought permission to continue there. Accordingly Bernard wrote to the Bishop of Lincoln for his sanction. Your Philip, he said, was longing for Jerusalem, and has found it more quickly than he thought. He has become not merely a visitor but an inhabitant and citizen of Jerusalem, not that earthly one, but of that which is free.[42]

Clairvaux was to open its gates to many applicants, to the sons of kings, as well as to the condemned criminal. But among all proofs of the Abbot's influence there is none more striking than the fact that Clairvaux opened its gates to the two remaining members of Bernard's own family.

A.D. 1118. Tecelin, the aged father, came to end his days among his children at Clairvaux. From Bernard's hands he received the religious habit. He would not be distinguished from the rest in any way. He was content to be a lowly monk in the house where Bernard ruled.

So Tecelin passed the brief remainder of his years, and finally died in Bernard's arms.

Bernard's sister Humbeline was the last to come. Humbeline appeared before the lowly dwelling, magnificently arrayed. Her retinue was an imposing sight. But she waited at the monastery doors in vain. Imperturbable calm reigned everywhere. Not a soul except the porter would come to give her greeting. The sensational was out of place there. The attractions of worldly pomp had no influence. Not one of her five brothers would speak to her. "If I am a sinner," she exclaimed, "at least it was for sinners that CHRIST died; and because I am a sinner, therefore need I counsel and advice. And if my brother disowns my relationship, let not the servant of GOD despise my soul. Let him command me, and I will obey." Then Bernard and the brethren issued forth. He bade her discard the parade and frivolousness of her social life, and live as her saintly mother had done before her. With these words he sent her away.

Humbeline returned to her mansion with a heart deeply moved. She laid aside her costly robes. She exchanged her luxurious mode of living for self-denial and simplicity. And the astonished world beheld the woman who once moved as a queen in the best circles of social life, henceforward dedicated to austerity, devotion, and deeds of love. Time rolled away, and Humbeline, like Bernard,

became foundress of a community in which she lived until she died.[43]

And the strong personality, the human centre round which all this community life gathered, the personal influence which held it all together, and controlled these widely contrasted elements, and bound these different temperaments and characters in one, was, under GOD, S. Bernard.

Singularly self-forgetting was his loving forethought for every member of his house. He seemed ever watchful to ward off the possibility of offending another. His penetrating insight instantly knew when and why a brother was displeased. He studied their characters, and dealt with each temperament according to its special needs. With the laborious, he would lighten their burdens; with the indolent, he would insist on zealous work. Their physical strength, their mental peculiarities, their tastes, and likes and dislikes, he seemed thoroughly to understand. Himself perpetually hindered by bodily weakness, he was ever providing some comfort of mind or body for the sick members of his house. This man is overworked, that cannot digest his food, this believes himself unfairly treated. So it ever was. The cares of the community, and all its trials, rested upon Bernard, and his genial, buoyant spirit was the support of all.

Such was Bernard's standard of duty. He held office not for his own advantage, but for the service of other men. In a few simple words, he has left

on record his ideal. He described for Abbot Rainald's use what he thought a ruler in the Church should be. A ruler in the Church is to bear the burden of souls, chiefly of those who are weak; for the strong need not to be supported, and in this respect are no burden. But to the melancholy, the weak, the discontented, Rainald must be as their father. He must console, exhort, reprove. He is sent to help others, not to be himself assisted. Thus is he the vicar of Him Who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.[44]

LECTURE IV.

BERNARD AS A MONASTIC REFORMER.

THE previous narrative has shown something of the inner life of a Religious House, and the fluctuations in its prosperity. Sometimes a Convent would almost perish. Sometimes the sons of the prophets would say to the Abbot, "Behold now, the place where we dwell is too strait for us." (2 Kings vi. 1.) Hence the multiplication of convents, in each of which the life of the parent house was reproduced. But the standard of severity varied greatly. Sometimes a lax and easy-going spirit would gradually settle within the walls where formerly intense devotion reigned, and iron discipline was loved. Then a new generation would enter in; a revival of the ascetic spirit began. The more self-indulgent brothers would rebel against a severer reign. And then the ardent-minded would leave them in possession, and issue forth to conquer some distant solitude, to live in literal fidelity to the severest principles of the great monastic founders long before. Historians have repeatedly called attention to this wonderful capacity which the monastic principle possessed of

recovering its youth and beginning anew.[45] Most true was it of the convent life, "They shall renew their strength like the eagle."

Then there would frequently exist in neighbouring regions religious houses in various stages of ascendency or decline. Here the ascetic spirit would be dominant to the last extreme. There a more lenient rule would find its home. This was the case between Clairvaux and Cluny.[46]

Cluny was founded in the year 912, and had passed through many vicissitudes under an illustrious line of Abbots, Berno and Odo, and the distinguished Hugh, who ruled there for sixty years. Privileges innumerable were showered upon Cluny by successive Popes. If an interdict were laid upon the land, the Altars of Cluny alone were exempt from that terrible suspension. The Abbots of Cluny were raised to the dignity of Cardinals. But increased favour and increased prosperity entailed dangers which in a simpler age Cluny never knew. The primitive zeal for self-denial faded away; slackness invaded the sacred precincts; discipline no longer prevailed. A piteous change, an almost incredible change, had not experience proved it—so thought the chronicler—passed over the standard of Cluny. Spiritual apathy was the parent of endless sins; it acted like rust upon the mind; it consumed as the moth; it crept in subtly, unobserved, and ruined everything.

The wealth of Cluny became enormous, and with wealth came luxury. Abbot Pontius,[47] successor to the saintly Hugh, became a scandal in Christendom. Pontius paraded in public with a retinue which eclipsed many a ducal court.

A.D. 1119. Pontius appeared at a Synod at Rheims at which the Pope presided. The Archbishop of Lyons seized his opportunity, and accused the powerful Abbot of invading the episcopal prerogative, and of unjust usurpations. The monks of Cluny were in ill odour in the diocese of Lyons. Pontius calmly retorted that he had wronged nobody, that he was entirely within the rights which the Pope had given, that Cluny was not under episcopal supervision, but was a peculiar of the Pope, to whose decision he referred the whole matter. Amid great uproar and discontent the Pope sheltered Pontius from his accusers. But it was impossible that this decision should be final. The more religious-minded monks of Cluny could not endure the extravagant administration through which their House was made notorious. They appealed a second time to Rome.

Pontius found that he had gone too far. In proportion to the popular reverence for genuine devotion was the indignant outbreak against this worthless counterfeit. The secularized Abbot saw that the tide was turned against him. Finding himself unable to hold his own, he was seized with a timely fit of suitable remorse. He abdicated,

disappeared on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, there, as it would seem, to spend the remainder of his days in penitential seclusion and amendment. Great was the relief at Cluny. They had heard the last of Pontius. Peace was restored, a successor chosen, and a more respectable level of religious life began again. Cluny resumed its usual occupations. But to the general horror Pontius reappeared. An armed and turbulent throng endeavoured by force to replace him at the head of the Convent. Pontius was excommunicated, and shortly afterwards died.

A.D. 1122.

To the headship of this troubled Community succeeded the Abbot Peter, commonly known as Peter the Venerable, of Cluny. Peter of Cluny was, on general attestation of all men, gifted with a most gracious and winning nature. Generous, kindly, liberal-minded, he was entangled in many disputes, but always knew how to pour oil on the troubled waters, and to find the appropriate reply to an irritated opponent. The whole collection of his letters is pervaded by a remarkable gentleness, courtesy, forbearance, a strong and deeply Christian disposition. Peter was exactly suited to guide the fortunes of Cluny through their dangerous crisis.

Between Cluny and Clairvaux serious jealousies arose. The monks of Clairvaux robed themselves in white, those of Cluny in black. Out of this trivial circumstance began a violent dispute. If

the white friars and black friars met in the streets they regarded each other as curiosities or monstrosities. If a black-robed monk came upon a group of Cistercians, conversation instantly ceased.[48]

But the difference lay deep within.

The severe and fervent inmates of Clairvaux looked askance upon the manners and customs which even Peter found it necessary to tolerate while he could not but condemn. Clairvaux rebuked the self-indulgence prevalent at Cluny. Cluny retorted by expressing regret at the youthful self-righteousness of Clairvaux. Cluny, founded 200 years before, with its line of illustrious superiors, looked down with complacent indifference on the little upstart house at Clairvaux.

The quarrel raged. It was kindled between the monks of each order, but both Bernard and Peter were drawn in to share in the dispute. In the vivid pages of an Apology, Bernard rebuked his own community for blindness to their own defects, and then with no sparing hand he chastised the convent of Cluny for the luxurious habits, which they made no attempt to reform. First reminding his own order, that variety in unity was the principle of Christendom; that Noah, Daniel, and Job represented three types of sanctity, but were members of the same religious kingdom; that Martha and Mary alike could please our LORD; that it was not reasonable to expect all classes of minds to be

included within the limitations of any one particular monastic rule; that Cluny and Cistercium were differently gifted; that humility in costly raiment was better than pride in rags; that if GOD clothed Adam in furs and skins, and John Baptist wore a leather girdle, there was no cause to object if the monks at Cluny did the same; that if they drank wine at Cluny, S. Paul had recommended S. Timothy to do this very thing; that our LORD had given wine to His Apostles at Cana; and that there was such a thing in history as the waters of contradiction, bitterness, and strife. (Numb. xx. 13.)

But, on the other hand, to Cluny, he must tell the plain and simple truth, although it be severe; for it is better to offend a man, than forsake the truth. Bernard was shocked, and was forced to say so, at the scandalous self-indulgences predominant in the convent at Cluny. The saintly founders of monastic life had indeed mercifully tempered the ascetic rule to the special requirements of the infirm and the sickly; but the luxury of Cluny was totally at variance with the spirit of a simpler age. Contrast the days of S. Anthony. The elaborate table at Cluny, with its variety of dishes and excellent cooking, was a grief to the severe-minded Abbot of Clairvaux. And as to wines, did not S. Paul say, drink a *little?* Cluny, in its better days, under Odo and Hugh, was a stranger to these innovations. The monks had become most particular about their

dress. Bernard gives a ludicrous description of a monk going shopping for a new cassock, turning over heaps of patterns, holding them up to the light, and testing the quality of the goods. He has not scorn enough for this excessive regard for costume. Cluny was radically wrong. The Abbot appeared with the gorgeousness of secular chieftaincy. It was scarcely credible, but Bernard had seen with his own eyes an Abbot with sixty horsemen. You would take them, not for fathers of monastic houses, but lords of a fortress; not guides of souls, but masters of provinces. When they issued forth into the streets, were it only a stone's throw, they came furnished with baggage, as if going to the wars or crossing a desert, where the commonest necessaries of life could not be found. The luxurious bedrooms, the elaborate coverlets, the numerous servants, are all alike subjected to Bernard's severe criticism. The Cistercian rejoiced in a severe simplicity in the architecture of his churches. Cluny elaborated the very stonework into the quaintest, most fantastic, and gorgeous intricacy. Bernard strongly disapproved. With Puritan austerity he condemned the costly fabrics, the marble pavements, the paintings, the precious gems, the golden candelabra, in which the Cluniac delighted. They who came out from among the people, he exclaims, leaving the world's beauty and costliness for CHRIST'S sake, were they to be again mingled among the Gentiles, and learn their

works? The church was brilliant in colouring of its walls, but outside were the poor, the starving. They clothed the very stones with gold, but they neglected the destitute. Forms of saints inserted in the mosaic pavement, and perpetually trodden in the dust, were to his mind most inappropriate. You could not walk, but you trod on the face of an angel. But Bernard was scandalized most of all by the monstrous and imaginary shapes, fierce or ludicrous, half beast half human, into which the stonework was distorted. The grinning features, the grotesque combinations, the fantastic gurgoyle, the secular and the spiritual, the awful and the irreverent, forced into violent contrast and companionship. All these were to the Abbot of Clairvaux very painful. "Good heavens!" he exclaimed, "if they are not ashamed of foolishness, let them at least grow sick of their extravagances."

Bernard's disquisition was probably directed chiefly against the luxurious *régime* of Pontius. But his language hit too hard to be easily forgiven. Abbot Peter also had his turn.

To Peter these disputes were infinitely distressing; and the Abbot of Cluny wrote to the Abbot of Clairvaux, deprecating such exhibitions of human littleness. In a letter, at once satirical, courteous, argumentative, Peter appeals to Bernard to unite with him in suppressing the jealous rivalries between their respective orders.[49]

Every divergence at Cluny from the Benedictine

rule had been vigilantly noted and severely reprehended by the monks of Clairvaux,[50] and Peter cannot help recalling the irony of the Prophet; Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou. He reminds Clairvaux that their adoption of the white garb was a mark of singularity not permitted by the rule, nor found elsewhere in Christendom. These little trifling diversities ought not on either side to be magnified into questions of life and death. Certainly the monks were bound to S. Benedict's rule; but while bound to the rule, much more are they bound to the Gospel. What is wanted on either side is love. Love is the fulfilling of the law. S. Augustine truly said, "Habe charitatem et fac quidquid vis." Ancient rules must sometimes become obsolete, or bend to the requirements of the age. Peter was for considerateness. The excessive austerities of Clairvaux appeared to him ill advised. The exact amount of abstinence must be left to pious discretion and local needs. Part must be voluntary. They who abstain entirely from wine have their own reward; but concessions must be permitted to human infirmities. Cluny did not prostrate themselves before every guest, recognizing CHRIST in the persons of the poor; nor did they wash the feet of every one who came, as Clairvaux did. Rules like this, said Peter, were means to an end, which end was salvation of souls. Hence they must be interpreted by that discretion which the rules expressly accorded to the Abbot.

"You, O white friar," exclaims Peter, "why cannot you tolerate your brother's blackness—blackness not of mind, but only of dress? You, black friar, cannot you endure your brother's whiteness—not of mind, but only of dress? Can anything be more puerile? Has it any inseparable connection with Redemption? Why should the colour of a dress alienate monks from their brethren?" Abbot Peter proceeds to comfort Cistercium and Cluny alike with the reflection that ancient precedents exist both for white dresses and for black, and shows with gentle satire the virtues and the drawbacks of the one and the other. He sees good in both uses, and will give the preference to neither. Let there be only more charity, and the quarrel will instantly disappear.

So Peter endeavoured to conciliate the divergent spirits in Clairvaux and Cluny. He reminded Clairvaux that a too rigid adherence to the letter of the rule was the cause of many difficulties in Clairvaux itself; that their thin winter dress, and insufficient protection against the inclemency of frost and snow, was a needless cruelty, a departure from charity, the cause of many complaints, and the reason for many failures, being dangerous to health, and liable to incapacitate them for the active service of GOD. And then Peter, evidently with reference to the attack on Cluny, observed: "Yes, we are proud, we are in the wrong, we are sinful. But the sins of a brother ought not

to be published in the church, nor the failings of monks made the talk of the people. Bishop Augustine would not have acted so. His rule was, where the sin arises, there let it die, nor should its correction be known further than the offence itself was heard of."

But Peter was not impartial when he claimed for Cluny exemption from episcopal supervision, as being a peculiar of Rome. Peter attempted to defend this on very inadequate grounds. What bishop, he asked, had better claim to their obedience, than he who ruled by divine right over all other bishops? So Peter misunderstood the text, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Gregory VII. (A.D. 1077) had exempted Cluny from all local interference, and this custom held in other places.

But, notwithstanding this sharp encounter, the heads of the rival orders were both too large-hearted to let friendship grow cold, or mutual sympathy become suppressed by stress of controversy. They reverenced and loved each other. They continued an unbroken correspondence, which still remains to testify to the generous character of two great but widely different men. But with the justice of Bernard's charge of extravagance, Abbot Peter fully concurred. Resolved upon restoring his house to primitive simplicity, the Abbot of Cluny had a harder task than fell to Bernard's share, for he was not on the wave of a first enthusiasm in a newly

founded convent, but at the head of an ancient house, which had fallen from its first estate. And to restore is harder than to build. Peter was, however, determined at all risk to enforce severer discipline. He issued letters to the daughter monasteries in Italy and in England, summoning all the priors to meet at Cluny on the third Sunday in Lent. A monk who was present on an occasion so memorable in the annals of Cluny, describes how 200 priors and 1200 brothers joined in the long procession through the cloisters from the abbey church to the chapel of S. Mary.[51] The venerable abbot laid before the whole order the rules from which their houses had grievously fallen, and insisted on the duty of a closer conformity with their spirit. Peter could not effect all he wished. The conservative instinct in a bad tradition was too strong. Murmurs were heard about removing ancient landmarks. Hard things were said about Cistercian novelties, want of compassion. But the abbot gained a great deal. And when the assembly was broken up, the influence of his words was felt far and wide in every convent affiliated to the order.

A reformer of monastic orders is easily led to excessive severity. Merciless towards himself, Bernard, at least in his earlier years at Clairvaux, did not always display sufficient consideration for human infirmities.

Robert, Bernard's kinsman, a young man of good

intentions but wavering character, found the discipline of Clairvaux a bitterness to the flesh. The monks of Cluny heard of it, and visiting Clairvaux during Bernard's absence, induced the novice to take flight, and to shelter himself under the more humane *régime* of Abbot Peter. Bernard sent the faint-hearted Robert a strong letter of mingled self-reproach and disapproval.[52] He confesses that for Robert's departure he has himself to blame. He was harsh and austere, and had repelled him by inconsiderate dealing with the faults of youth. He promises that Robert shall find him changed. But he cannot resist sarcastic sketches of Robert in his prim new attire, in the luxurious environment of Cluny, where, to his soul's peril, he was being petted and spoiled. Then growing sorrowful and indignant, Bernard describes the Cluniacs sending to Rome for the Pope's sanction. Vainly did they talk of Apostolic absolution to a man whose conscience was bound by his vows before GOD. It was written, "No man putting his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of GOD." S. Luke ix. 61. If Robert had left Clairvaux in order to discipline his nature, and lead a more self-denying life, well and good. But if he was exchanging a career to which he had solemnly engaged himself, for a career more congenial to the sinful flesh, then he was "looking back," and to look back is apostasy. "My son," cries Bernard, in a Scriptural strain, "I say this not

A.D. 1119.

to shame you, but as my most beloved I warn you; for though you have many instructors in CHRIST, yet have you not many fathers." Bernard is like the woman who stood before Solomon, when her son had been stolen away. So he writes, mingling sarcasm and rebuke, and concludes with a passionate appeal: "Arise, O soldier of CHRIST, arise, shake yourself free from the dust, return to the battle whence you fled, and you shall become more glorious by contrast with your flight." Son Robert read that letter, and its fatherly appeal touched and subdued him. He forsook the easier life of Cluny, came back to Bernard's arms, and became distinguished in the order, and abbot of one of its daughter houses.

The celebrated monastery of S. Victor, in the suburbs of Paris, was at that time the home of three illustrious hymn writers and learned men—Adam and Richard and Hugh.[53] Bernard corresponded with Hugh of S. Victor on various theological questions. These are interesting, as showing the prevalent ideas in the twelfth century. Some were teaching the narrowest and most exclusive theory of salvation. They asserted that the unbaptized, whether they lived before Christianity or beyond its range, were infallibly lost. The large-hearted teacher of Clairvaux indignantly repudiated this uncatholic conception. Were the whole Jewish millions before CHRIST came inevitably lost, although they obeyed the sacrament of

circumcision? Unhappy ages indeed, when no remedy prevailed. Was the Almighty sleeping, and no one found for the work of redemption? There was an ignorance, indeed, which is sinful, born of carelessness, when men know not, because they will not know. Such ignorance has no excuse. But there is an ignorance which is inevitable. Can you condemn for that? Quite different was the case of those who knew and despised the Sacrament, from those who never heard.

These maintainers of the narrow theory also asserted that even those who wished to receive Holy Baptism, yet died without it, were lost. No reality of penitence or faith could atone for unavoidable absence of the visible Sacrament, except to the martyr alone, forgetting that, while it is written, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved," it is not written, he that is not baptized shall be condemned, but he that believeth not (S. Mark xvi. 16,) showing that faith in certain cases will suffice, and that without faith nothing will prevail. If martyrdom is accepted, it is for its faith. When baptism cannot be had, the will is taken for the deed.[54]

Most distinguished among the abbeys of France was the church and monastery of S. Denys, at Paris. Its splendid height, its vast nave,—400 feet long,—its marble paved choir, its windows, were the glory of the nation. At the head of this illustrious house was Suger, confidential adviser to the

French king. Abbot Suger copied the magnificence of kings. He appeared in public encircled with all the pomp of a gorgeously equipped cavalry. Bernard was scandalized. But a change, probably through Bernard's influence, came over Suger's life. The Abbot of S. Denys discarded his secular parade, divested himself of his expensive attire, dismissed the crowd of attendants, and betook himself to a life more in harmony with his profession. The throng of soldiers, secular personages, women, who had invaded the precincts, disappeared at Suger's bidding. Religious peace was restored, discipline reigned. The cloisters were dedicated afresh to silence and meditation. The world was amazed. Bernard rejoiced. This wonderful man's most wonderful influence in religious reform invigorated all he touched. Men of all kinds bowed before his moral ascendancy. Relatives and strangers, high born and lowly, all alike acknowledge Bernard's truth and Bernard's influence. He is an apostle of the self-denying life. The Abbot of Clairvaux wrote to his illustrious brother of S. Denys, to express the gladness with which he welcomed Suger as an advocate of Christian simplicity in the priestly life. Bernard dwelt forcibly on the impossibility of combining in the same person the offices of the warrior and the priest. It was totally incongruous to hold secular office, and yet robed in priestly garb, pronounce the Gospel in the church and offer the Eucharist.

It was wonderful that the Church did not expel her military priests, or the Court its priestly soldiers.[55] Every word which Bernard wrote on such a theme was a strong condemnation of the secular life which even Pope Innocent sanctioned by his own example.

It is peculiarly interesting to us as Englishmen to know that Bernard's zeal in monastic reform was felt in the religious houses of England. The great Convent of S. Mary at York, founded but a few years before, had lamentably departed already from the Benedictine Rule. But Bernard's monks rested there for a while on a Mission of Reform. The result is most graphically described in a letter from Thurstan,[56] the celebrated Archbishop of York, to William Archbishop of Canterbury. Archbishop Thurstan, a great and noble-minded man, the unworldly, disinterested, fearless opponent of King Henry I. in defence of the interests of his Province, was himself most ascetic, and a strong advocate of all such reforms as tended to lift the religious houses toward their high ideal. In S. Mary's Convent the exemplary conduct of Bernard's brethren made a deep and permanent impression upon the more devout and thoughtful members of the House. The better sort were "ashamed to rest in the borders of Moab, while they had received an inheritance across the Jordan."

Convinced of laxity and self-condemned, they ventured to approach the Prior, and communicated

to him their longing for a stricter standard of life, more in conformity alike with their spiritual needs and the Rule which they had undertaken to obey. Prior Richard hesitated but sympathized. Eventually he was won over to complete agreement with them, and pledged himself to support the movement to the utmost of his power. Thirteen brothers resolved to live more nearly after their founder's rule. But thirteen were only a small minority in the Convent of York. Nor were the majority likely to sympathize in the least degree with any longing after increased severity. Accordingly Prior Richard with whom the practical management of the Community rested, held a private consultation with his Abbot, on the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul, taking with him Gervase the Subprior as his supporter. Abbot Galfrid, an illiterate and otherwise undistinguished person, was dismayed. Honest, well-intentioned man, but intensely conservative in a bad tradition, Galfrid saw with alarm the restless spirit of reform, the eagerness for fresh ideals invade his house. Supremely distasteful as innovations were alike to his natural bent and life-long habits, he was more than satisfied to let things continue in the old routine, and declared himself powerless to change customs which even if not ideally the best, had long ago become traditionally respectable.

Prior Richard apologized. He deprecated the idea that he had been snared by an innovating spirit.

He knew well that various orders existed, and he coveted no man's ideals. He knew that Job served GOD better on a dunghill than Adam in a Paradise. All he wanted was conformity to the rule of S. Benedict, which he had vowed he would obey. He was absolutely convinced that indolence was destructive to the soul. The Benedictine rule assigned special hours for study and for prayer, for work and industry. Above all, it insisted upon silence and meditation. Richard's chief complaint was the endless loss of time in idle gossip and profitless conversation alike hurtful to the monks' character and contradictory to the rule. After contrasting in various details the Founder's rule and the actual condition of the Convent, the Prior added, It was not thus that our father Benedict taught. Let us return to a simple life. That this could be done was certain, for they had seen it with their own eyes. The monks of Clairvaux had so lived in their very presence in York. In these men the Gospel standard seemed realized. They were living representatives of the Christian spirit; they did not seek their own; they held no possessions of any kind; having food and raiment they were literally therewith content. They seemed to have a right to use the Apostle's language,—"the world is crucified unto us, and we unto the world." Happy and holy race of men, whose manners and life and whole ideal corresponded with such striking exactness with

that of the Gospel; GOD was their portion. Contemplating these facts, urged Prior Richard, it was useless to say that the evangelical standard of life was inaccessible. Bernard's monks had attained it, and he aspired to be like them. Abbot Galfrid listened regretfully to his Prior's theories. The new enthusiasm was not to his liking, but he honestly admitted that he was not a learned man, and was anxious to do what was best. What he stipulated for was time to consider the Prior's suggestions.

Meanwhile the news of the interview between Abbot and Prior got wind in the Convent. Rumours of impending reforms roused general anger and opposition. The monastery was in a ferment. Tongues were busy vehemently condemning the Prior's interference, and unless the more moderate had intervened, Richard would scarcely have been safe from bodily injury. Soon the disturbance became known in the city, and the Archbishop heard that S. Mary's Convent was in an uproar. Prior Richard departed with the Subprior Gervase to seek the Archbishop's advice.

"I therefore, Thurstan, by the grace of GOD Archbishop of York, understanding that these servants of CHRIST desired nothing but to serve Him more truly after Benedict's rule, feared lest I should wrong the Divine grace if I came not to their assistance."

The great Chapterhouse was thronged with

monks, as Archbishop Thurstan, and Canon Serlo, and Archdeacon Hugh, and Canon Aufred the Archbishop's Chaplain came to the Convent gate. But when Thurstan began to remonstrate, the entire chapter burst out into fierce uproar. They howled at the Archbishop. They conducted themselves, says Thurstan, more like infuriated drunkards than sober-minded monks, they stormed round the terrified minority who in their helplessness clung to the Archbishop. In this wild scene of utter confusion Thurstan stood dignified, calm, fearless. He had before this witnessed King Henry's furious outburst of temper, and was not to be beaten by the unruly throng. Without hesitation he at once placed the Convent under an interdict.

"GOD is witness," exclaimed the Archbishop, "that I came to you as a father, with the sole purpose of restoring Christian peace among you. But since you endeavour to thwart me in the exercise of my office and authority, I am compelled to take away the privileges granted you—your Church is closed."

"Let it be closed for a hundred years," retorted Simeon, a turbulent monk. And the disrespectful answer was echoed on every side. They would do anything rather than submit to the proposals of reform. "Seize them, seize them," cried the mob. And the Prior with his twelve escaped with difficulty from their infuriated brothers.

So they turned away reluctantly from the Con-

vent of S. Mary, baffled in the effort to reform, and departed from the wealthy foundation destitute and friendless, having no worldly possessions save the robes which marked their order, but strong in the sense of having sacrificed all to the spirit of their Rule, and in faithfulness to the severer life. Then the good Archbishop befriended them, and took the cause of reform under his protection, and provided for their immediate necessities.

Difficulties ensued. Two of the thirteen found their courage fail them. Gervase and Ralph yielded to the sore temptation to return to the wealthy foundation at York. "You are not better than your fathers," said the people. They re-entered. But Gervase's heart misgave him. Once more he summoned strength, and went forth again to Fontaines, and there was faithful. They chose Richard as their abbot. The new abbot had a community, but no dwelling, no means, no possessions. They slept under a great elm, and sang the midnight offices beneath the trees. So they began to build. In the midst of a beautiful well-watered valley, lands were given them, and a noble church arose, known to this day in its ruins as Fountains Abbey. Fountains was a name appropriate to the natural springs of the valley, but it was also a name peculiarly dear to Bernard, since it recalled Fontaines, his birthplace. The name then was probably given at Bernard's suggestion. The attempted reform at York met with his warm ap-

A.D. 1132.

proval. Bernard's ideal was before their minds, and they sent messengers to Clairvaux, saying that Clairvaux should be their mother, and Bernard their father. Then Abbot Bernard was glad at heart, and wrote to Richard and his brethren right joyfully: Out of weakness ye have grown strong, ye have flourished in newness of life. The finger of GOD is here. Would that Bernard might cross over and see with his own eyes this gladdening sight. You will more easily see secular men become religious, than religious men rising to something better. A monk whose later years surpassed the level of his early zeal, was a rare bird on earth.

And Bernard also wrote to the good Archbishop of York. Thurstan's works of mercy and almsgiving were long ago in all the Churches, but this episcopal care of the religious orders was the crown and the glory of his career. It is a good thing to feed the hungry, and it is a greater thing to kindle zeal, for the one is nature, and the other grace.

Bernard had a more difficult task when, in answer to a letter of complaints, he wrote to Abbot Galfrid. The Abbot of Clairvaux was evidently anxious to speak gently with an aged religious, with whom, however, he could not really sympathize. As to Gervase and Ralph, if they had continued as they were at first, they were justified; if they rose to a higher level, they did better. And if they returned to

their easier life, "I will not condemn them," says Bernard; "for the LORD knows who are His, and every man shall bear his own burden. But I will speak what I think. If I, Bernard, rise from good to better, and then go back to my former state, I become apostate. It is putting my hand to the plough, and looking back."

But Bernard could not but bear the English house in his mind. Anxious for their advance, he sent them, at their request, from his own community at Clairvaux, a saintly brother, to impress upon the English branch the rules of their holy institution. "Go with these men," said Bernard, "and teach them what thou knowest." But brother Galfrid had no wish to visit the English shores. He was old, and the time of dissolution could not be far off. He longed to end his days at Clairvaux; there would he die, and there would he be buried. "Fear not," said Bernard, "I myself will bury you here."

So brother Galfrid issued forth from Clairvaux, and crossed the seas, and entered the community at Fountains. They received him with deep respect. They heard the word from his lips, and kept it, embracing willingly with reverence his holy teachings. The Burgundian monk went back impressed with the English monastic character, their ready obedience, their frugal fare, their seriousness of life. He found them strong in faith, rooted in charity, zealous in hope, patient in poverty. Thus Galfrid's

mission was ended, and his heart's desire was fulfilled, for he speedily faded away in death, and Bernard's loving hands laid him to rest among his fathers.

And Abbot Richard of Fountains lived beloved of all men, and in after years they spoke of his peculiarly loving sympathy in confession as a spiritual guide. But Richard longed to visit Clairvaux, and wrote repeatedly to ask for Bernard's leave. Bernard, after many requests, at last reluctantly granted it, coupled however with the condition, that the chapter of Fountains approved. The chapter loved their good Abbot far too well to let him go. Yet the longing of Richard's heart was ultimately granted him, for the Abbots of the order were convened at Clairvaux, and there Richard was taken ill and died. For him also Bernard's loving care and sustaining faith were present in the dark passage to the grave. Thus Bernard's name was very dear to English hearts, as well as to those of his native land. "Blessed Bernard, of happy memory," wrote Hugh, monk of Kirkstall, "a noble-minded man, very zealous for the LORD GOD of hosts, sublime in sanctity, illustrious in doctrine, distinguished by wondrous deeds."

The reformer of monastic life gradually took a wider survey, and became a reformer of ecclesiastical laxity, wherever it existed. Men of high distinction sought Bernard as a spiritual adviser.

Bruno, being elected to the Archbishopric of Cologne, writes to inquire of Clairvaux whether he does well to accept such responsibilities. Bernard bids him weigh most solemnly the perils inseparable from that sacred office. From what we know of Bruno's life and character, he evidently mistrusts his fitness.[57] Bruno, however, was consecrated. After his consecration, a second letter from Clairvaux was placed in his hands: A.D. 1132.

"If election to the Episcopate includes entrance into the kingdom of heaven, then is the Archbishop of Cologne secure of everlasting bliss. But if Saul was divinely chosen to a kingdom, and Judas to a bishopric, as indeed the Scriptures teach, then the Archbishop of Cologne has cause to be afraid. If, further, not many noble, not many powerful, not many wise are called, has not the Archbishop of Cologne a threefold reason to fear? 'If thou be made the master of the feast, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest.' Ecclus. xxxii. 1. 'The greater thou art, the more completely humble thyself in all things.' Eccl. iii. 20. It is the wise man who advises this, and indeed Wisdom Itself has said, 'He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger.'" S. Luke xxii. 26. Warnings of such a kind came from Bernard's lips with all the force of Bernard's unquestioned fidelity to the advice which he was giving. Perhaps no man ever lived more singularly free from personal ambition than Bernard of Clairvaux.

The Abbot of Chartres was filled with a longing to resign his charge, and, quite in the spirit of the age, make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. He sent to Bernard for advice. Bernard discourages any abdication of duty for such a purpose as this. Abbot Stephen has his work to do where he is, and this longing could not justify reliction of the charge entrusted to him. He ought not to lay his burden down, nor leave the souls whom he is bound to guide. Art thou bound to a wife, seek not to be loosed.[58] Abbot Stephen, however, had his way, and became the Latin Patriarch at Jerusalem.

Bernard is also in familiar correspondence with Haimeric, the Roman chancellor, and with Honorius, his master.[59] He receives courteous letters from Cardinal Peter Leo, afterwards notorious as Antipope, and destined to be overthrown by Bernard. At present all this is unsuspected by either actor in the tragic scene, and Bernard sends, at the Cardinal's request, copies of his sermons and his books on Humility, in the Virgin's Praise, and the Apology on monastic quarrels.[60]

Bernard is rapidly linked with the leading minds in Europe. He corresponds with Gilbert, Bishop of London, one of the most distinguished men of that age. Gilbert's immense accumulated learning in every department of human study earned him the title of "the universal." Bernard's communications with him are based on a common love of self-denial. It was no great thing for Gilbert to become a

bishop, but for a Bishop of London to live as an ascetic was great indeed.[61]

Oger, one of the canons regular, had been made superior of a religious house, but growing weary of his charge, Oger, with the Bishop's consent, resigned his office, and returned to the parent house as an ordinary brother. Bernard sharply rebuked him. The charge once undertaken ought not to be laid down. Oger had given way to the love of ease and quiet. Did not Scripture say, "Art thou bound to a wife, seek not to be loosed?" In one thing Oger was right. He had not secured his own independence, but returned and submitted himself to the parent house whence he came out. He was afraid to be his own master. Wise indeed. He who is his own master makes himself disciple to a fool. "Experience teaches me," added Bernard, "that it is easier to govern a houseful of men than to govern myself." But Bernard warns Oger that trials will arise from his return to a subordinate position. Do not expect honour because you were in honour once. Possibly another danger may arise. Human nature is fickle and uncertain, and the fascinations of to-day are repugnant to-morrow; while what we will not to-day, to-morrow we long for. Things become sweet in memory, which in reality were bitter. Distinction, household management, dispensing of affairs, obedience of subordinates, personal freedom, power over others—these may become dear after they have been left. What must

be aimed at is humility. And if you seek the grace of humility, you must not shun the road of humiliation. If you cannot bear the one, you will never secure the other. Bernard explains that Oger's letters found him overwhelmed with work, and were read during dinner, and the replies dictated in broken intervals snatched from other duty.[62]

Henry, Archbishop of Sens, had succumbed to laxity and worldliness. Afterwards, however, through the influence of Godfrey, Bishop of Chartres, Bernard's friend, the Archbishop began to amend his ways. Godfrey induced him to ask for Bernard's advice. The Superior of Clairvaux replied,[63] who was he to write to bishops? But, again, who was he that should not obey? Being commanded, he would speak. The Archbishop was called to an arduous and perilous work, needing perpetual prudence. He must never be impulsive in judgment, nor passionate in punishing; neither lax in things which must be corrected, nor severe where he ought to spare. Let him acquire reverence not for his magnificence, his horses, his princely surroundings, but for his character, religious studies, good works. He is a priest of the most high GOD. Whom will he please—GOD or the world? If the world, why is he a priest? If GOD, why does he resemble the world? Will he try to serve two masters? The friendship of the world is enmity with GOD. If I pleased men, I should not be the servant of CHRIST (S. James

iv. 4 ; Gal. i. 10). What business has a mere monk to judge bishops? Would it were possible to shut his eyes, and not see the scandals around him! The portion of the poor is squandered in luxury. The trappings of the horses glitter with gems, while the limbs of the poor are scarcely clad. Rings and bells and insignia are not the true accessories of an apostle. A bishop's real dignity consists in purity, humility, and charity. "Our glory is this, the testimony of our conscience." 2 Cor. i. 12. Nor will even that suffice. Even if I know nothing against myself, yet am I not hereby justified. I cannot adequately judge myself, because I do not adequately know. "He that judgeth me is the LORD." Bernard here loses all sight of the Archbishop, and pours out his soul to JESUS CHRIST.

Then the Abbot turns indignantly against the abuses of his day. Mere boys were advanced to ecclesiastical rank through family influence—youths just escaped from their masters at school. Not indeed that any age is premature to the grace of GOD, and sometimes the young have more understanding than their teachers, and compensate by goodness for what they lack in years. The whole evil lay in a ruinous ambition. Men will not be content. The priest must become an archdeacon, the archdeacon a bishop, the bishop a primate. And then he must needs haunt the palaces of Rome, to secure the vote of influential personages. "Is this all for the good of souls?" adds Bernard.

Then, with impressive directness, Bernard ventures to turn to the Archbishop of Sens. "When you were first elected to your throne, you wept, you declined it, you complained, you asserted that it was an office hopelessly beyond your power. You said you were wretched and unworthy, unequal to so holy a ministry, incapable of so solemn a charge. How is it that now all your fear and reverence have vanished away, and you go of your own accord in search of greater dignities than these, yea, with an irreverent boldness, not satisfied with your own, you invade the functions of others! Why is this? Is it all for the good of souls?"

The same spirit of ambition led superiors of religious houses to seek exemption from episcopal control. The mitred abbot, a monk wearing episcopal insignia, was now to be seen in Christendom. This mark of ambition Bernard cannot endure. The mitre is the emblem either of dignity or of administration. If dignity, it is unbecoming to a monk. If administration, the Abbot has no diocese. Work and silence and poverty are the insignia of the monk, and in these alone the dignity of the common life consists. But, he adds, declaiming against conventual ambition, "your eyes are turned towards every eminence, your feet wander in every public place, your tongues are heard in every assembly, your hands are upon the possessions of every man. They will claim one day to confer holy

orders themselves." So wrote Bernard to Henry, Archbishop of Sens, in 1126.

Beyond the monastery Bernard was concerned with raising the standard of life among the secular clergy. Beyond these, the intrepid Abbot stood forward as the champion of the oppressed: an office which will probably never be a sinecure on earth, but which was peculiarly needful in days when impulsiveness, caprice, arbitrary power were the frequent administrators of law. Theobald, Count of Champagne, according to the verdict of his contemporaries in many respects an admirable person, was fired with anxiety to efface the irrational practice of duelling. But in his praiseworthy zeal, he forgot all sense of proportion, and decreed that those who venturing upon single combat had the misfortune to be beaten, should suffer the further penalty of loss both of their eyes and their possessions. Humbert, one of Theobald's dependents, rendered himself liable to this cruel sentence, which was remorselessly carried out. The unhappy man and his wife and children were reduced to the lowest misery and destitution. The story came to Bernard's ears. In holy anger he wrote to the barbarous chief.[64] Was not Theobald afraid of the warning which is written, With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again? Did he not realize that it would be incomparably easier for GOD to disinherit him, than it was for him to disinherit Humbert? Justice

demanded that the unhappy victim's property be restored to him. The innocent children ought not to be deprived for their father's fault.

So pleaded Bernard with secular chieftains in behalf of justice and humanity.

Bernard's next vindication of justice takes a yet higher flight. The offender is a king.

A.D. 1127. Louis, surnamed the Fat, King of France, had in some way defrauded Stephen Bishop of Paris. The king refused to do justice. Stephen retaliated by employment of that most terrible spiritual weapon—the interdict. He suspended the exercise of religious offices throughout the diocese, and fled to take refuge at Cistercium.[65]

An interdict is thus described by an eye-witness. The sweet chants of the Catholic worship ceased, no solemn litany, no prayer, no absolution, no benediction was uttered throughout Paris. The Eucharistic Sacrifice ceased. The consolations of the Faith were denied to all except the dying. The marriage of believing men could not be celebrated. The churches were forsaken, the doors were locked, the church bells rang out no more across the city. Paris, so far as religion was concerned, became a desolation.[66] The awful silence was unendurable. Heaven itself had hid its face from them. Louis dared not brave the consequences of his action. Meanwhile in the cloisters of Citeaux the assembled Abbots of the Order wrote a bold warning letter to the throne of France.[67]

"Stephen, Abbot of Citeaux, and the whole congregation of Cistercian Abbots and brethren, to the illustrious Louis, King of the Franks, greeting.

"The King of Heaven and earth has accorded you a kingdom in this world, and will accord you one in Heaven, if you strive to administer with justice and wisdom, the realm you have received. This we desire of you, for this we intreat, that you may reign faithfully here, and happily hereafter. . . . . Serious charges are brought against you before the Church's LORD, while the Church experiences your hostility where she ought to have your defence. Do you realize against Whom you have raised your hand? It is not the Bishop of Paris, but the LORD of Paradise, the terrible One, He Who refrains the spirit of princes. (Ps. lxxvi. 12.) It is He Who says to the Bishops, Whoso despiseth you despiseth Me. (S. Luke x. 16.)"

King Louis had almost yielded, when to the amazement of the French Episcopate, he suddenly flourished in their faces a Papal rescript removing the interdict. Louis triumphed. Armed with Papal authority he defied the spiritual authorities of France, and the Bishops knew that their one effective weapon was ruthlessly taken away. Whatever Bernard's attitude to the Papacy might involve in reverence and devoted service, he was no advocate for blind submission or unreasoning obedience. The simple monk of Clairvaux spoke

out publicly with a freedom and a vigour which would startle a more subservient theory of Papal power.

Bernard wrote direct to the Pope Honorius. He stated that the grievous wrongs inflicted upon the Episcopate, nay upon the whole Church, could not be passed by in silence. A solemn necessity forced him into public action from the obscurity of his cloister. "We have seen it with sorrow, and with sorrow we speak. The honour of the Church is not a little impaired in the time of Honorius."[68]

How Pope Honorius received this rebuke of his conduct and jest upon his name is not recorded. But it was evident that fearless utterance of the simple truth was to be expected from the solitude of Clairvaux. Bernard received a letter from Rome apparently to the effect that a monk's place was the cloister, and that he had best not meddle in matters beyond his sphere. Bernard wrote again to Haimeric the Chancellor, explaining that he had been drawn into the affair by no will of his own, but by the order of his ecclesiastical superiors. Would indeed he had not been there; for he would have been spared the sight of tyranny armed by apostolic authority, and advancing thereby against the Church. He is glad to know that he may occupy himself with convent routine, assured that justice will at last be done. Let the frogs be told to keep within their caves, and be content with their marshes. Let them neither be

heard in councils nor met in palaces. His personal determination is not to quit the monastic precincts except on the business of the order, or under episcopal command. But for all that, he warns the Roman Curia that so long as Roman interference is thus exerted to the detriment of the absent, no silence on his part will avert the resistance of the Churches.[69]

LECTURE V.

THE SEVEN YEARS' SCHISM. 1130—1137.

THE life of the great Hildebrand (Gregory VII.) to whose powerful ascendency the See of Rome owes perhaps as much as to any other of her Bishops, was terminated in 1085, just six years before Bernard was born. The papacy then as Bernard knew it bore the impress of that masterful character. But Hildebrand's successors were not heirs to his genius. As he lay on the bed of death his Cardinals besought him to appoint a successor as Peter had appointed Clement. Hildebrand declined the privilege as contravening the Councils of the Church, but he advised the anxious electors that if they wanted a man powerful in the world they would do well to select Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino; if however they wanted an ecclesiastic and an eloquent man, let them select Odo, Bishop of Ostia, former Abbot of Cluny. It is a remarkable evidence of Hildebrand's power, that both Desiderius and Odo succeeded him.[70]

Desiderius took the name of Victor III., but his days were brief. He fell and died at the Altar in the act of celebrating. It was believed that he

was poisoned, were it not almost too horrible a suspicion, in the reception of the sacred chalice itself.

A.D. 1088.

Odo succeeded to the perilous pre-eminence, under the title of Urban II. Urban was distinguished as the instigator of the first Crusade. Urban guided the Church ten years, and was followed by Paschal II., who governed Western Christendom for the exceptionally lengthy period of twenty years, (1099—1118.) One of the main struggles which Bernard saw during Paschal's supremacy was the contest about investiture, in which he himself was destined to take his part. Then with singular and painful rapidity the See of Rome was a constant scene of consecration and funeral pageant, as the occupants of the papacy followed each other in swift succession to the throne and to the grave. After these came Honorius II., (1124—1139,) upon whose death Bernard was called upon to decide the contested succession.

The unbelieving gazed with wonder and contempt, the devout with profound distress on the sight of rival Cardinals aspiring to occupy the vacant papal chair. This was not the first time nor the last when Rome was the arena of a disputed succession. Pope Honorius was on the verge of death. Intrigue was already active in securing a successor. With precipitate haste a group of Cardinals elected Gregory, Cardinal priest of S.

Angelo, almost before the vacancy had occurred; some say before the dying man's last agony was past, or at least before his body was consigned to the grave. But another powerful section of Cardinals yet remained. Determined not to be baffled, these electors proceeded certainly at a more appropriate and becoming time, to confer the coveted distinction upon Cardinal Peter Leo. [71]

Peter Leo, son of a Jewish convert of enormous wealth, heir to a family which had rendered to the Church many important services, had been educated under most Catholic auspices in the Convent of Cluny, and had already appeared as Papal Legate in France in company with Gregory, whose rival he now became.

Thus the Church possessed two rival claimants to supremacy. Peter Leo assumed the name of Anaclete, and through family influence and personal ascendency occupied the Eternal City, where by the aid of his party he attempted to discharge the office of the papacy. Meanwhile Gregory, who had assumed the name of Innocent II., was supported by the Roman clergy, but found it impossible to continue within the walls of Rome.

Accordingly schism rent the very centre of Western Christendom. And the rivalry born there was necessarily repeated in miniature in every diocese and every kingdom. A contemporary historian describes the miserable results which followed. In many a diocese two Bishops arose, representing the

two rival claimants at Rome. In the very Convents two Abbots attempted to rule, one in behalf of Anaclete, the other of Innocent. It was exceedingly difficult to avoid excommunication, for each party fulminated against the party opposed; Bishops were ranged on either side; and the humble ranks of the unlearned may well be excused if they knew not how to discriminate between plausibly supported rival claims. To put an end one way or the other to these miserable disunions was of the highest importance to the well-being of Christendom.

Innocent sent his legates into France announcing his succession and claiming submission. Peter, Abbot of Cluny, returned an affectionate reply. Cluny was at the Pope's disposal. The venerable Abbey and all its brethren, and dependent houses would acknowledge Innocent as their head. Driven from his city, or guarding his flock, exiled or restored, Innocent was still their master. Peter in prison, Clement in exile, were just as truly primates and to be acknowledged as in the hour of their greatest prosperity.[72]

Innocent made a bold decision, which events amply justified. He determined to throw himself on the loyalty of France. Accordingly he sailed down the Tiber, and took refuge in the Convent of Cluny.

King Louis, in his perplexity, turned to his minister. Abbot Suger, however, was on this occa-

sion reluctant to exercise the dangerous office of adviser. All Christendom seemed involved in the decision, which however perplexing, was inevitably forced upon the attention of all the faithful, for not to acknowledge was practically to repudiate. Confronted with this vexed problem of succession, the King and his minister turned to the only man in France in whose clearness and discriminating power all alike confided. Upon the recluse of Clairvaux rested in a single hour the fate of Western Christendom and the peace of the Church. Louis VI. summoned a national assembly at Estampes, where the chief spiritual and lay personages of the realm met in council to hear Bernard's advice. Bernard's decision was already made. Summoned by episcopal authority and kingly invitation from the convent to the Council, Bernard threw the whole weight of his influence on Innocent's side.

From that moment Innocent prospered. With Bernard, Innocent had on his side Peter, Abbot of Cluny, and the powerful influences of the numerous Cistercian religious houses, the hundreds of Abbots, the thousands of monks who all acknowledged the orders of Citeaux. This adherence of Cluny was all the more remarkable as Anaclete was formerly a monk of that place.[73] Innocent himself continued to seek refuge from Italian violence amid the loyal devotion of France. And in all his visits to the French cities the Abbot of Clairvaux

is the Pope's almost inseparable companion, writing, speaking, visiting, persuading, denouncing, insisting with inexhaustible energy and activity, and a force of character and weight of influence which it was everywhere difficult to resist.

Innocent's arrival in France was met by lavish and generous offerings. The exile and the disowned was universally welcomed and reverenced. The wealthy House of Cluny sent sixty mules burdened with supplies for the Pope and Cardinals. The brethren conducted him to Cluny itself, and entertained him there with his retinue for eleven days.[74] The great Abbey Church of Cluny, with its five and twenty altars, one of the wonders of France, was just completed. Innocent himself proceeded to its dedication. All this unquestioning allegiance told immensely in Innocent's behalf.

One of the strangest incidents of Innocent's stay in France was a deputation from the Jews, who met him in Paris with the friendliest greeting, and presented him with a copy of the Old Testament. Innocent received them very graciously, and conversed with them. On parting he uttered an earnest prayer, "May the Almighty take away the veil from your hearts!"[75]

The French monarch Louis, chiefly through Bernard's influence, acknowledged Innocent's claim to the papal throne. Henry I. of England however by the advice of the English episcopate hesitated. "You fear lest to acknowledge Innocent

would be a sin. Leave that to me," exclaimed the intrepid Bernard, "answer to GOD for your other sins." Henry and England submitted.

Germany followed. Lothair the Emperor was urged to give in his allegiance. Fully conscious of the value of his support, Lothair hesitated. Upon the power of his army depended, humanly speaking, Innocent's return to Rome. Lothair determined to improve the occasion. If he accepted Innocent, then the Pope must make some concession in the vexed question of investitures.

The investiture was the form by which Bishops and other religious persons were admitted to the temporal possession of their office. This admission was conferred by the secular authorities, and was jealously regarded by the spiritual powers. The investiture thus involved the serious question as to the limits of spiritual and temporal power. Investiture was regarded by the King as an outward mark of allegiance to himself, it corresponded with the ancient consent of the laity in the choice of Bishops, it conveyed possession of endowments, houses or lands. But on the other hand investiture was regarded by the Pope as an invasion of the spiritual sphere. Gregory VII., better known as Hildebrand, had abrogated all right of lay investiture A.D. 1075. The question had received a further settlement at the Concordat of Worms, A.D. 1122, just eight years before Lothair raised this dispute.[76]

Great was the dismay of Innocent and his court. They were in a strange land, dependent largely upon the hospitality and protection of the German King, who thus dexterously chose the hour of the Pope's greatest weakness for pressing the kingly rights. But the ever watchful Bernard rose at once to the Pope's defence; and before his authority Lothair surrendered.

Bernard may be pardoned if he wrote back with exultation to the Convent of Clairvaux, describing how GOD had prospered his efforts. The Kings of Germany, France, England, Scotland, Spain, and Jerusalem, with their respective realms had all acknowledged Innocent.[77]

Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, found it exceedingly difficult to discriminate between the rival Popes. Bernard sent him an earnest letter, asserting that Innocent was set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, while in the person of his rival the abomination was standing in the holy place. Innocent is wronged, and innocence with him. He flees from the face of Leo, as it was written, "the lion roars, who will not fear?" (Amos iii. 8.) He has left Rome according to the precept, "if they persecute you in one city flee to another." Innocent had lost the city of Rome, but had gained the world. Shimei rages against David, (Gerard of Angoulême against Innocent,) but all the principal sovereigns of Europe had given in their allegiance. Only Ahitophel is ignorant that his counsel is frus-

trated. That Innocent was the true primate was proved alike by his election, his reception, his character. That the Archbishop has been slow to recognize the truth is not a matter for blame. Mary herself did not respond to the Angel until she had considered what manner of salutation this should be. But it is now high time for Hildebert to acknowledge the Pontiff, and Bernard counsels him to do so without further delay.[78]

Schism was still dominant in the territory of Aquitaine. Gerard, Bishop of Angoulême, had acknowledged Innocent, conditionally on receiving from him the position of Legate, which he had held under previous Popes. Innocent, however, declined the conditional acknowledgment, and being well aware of Gerard's notorious unworthiness, deposed him from his place as legate, substituting Bernard's friend, Geoffrey, Bishop of Chartres.[79] Gerard instantly disowned Innocent, and not only transferred his allegiance to the rival pope Anaclete, but also persuaded the Duke of Aquitaine to follow the course which he had taken. Then, assuming the functions of papal legate, through the province of Aquitaine, Gerard proceeded to depose such bishops as favoured Innocent, and to elect others in their stead. Bernard then wrote a vigorous letter to the bishops of Aquitaine, insisting upon the validity of Innocent's election. Bernard scornfully describes Gerard as a new Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence. Gerard called

himself papal legate in Burgundy and France. "Let him add Medes and Persians," derisively exclaims the Abbot. Can Rome have no Pope, unless Gerard is his legate? Who gave him this privilege in the inheritance of CHRIST? Men should learn to be content with the angelic distribution,—glory to GOD, peace to man. Foolish sons of Adam, who, despising peace and thirsting after glory, lose both. Innocent had been already elected, and no second election was possible. Moreover Innocent had the advantage every way: in personal character, in priority of election, in the majority of electors. Gerard, Bishop of Angoulême, was actuated by an audacious love of influence. He was erecting altar against altar, substituting creatures of his own for duly elected abbots, degrading Catholics, promoting schismatics, working confusion everywhere. Let the faithful observe that all the religious orders are on Innocent's side—Vallambrosans, Carthusians, Cluniacs, Cistercians—all with perfect unanimity have acknowledged him.[80]

Not satisfied with letter writing, Bernard, at Geoffrey's pressing invitation, proceeded in person to Aquitaine. At Poitiers the Abbot of Clairvaux celebrated the Holy Sacrifice.[81] No sooner was he gone, than the dean had the altar destroyed, in sign of his hatred of Innocent. At length Bernard met the Duke of Aquitaine. The Duke reluctantly offered to make a compromise. He was not disinclined to acknowledge Innocent, but to reinstate

the ejected bishops he steadily refused. Argument being no further availing, Bernard resorted to prayer. He entered the church, and celebrated the Holy Eucharist, in the presence of all who would enter, while the Duke remained at the doors without. The Sacrifice proceeded. Then Bernard arose in the full strength of unassailable conviction. Bearing upon the paten the consecrated Host, he passed down between the assembled throng of prostrate worshippers, and addressed the Duke no longer in the language of courtierly deference, but in menacing terms, and accents of reproach and indignation. "I besought you," he exclaimed, "and you despised me. The whole multitude entreated you, and you met them with contempt. See now the Son of the Virgin, the Head and LORD of the Church which you persecute, Himself approaches you. Your Judge is at hand, at Whose Name every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. Your Judge is at hand, before Whose bar your soul must one day come. Is it possible that you will despise Him? Will you treat Him with the contempt which you have measured out to His servants?"

So pleaded the half-transfigured priest in fearless audacity, in the overwhelming certainty that he was in the right. The bystanders wept. The whole awe-struck multitude stood speechless, in momentary expectation of some tremendous miracle; and the

Duke himself, confronted with the awful Presence of the Redeemer, dared no longer resist. A sudden terror came upon him. He trembled visibly, and fell prostrate to the earth, and when his soldiers raised him, he fell again, and lay in the dust as paralysed. Bernard stood over the cowering Duke, pushed him with his foot, ordered him to rise. "See," he said, "the Bishop whom you expelled from his church is here; go, and be reconciled." Without a word the submissive noble arose, conquered by the presence of the Holy Sacraments, and, amid universal rejoicing, reinstated the Bishop whom he had most iniquitously driven away. Afterwards Bernard and the Duke were seen walking together as friends, while the Abbot gently besought him henceforward to be true, lest he should by renewed injustice provoke too far the forbearance of GOD.

While a fugitive from Rome, Innocent and his court visited Clairvaux. The austere simplicity deeply impressed them. No purple, no silken vestments, no gorgeous hangings adorned the sacred shrine. No costly marble gleamed upon the walls. The very vessels of the sanctuary were of the poorest kind. No art and splendour, upon which the eye might rest with satisfaction. The elaborate melodies of Italian devotion were here exchanged for severe simplicity: the illuminated missals, the jewelled crucifixes, for poorest manuscripts, and wooden cross. Innocent with his attendant car-

dinals were affected even to tears. The entire unworldliness, the saintly character of the good brothers, made a memorable impression.

But months and even years were passing away. Innocent's accession dates from 1130. It was now 1133. The Pope could not remain a burden upon the hospitality of France,[82] and the cost of maintaining his court was certainly no trifling consideration. Innocent gazed anxiously towards his own city, where Anaclete was meanwhile strengthening his position, by crowning Roger, Duke of Apulia, as King of Sicily, thus securing him the more devotedly in his behalf. Innocent's anxiety increased, and accompanied by Lothair, and followed by Bernard, he determined to begin the return journey towards Rome. The Pope and the Emperor entered Rome together in triumph. Innocent was enthroned within the Lateran Palace. The Antipope Anaclete retired to the Castle of S. Angelo, and from the midst of its fortifications, still continued to govern a considerable portion of Rome.

Meanwhile, in the church of S. John Lateran, Innocent placed the crown upon Lothair. Thus each, in the face of the world, acknowledged the other.[83] Lothair acknowledged Innocent in being crowned by him, and Innocent recognized in Lothair the lawful emperor. Lothair returned to his people; but Innocent, without the German army, was unable to retain the city. The party of Anaclete was still too powerful, and Innocent took

refuge in Pisa. Bernard congratulated the city which opened its gates to the truth. Pisa has taken the place of Rome.[84] But the city of Milan was still rebellious. And here Innocent desired to act with great severity. Bernard, however, reproved him, reminding Innocent of the passage in the Gospel, "Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none." S. Luke xiii. 7. "Three years!" exclaims Bernard; "you have not waited six months. Even had you waited three years, I would say as in the parable, let it alone this year also."[85]

Bernard was right. He thoroughly understood the Milanese, and meanwhile wrote to the people in mingled expressions of praise and warning. "Hear me," he insists; "I tell you the truth; I do not lie. I am your lover; I am concerned for your salvation. The Roman Church is very merciful, but she is mighty. It is a faithful saying, it is worthy of all men to be received. Do not abuse her clemency, lest you experience her power."[86]

Whatever the Milanese might think of Bernard's assertions, they respected, they reverenced Bernard's life. The fame of his severe ascetic self-discipline had preceded him, and nowhere did the ascetic life find more eager devoted admirers than at Milan. Monasticism had flourished there certainly not less than 800 years, since the days of Ambrose, their Bishop. The Milanese surrendered to Bernard's will, and Innocent was henceforth their Pope. Bernard

himself visited the admiring city. They rejected Anaclete. They acknowledged Innocent. They swore on the Gospels fealty to the Emperor Lothair, and Innocent restored their forfeited privileges. Bernard writes triumphantly to Lothair. The Sicilian usurper is disowned; Lothair is lord of Milan; and the Jewish Leo no longer occupies the throne of Peter.

Bernard's entry into Milan was a progress more than royal. The simple inhabitants surrounded him with a veneration indiscriminate and excessive. They felt themselves abundantly rewarded if privileged to hear his voice. Much to his discomfort they crowded round him, insisted on kissing his feet, wanted fragments of his robes to apply to the sick, and maintained that everything which Bernard touched was sanctified. They preceded him, they surrounded him, they followed him. There was no escape from the besetting multitudes. Amid this overwhelming enthusiasm, public business was suspended. All crowded round Bernard, to touch him, or to receive his blessing. Even the Church, during the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, was not exempt from their invasion. They followed him up to the altar steps. They brought him a little girl, "vexed with a devil." They entreated him to use his influence with heaven to restore her to health. According to their entreaties, he took the consecrated chalice, and poured of the Blood of CHRIST upon the afflicted lips. And as if the devil was being burnt

up, he hastened to escape, and the child was well.[87] But—greatest miracle of miracles—in the midst of all this incense of veneration, Bernard retained his humility. Kings sought his counsel, Popes sent him on missions of high importance, people crowded at his feet; but Bernard was still the lowest of all in his own esteem. It was the Eternal Who did all these wonders, and Bernard was nothing but ashes and dust. The simple-minded crowds idolized the saintly Abbot. They must retain him in their city. He must become their Archbishop. And they would have made him their spiritual head, had he not gently but firmly resisted. "To-morrow," he said, in his quaint but subtle manner, "I will mount on horseback, and if I am carried beyond your city walls, I will not become what you desire; but if I am not carried beyond your walls, then I will undertake it."

Needless to say, that on the morrow the horse took Bernard far beyond the city walls. But the people were content, for the sign was conclusive.

This gifted man, with his marvellous ascendancy over whole cities, over educated and illiterate alike, this maker of Bishops and Popes, refused all offices of high distinction. He was determined to remain a mere monk to the end.[88]

For three entire years the needs of the Church at large enforced S. Bernard's absence from the beloved retreat of Clairvaux. But in spirit he was ever there. He rejoiced to withdraw in thought from the distractions and turbulences and self-

seeking and disputes which incessantly beat upon him in the clouded atmosphere of the greater world, and to be once more obscure, unnamed, unknown in the place of study and of prayer. Whenever he could escape he did. The adviser of princes, the confidant of popes, was at his best in the quiet convent, writing on Humility, or the Love of GOD, or on the Song of Songs. And when he preached to the brotherhood on such themes as these, he seemed raised above the ordinary dull earth on which the feet of all men tread.

If there is one doctrine which, more than another, Bernard may be said to have made his own, it is the doctrine of the Divine Love. This aspect of the truth penetrates his whole being. The imagery, the passionate language of Solomon's Song, was to him a faint expression of the intense devotion which exists between the awakened soul and its GOD. Everything is transfigured and spiritualised. And the beauty and refinement of his thoughts, the profound living reality of love between GOD and man, the depth of devotion, are indeed perfectly amazing. Ascetic meditations such as these, intended solely for the minds of a religious order, will undoubtedly be cast in a form uncongenial to modern popular belief, will be deemed unpractical, and judged as obsolete. Perhaps in many ways they are. Yet for vivid realisation of the love of GOD, we shall not easily find a rival to the sweet eloquence of Clairvaux.

Bernard would sometimes preach in the early morning, before the Holy Eucharist; sometimes, again, in the evening. His addresses contain many local touches, nor does he hesitate to call attention to the fact that drowsiness would occasionally seize upon the brothers, and not all his efforts succeed in keeping them awake. He admits, on one such occasion, that the midnight office was very long, and is very willing to invent excuse.[89] The secret of Bernard's power as a preacher lay in his wonderful knowledge of human nature, and in his extraordinary facility for adapting his style to the particular class of hearers. Enraptured chroniclers declare that Bernard perfectly realized the intellectual capacity, the customs and life and moral standard of those to whom he spoke. Before a rustic audience he gave the impression of lifelong familiarity with rustic ways. In a learned assembly he exhibited knowledge of learned studies. With the simple, he was simple; with the spiritually-minded, he was profound. He adapted himself to all capacities: his one supreme ambition being to win all men to CHRIST.

In addition to the expository and devotional addresses on Solomon's Song, a large collection of Bernard's sermons on the Seasons of the Christian Year, and on general Christian duties, is preserved. The main feature which distinguishes Bernard from many of the preachers in early Christendom, is that, while Chrysostom and Augustine address

almost exclusively the popular congregations of their respective cities, Bernard's instructions are for the monastic ear. This fact of course determines the nature and form of his teaching. Bernard's hearers would undoubtedly be very mixed, but they would require a totally different order of instruction from that suited to the common world. Bernard's cast of mind was not so much of a speculative order. He rarely penetrated far into the great problems of human destiny. For critical acumen, for profound reasonings, we have to look elsewhere. Bernard's gift lay chiefly in intensely devout and glowing meditations on the faith. He delighted most in that portion of theology which concerns the soul in its progress towards GOD—the various stages of religious advancement, the moral hindrances to entire conversion, the practical duties, penitence, confession, fasting, almsgiving, prayer, obedience, the Christian graces, the steps of holiness. In these, and such like themes, Bernard is at once most profitable, and in his most congenial sphere. Bernard revelled in elaboration. His threefold, fourfold, sevenfold divisions, his seven divisions each subdivided into three, are at once most intricate, and more suggestive of innate delight in the mystery of numbers, than of thoughts which flow out in logical and irresistible order. Teaching which is entirely forced into such divisions is apt to lose its naturalness, and assume an aspect very artificial. In Bernard's master hands this is indeed

rarely the case, but with a less able mind such result would be inevitable. At the same time these subdivisions are undoubtedly an aid to memory, and as such calculated to make a more abiding impression on the hearer's mind. One notable feature of Bernard's writings is the marvellous way in which all his teaching is saturated with Holy Scripture. His memory of the Psalms, the strangeness at first sight, but yet peculiar appropriateness of quotation, the insight, which attests long silent pondering over the sacred page, until new depths and fresh significances have opened out before him, is little less than amazing. The old familiar words are illuminated by an intensity of meaning which the casual listener could not detect.

S. Bernard's private Secretary has left us a description of the room at Clairvaux where much of the work was done. Bernard's study was in the very centre of the monastic buildings, the door opened upon the cell of the novices, which was crowded in Clairvaux's palmy days by learned and illustrious men humbly seeking admission into the order. On the right was the cloister and the cells where the brothers passed the hours in study of the sacred books; a region of silence, and peace, and penitential devotion. On the left was the infirmary where the severer monastic discipline was relaxed for those whose strength of body was not equal to the continual strain. Bernard's study was by no means to be despised, it was full of the choicest books.

Here Nicolaus the secretary passed his days transcribing the MSS., or writing at Bernard's dictation. From morning to night, says Nicolaus with something approaching a sigh, this was his occupation.[90]

These quiet devotional hours at Clairvaux were much after Bernard's heart. But they were speedily broken through. The distracted state of the Church repeatedly demanded his presence elsewhere.

In 1137 Bernard is in Italy again. The great Monastery of Monte Casino, the training place of many popes, had itself become infected with the schismatic spirit, had in fact abandoned Innocent's cause. Through Bernard's influence their allegiance was renewed.

Last of all monarchs to capitulate, Roger of Sicily still stood out. Bernard crossed to Sicily, there to be confronted with the incorrigible Roger, who reluctantly consented to a conference. Anaclete sent three Cardinals as his defenders, among whom the chief was the learned and formidable Cardinal Peter of Pisa. The Cardinal delivered an address replete with learning, acute, argumentative, in behalf of Anaclete. But he was no match for Bernard's simplicity.

"I know," said he, "that you are a very wise and very learned person, Peter. Would that the truer interest, the better cause could claim you! You would then be irresistible. I am an unlearned man, more used to country life than logical disputation, and if the cause of faith did not compel

me, would rest in silence. But charity requires that I should speak, now that the Redeemer's robe which neither Jew nor Gentile rent in our SAVIOUR'S Passion, is torn and pierced by Peter Leo. There is one faith, one LORD, one baptism. We do not acknowledge two lords, two faiths, two baptisms. To go back to early ages—there was one ark at the time of the flood. In that ark eight souls were saved; all others perished. To be outside that ark was destruction. That the ark is a type of the Church, there is no one who will deny. A second ark is lately builded; and since there are two, needs must that one is false, and shall be sunk in the deep. If the ark which Peter rules is of GOD, then the ark which Innocent rules must perish. Then the whole Eastern Church must perish; the whole Western Church also must perish; France must perish; Germany must perish. The Christianity of English and barbaric kingdoms must also be destroyed. The religion of the Carthusians, and Cistercians, and all the other Orders must all alike perish in the deep. Alone then of all princes there is found in Peter's true ark—this Roger! All the rest being overthrown, shall he alone be saved? GOD forbid that the religion of all the world should be valueless, and the ambition of this Peter should secure for itself the Kingdom of Heaven!"

The Abbot of Clairvaux's utterances fell on willing ears. The assembly abjured Anaclete. Ber-

nard extended his hand to Cardinal Peter of Pisa, "Let us enter together into the safer ark," said he. And lo once more his extraordinary influence prevailed. Taking the Cardinal by the hand, Bernard led him away and reconciled him to Innocent.[91]

King Roger was left almost alone a reluctant witness to Bernard's moral ascendency, amazed, but unconvinced. Roger knew that to acknowledge Innocent was to part with broad lands which the Pope claimed as his patrimony. But Anaclete felt that his power was broken. Abandoned by his most trusted defender of Pisa, the Antipope grew embittered, a disappointed man, secluding himself more and more from the world.

For seven years the disputed succession lingered, and all that time Anaclete held the city. Then suddenly without warning Anaclete, while seated quietly in his room, expired. The body was hurried away and buried secretly, none knew where. But the schism survived.[92]

A.D. 1138.

The electing Cardinals had committed themselves too deeply to hope for reconciliation. They were forced by their own past to perpetuate the schism. They must needs elect some one. Their choice fell on Victor, a mere figure-head, a caricature of a Pontiff, whose powerlessness helped to overwhelm the party, and speedily bring things to an end. Victor, painfully conscious of the absurdity of his position, within a few days after his election secretly betook himself, under shadow of

night, to Bernard's presence, entreating to be reconciled with Innocent. Thus the most singular good fortune fell to Bernard's share. He brought the Antipope into Innocent's presence, and saw him there lay down his usurped authority.

Bernard sent a very jubilant message to Clairvaux. In the octave of Whitsuntide GOD had fulfilled the longing of his heart, GOD had given unity to the Church, and peace to the city. All the adherents of Peter Leo had acknowledged Innocent. Bernard is coming back to the brotherhood at Clairvaux. Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, the triumph of JESUS CHRIST, and the peace of the Church.[93]

LECTURE VI.

BERNARD AND INNOCENT.

BERNARD and Innocent stand contrasted together, the one as officially the greatest, the other as morally the greatest personage in Christendom of that age. And the boldness of Bernard's language to the Pope, the dignity of his rebukes, are as significant as they are amazing.

There were occasions when Bernard, labouring to reduce rebellious cities to unity with Innocent, ascribed to the Pope an exaggerated authority, which it is impossible to reconcile with more primitive Catholic principles. When the Abbot of Clairvaux asserts that plenitude of power over all the Churches of the world is the peculiar prerogative of the Apostolic see; that he who resists this power, resists the ordinance of GOD; that the Pope can by his sole authority, deprive and make Bishops, and summon at will the highest ecclesiastical personages from the most distant places to his presence, Bernard is assuming doctrinal positions, with which his own language elsewhere, and his own constant attitude towards Rome, is totally inconsistent.[94] Bernard dealing with the

Pope's enemies, is a different being from Bernard dealing with the Pope himself.

1. Innocent was greater in misfortune than in prosperity. The deprived and bereaved Pope, appealing to the compassion of his children in France, is a figure of pathetic dignity. But Innocent in prosperity descended to the level of meaner men. No longer the careworn prelate, overwhelmed with grave anxiety and uncertainty from day to day, he was now at the height of his triumph, and saw every enemy prostrated at his feet. And the change was too much for him. He could not resist the opportunity of retaliating upon his now helpless foes. He had not the generosity to pardon, nor the magnanimity to forget. The sufferings of the past seven years had embittered his spirit, and warped his judgment, and he broke without hesitation the solemn pledges of forbearance and mercy to which, under stress of difficulty, he had also without hesitation committed himself.

Innocent held a Council in Rome, and there cancelled the position and office of all the Cardinals who had formerly opposed him. In this indiscriminate punishment, Peter of Pisa was included. At this, Bernard was especially indignant. For Peter had expressly pleaded that if reconciled to the Pope, no such acts of severity should be passed against him. And to this condition Bernard, as Innocent's legate, had, with the Pope's approval, fully consented. To go back from this position

was then nothing less than a breach of faith. Accordingly Bernard wrote repeatedly to Innocent, expressing his strong dissatisfaction.[95] But Innocent was immoveable. He was tasting the pleasures of revenge. Bernard expostulated in still more vehement terms. He did not hesitate to risk the favour with which Rome regarded him, in his determination to see justice done. "How am I to obtain justice from you?" asks the Abbot. If there were a judge before whom he could summon him, Innocent should be told what he deserves. There is indeed the tribunal of CHRIST. But Bernard would rather appear there in Innocent's defence. I summon you before yourself. Do you judge between yourself and me. Did you not appoint me your legate? If you deny it, I will prove it by witnesses. What has induced the Pope to cancel his own decision? For the sake of Him Who spared not Himself, Bernard urges the Pope to revert to his former sentence, and maintain his own consistency.

2. But Innocent was evidently concentrating all his energies on retaliation. Roger of Sicily still remained the solitary opponent of his now triumphant see. Accordingly Innocent proceeded to take measures for suppression of this rebellious realm. Divesting himself of his sacred functions, Innocent became leader of an armed host, and proceeded in person against Roger. But if Innocent was an able bishop, he was a bad general. He was snared

by his subtle foe, surrounded, conquered, and taken prisoner. But whatever were Roger's impressions of Innocent's military skill, he stood in awe of his prisoner's spiritual office. Innocent the prisoner obtained better terms from his conqueror than he secured while he was free.

There remains recorded no word of rebuke from Bernard to Innocent upon this episode in the papal career. But what Bernard thought of military bishops is plainly written in those celebrated lines of mingled sarcasm and invective, in which he denounced the secular conduct of religious men.

3. Bernard's plain language to the Pope and the Cardinals must have been at times somewhat too plain to be congenial. Innocent and the Roman Court had cancelled the election of William, Archbishop of York. The following Pope reversed his predecessor's decision. Bernard was indignant. William boasts the possession of letters from Rome: would they were written by the Prince of Darkness, and not by the prince of the Apostles! The sons of the uncircumcised triumph. They deride a Court, which, after giving public decision, reverses it by private letters. Religious men cannot conscientiously receive the Sacrament from the leprous hands of the papal favourite, William of York. He appeals from the Court of Rome to the Court of Heaven—that Court whose judgment cannot be perverted by ambition.[96]

4. Innocent found in Bernard his most able and

devoted defender. And the Abbot became more and more indispensable to the Pope. Innocent made Bernard his adviser, and consulted him upon the most intricate affairs of Christendom. Bernard's authority grew continually. He powerfully influenced the choice of bishops; tells Innocent plainly that Bernard de Portis, just elected to a bishopric in Lombardy, is unsuited for the peculiar difficulties of the work, and prevails; writes to Rome, in behalf of the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who are being unjustly treated; reminds the Pope that the noblest gem in the Papal tiara is zeal in behalf of the oppressed, a determination that the rod of the ungodly should not come into the lot of the righteous. He writes to vacant dioceses regulating the election of new bishops.[97]

5. One of the most singular instances of Bernard's ascendency yet remains to be told.[98] It was during Bernard's stay in Rome. The Archbishop of Lyons arrived. There came also Robert, Dean of Langres, and Olric, one of the Canons, to obtain Papal permission for the Chapter of Langres to proceed to elect a Bishop for the vacant see. The Pope enjoined them to take no steps without consultation with members of some religious order. Dean Robert and Canon Olric accordingly fixed upon Bernard. Bernard would be no party to it unless he were given precise and definite information as to the intended election. The Dean and Canon

promised to do nothing without Bernard's advice. But Bernard was not even then content. Robert and Olric brought the Archbishop to reinforce their promise. The Archbishop declared that he would refuse to confirm the Chapter's election unless they abode by Bernard's advice. The Chancellor of the Roman see was also brought in as further witness. Bernard did not rest until the Pope himself had been consulted, and approved the procedure. Two candidates were nominated between whom the Chapter was to decide. Then Bernard, satisfied that everything was concluded, left Rome to retire to Clairvaux. But, as he crossed the Alps, a rumour reached him that the whole of this engagement was being unscrupulously set aside, and another person elected to the bishopric. Bernard was sick in body, and worn with work, and longed to reach the quiet cloisters of Clairvaux; yet at the earnest entreaty of certain religious, he was induced to visit Lyons, where he instantly confronted the Archbishop, who admitted that the rumour was true, but excused himself on the ground that he was afraid of the secular authorities. Fortified by Bernard's presence, he agreed that all should be done after Bernard's will. "Certainly not," exclaimed the Abbot; "not my will, but the will of GOD be done." Meanwhile the intruded candidate arrived. But hearing that Bernard was there, he did not appear at the palace, but lodged at an inn. He arrived on Friday night, and left on Saturday

morning. He had retired apparently vanquished from the field without a conflict. But the intruder had stealthily departed to the French king, whom he induced to grant his investiture in the temporal possessions of the see: and after Bernard left Lyons, secured the election which he could not get during the bold Abbot's presence in the city.

When the news reached Clairvaux, to which Bernard had retreated, his anger burst forth furiously. He wrote indignantly to Innocent. He wrote again more furiously. Men had added iniquity to iniquity. They neither regarded equity nor law, nor the sacred canons of the Church. It is not his to accuse or blame any one. But he appeals in virtue of his services and severe toil endured for the Roman Church. Broken in bodily strength, he had carried his life in his hands, and was content that it should be so. But he is evidently determined that no man shall be bishop at Langres without his own consent.

Here Peter, Abbot of Cluny, intervened. The intruder so called, was a Cluniac monk. Rumour had indeed busily detracted from his character: but rumour was false. Let Bernard accept the fact on Peter's authority; the monk was above suspicion. Not that it mattered much to the Abbey of Cluny, whether one of its monks should be entrusted with the charge of a diocese so obscure as Langres. Cluny had supplied to Christendom Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, and even Popes, and could well

afford to regard the affairs of Langres with complete indifference. Hildebrand himself had been a monk of Cluny. But Abbot Peter's letter of remonstrance was unavailing. Bernard wrote again, this time to the Cardinals' Papal Court, in more passionate terms than ever. They knew, if only they would condescend to remember, how he had lived among them in the evil time of the schism, going out and coming in, and continuing with them in their temptations. But his reward was increase of sorrow. The mighty gods of the earth have lifted up themselves against him—the Archbishop of Lyons and the Abbot of Cluny, trusting in their strength, boasting themselves in the multitude of their riches, have advanced against him. And not against him alone, but against the servants of GOD, against the Roman Cardinals, against their own advantage, against all justice and truth, against GOD. They have put a man over our head, who is at once the shame of the good and the laughter of the base. Let the Roman Curia see to it, and set it straight. Was it worthy of them to refuse him a share in their peace, who had willingly shared their sorrows? He insists that they may not and cannot decline his request.

Bernard conquered. Everything gave way before his passionate appeals and determined resistance. The Archbishop of Lyons gave way to him. The Cardinals and the Pope gave way. The Abbot of Cluny gave way. The elected Bishop of Langres

was sent back to the cloister whence he issued, and Bernard selected a new candidate, Godfrey, his prior at Clairvaux, whom he caused to be enthroned in the disputed seat.

6. Bernard's profound knowledge of the ecclesiastical affairs of Europe rendered it impossible that the gradual encroachings of the Papal over the Episcopal authority should escape his watchful eyes. Bernard saw clearly that through the practice of incessant *appeals to Rome*,[99] the Episcopal order was being slowly and steadily subordinated to the Papal.

He tells Innocent that he will speak confidently, because he loves faithfully. The complaints recently uttered by the Bishop of Treves are not his alone, but widespread among those who are devoted to the Papal interest. The most exemplary members of the Episcopate are complaining that justice has ceased in the Church, that the power of the keys is being destroyed, and the Episcopal authority lowered, since none of the Bishops is left free in the administration of his own diocese. Everything is being referred to the Pope and the Roman Curia. The Bishops complain that the Pope frustrates their just decisions, and re-establishes the evil which they cast down. Any turbulent priest, or layman or monk, escaped from his convent, rushes off to Rome, and returns exulting that he has found a protector where he ought to have encountered an avenger. For shame, exclaims

Bernard. Oh, the scorn and laughter which this creates among the Church's enemies! The faithful are wronged, the Bishops treated with contempt, and while their right judgments are cancelled, no reputation suffers more grievously than the Pope's.

Albero, Archbishop of Treves, was, in Bernard's opinion, entirely mistrusted and misunderstood by Innocent. Albero strove to raise the religious standard in the Abbey of S. Maximin, close to his city, but found himself frustrated by the Pope's interference. Bernard's first letter seems to have been ineffective. He wrote again, assuring Innocent that he was utterly wrong in his estimate of the Abbot and the Bishop. While none was truer than the Bishop, or more worthless than the Abbot, Innocent had honoured the worthless, and despised the true. Bernard says he began by pitying the unfortunate Archbishop, but unless the Pope speedily changes, all his pity will be wanted for him who, while able to rectify a serious blunder, refused to do it. Whatever stains the name of Innocent goes to Bernard's heart.

Considering the speaker, this bold resistance to Papal encroachments is in itself most significant, and more remarkable still is the language in which that resistance is expressed. That centralising power which would make Roman a synonym for Catholic, and rule all Christendom from the Vatican, was becoming even then practically destructive to the Episcopate, reducing them from the position of

equal authority and independent power which they held in the earlier centuries, to the position of entire inferiority, a lower order beneath the successors of S. Peter. Bernard saw the evil, and attempted to resist it. But the whole tendency of the age had especially since Hildebrand set that way. Nor can it be denied that Bernard's own teaching increased the evil he resented. He seems to ignore that this absolutism was a legitimate inference deducible from certain of his own expressions.

Nor can it be said that Bernard's practice was consistent. For when Innocent offered to render the whole Cistercian order independent of the Bishop in whose diocese they worked, Bernard accepted it,—"We forbid any Archbishop or Bishop to summon you or your successors, or any Abbot of the Cistercian order, before his Council or Synod, except only in matters of faith." This dangerous immunity often seriously increased the Bishop's difficulties, by placing in his diocese an organized body of men, over whom he had practically no control. It was an exercise of Papal authority which would most certainly not have been tolerated in a more Catholic and less Romanized period. And had Bernard been true to the lines of his former protest, he must have been the first to decline an independence of Episcopal control, which his own eyes saw to be so dangerous to the best interests of the Church. The privilege which Bernard that day

accepted at Innocent's hands was destined to work out disastrous consequences in the following centuries. And the subsequent decline of the religious orders has been in no small degree attributed to their emancipation from Episcopal control.

The seven years' schism now ended, Bernard was once more free to return to the cloistered life, and to resume his spiritual instruction on the Song of Songs. Here a new sorrow awaited him. Bernard's brother Gerard died. Gerard had been his right hand in matters of administration, proving himself invaluable during the Abbot's protracted absences. Gerard was not a student or an intellectually gifted man, but he fully realized his brother's surpassing powers, and accordingly set himself to secure Bernard from unnecessary interruptions. Gerard was singularly free from self-seeking; his heart was invaded by no sense of jealousy; he underrated the extent of his own abilities, and rejoiced to minister to his brother's greater usefulness. Visitors at the monastery always encountered the watchful Gerard, who settled everything which lay within his power, leaving only the more difficult cases to be referred to his brother. The endless details of practical management were through Gerard's loving assiduity quietly disposed of without Bernard's intervention. So Bernard studied and prayed, prepared his addresses and instructed the Community, while Gerard toiled in the round of

daily duties. Then suddenly the humble-minded brother was taken ill and died.

The whole Community was overwhelmed with grief, but Bernard above all. His brother after the flesh, his brother after the spirit, lay there dead; and Bernard had to say the last offices of the dead for him, and to cast the dust upon Gerard's lifeless frame. The Abbot by a supreme effort suppressed all outward signs of his emotion at the grave. Faith ought, he felt, to conquer grief. Afterwards he began as usual his meditations on the Canticles; the passage taken in its natural order being the verse, "As the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon." Cant. i. 5. Bernard began calmly as usual, as if nothing had happened. But his emotions mastered him. He suddenly broke off, and poured out his whole heart in pathetic utterances of mingled faith and grief over Gerard's departure.[100]

But Bernard's private grief was speedily invaded by the sorrows of the Church. Innocent was perpetually referring the difficulties of the Gallican Church to Clairvaux. Now and then, Bernard expostulated, protesting against the heavy burdens laid upon him. "Did I ask your lordship for a bishopric?" he wrote reproachfully. "If I had coveted an episcopal throne, certainly it was not Trèves—a stiff-necked and discontented people, incessantly raising discord, and resisting the Church." He cannot endure them. He has received a most

difficult charge, no doubt a punishment for his sins. And to increase his difficulties the Suffragan Bishops at Trèves are young and noble, and are so far from supporting him, that he is fortunate if they are not his resolute antagonists.[101]

A.D. 1142.

Bernard's indignation was next roused by a grave wrong to the sanctity of marriage.[102] Ralph, Count of the Viromandi, had married a sister of Count Theobald. The opportunity afterwards presented itself of a much more advantageous match. Accordingly Ralph abandoned his wife, and married Petronilla, the Queen's sister. The heartless Ralph induced three bishops secretly to sanction the divorce. But Count Theobald, bitterly indignant over his sister's disgrace, appealed to the Pope, who through his legate, Cardinal Ivo, cancelled the marriage, excommunicated Ralph, and suspended from their functions the three subservient episcopal advisers. Hereupon King Louis interposed. Petronilla's cancelled marriage reflected dishonour upon his own Queen. And against all justice Louis fell furiously upon the territories of Theobald, who had provoked the inquiry. Theobald, reduced to the direst distress was forced to take an oath that he would plead with the Pope for the removal of Ralph's excommunication.

All this the Abbot of Clairvaux, watching over the affairs of France, witnessed with shame. He had long since expressed himself to Innocent on

the iniquitous procedure of the three bishops. It was written, What GOD hath joined let not man put asunder. But presumption had even ventured to this extreme. It is not aliens who have done the Church this dishonour, nor strangers to the sanctuary, but the living representatives of those to whom it was said, If ye love Me, keep My commandments. Count Ralph and his wife GOD Himself had through the ministers of the Church joined together, and the Church through GOD Who had given such power unto men. Shall the Court of Rome separate those whom the Church has joined together? Louis' treatment of Count Theobald was abhorrent to all principles of justice.

"What had Count Theobald done to merit this?" exclaimed Bernard indignantly. "What was his sin? If it is wrong to love righteousness and hate iniquity, then indeed Theobald cannot be defended. If it is wrong to render to the king the things which are Cæsar's, and to GOD the things which are GOD'S, then Theobald cannot be defended."

To the King himself Bernard wrote with well deserved severity. "Whatever you may be pleased to do with your kingdom, your conscience, and your crown, we, sons of the Church, cannot pass over the wrongs, the insults, the oppression inflicted upon our Mother." Louis' conduct reminded the Abbot of the prophetic rebuke, "When

thou sawest a thief thou consentedst unto him, and hast been partaker with the adulterers." Ps. l. 18. "I tell you if you persist in this conduct, it will not long be unavenged. Satan alone could be the instigator of such flagrant injustice."

To Bernard's defence of the cruelly injured no reply was possible. In this question of divorce the Church stood before the world, invested with the moral power inseparable from conscious purity of motive and loftiness of Creed. And when the selfishness of human passion threatened to destroy the sanctity of family life, surely the fearless utterances of men who could neither be silenced by love of popularity, nor awed by secular authority, nor bribed into submission, was a benediction to mankind. The three abject episcopal advisers who dared not force upon a king the moral truth which he knew very well, sink away nameless into oblivion; but the Abbot of that lowly community who brought the truth before kings, and was not afraid, stands out very gloriously as the champion of purity, and honour, and justice, in a barbaric and selfish world.

But Bernard was only the mouthpiece of the Church. It was the very safety of mankind that a moral authority should exist, before which princes and popular clamour alike should lay aside their violence, and listen as to a voice from Heaven.

Bernard wrote also to Suger, Abbot of S. Denys, and to the King's advisers. Such a measure as

Louis' recent action could scarcely have taken place without their knowledge. And the absence of all protest rendered them liable to suspicion for indifference, if not actually responsible for concurrence in guilt.

All that Bernard could find to say in the King's favour was that he was passionate, and that he was young. Louis was also in the same predicament as Herod. He had rashly vowed that no power on earth should induce him to accept the recently appointed bishops. And the French conscience was not alive to the fact that a rash oath is not binding.

But the state of the Gallican Church was in consequence most lamentable. Chapters were prohibited from electing bishops, and if they dared to brave the royal injunction the newly appointed were not permitted to exercise their office. The diocese of Paris was without a bishop, no one ventured to suggest a successor.

But Bernard was not destined to enjoy the Papal favour uninterruptedly.[103] Cardinal Ivo, legate of the Roman See, was taken dangerously ill during his mission to France. Ivo drew up his will, appointing Bernard and two other Abbots as his executors. Shortly afterwards the legate expired. Acting on the terms of the will, but in Bernard's absence, and without his knowledge, the other executors discharged their office and distributed the Cardinal's possessions for the benefit of the poor. But the Roman Court was exceedingly

enraged. Innocent thought that Bernard had alienated funds which should have found their way to the Roman See. And Bernard discovered that his popularity at Rome was suddenly gone. He replied to Innocent, endeavouring to remove the unjust impression. He asked the Pope to hear from his own lips the simple facts. He explained that the entire business was transacted in his absence on a mission in Innocent's behalf, and that the distribution of the money had been carried out in simple obedience to the terms of Ivo's will. But Innocent's friendship was lost to Bernard. It is a pathetic, and not very creditable illustration of human infirmity. Innocent owed to Bernard, humanly speaking, everything that he possessed. It was Bernard's indefatigable efforts through the seven long years which had gained for Innocent the confidence, the loyal reverence of Europe and its princes. Upon Bernard he had leant continually during the precarious time of anxiety and fear. From Bernard he could scarcely bear to be parted. Bernard's counsel, Bernard's service was then the most vital of all human aid to him. But all this was in the days of exile and mistrust. It was pathetically different in the days of assured possession. Innocent, in the calm strength of the position which Bernard helped to give him, could now afford to ignore the Abbot of Clairvaux. But in the judgment of later times there is something unspeakably sad in this piteous alienation,

and the historian must needs relate with sorrow how Bernard's labour was rewarded by Innocent's ingratitude.

Innocent's days were numbered. He speedily passed away. Whether in the deeper hours which came upon him any reconciliation took place towards the Cistercian Abbot is nowhere recorded. We look in vain for any kindly words, any gentle expression of sympathy, any blending of parted minds, any letter in which the asperities to which imperfect human nature is too liable might appear finally softened and effaced. So loving a nature as Bernard's must certainly have yearned for this. Who shall say whether this estrangement of two great men was one of the misunderstandings left to be readjusted elsewhere?

Once more Bernard is at Clairvaux. He is exhausted by the seven years' schism, and perhaps more still by recent disappointment. He writes confidentially to the Abbot of Cluny, that except for the annual visit which he is bound to pay to Citeaux, he has resolved that nothing shall draw him forth from the cloister limits. His strength is failing. He must rest and be silent. He will act on the prophetic utterance: "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." How far Bernard was permitted to keep his resolve will be shortly seen.

LECTURE VII.

BERNARD AND ABÉLARD.

THE period covered by S. Bernard's life is notable for considerable increase of intellectual activity. The renewed study of Greek philosophy led to two divergent results. Where subservient to the Faith it issued in vast systematic unfolding of Catholic Theology; but it also led some to subordinate their religion to their philosophy, and to make desperate efforts to harmonize Christianity with irreconcilable principles. In the former case the revival of learning produced Scholasticism, in the other case theories of a rationalistic order.

The thirst for knowledge increased. Able teachers arose, gathering round them immense crowds of eager pupils from all parts of Europe. And in this simple unconventional method of instruction is seen the rise of the great Universities. About 1100 A.D. no city was more intellectually distinguished than Paris, and no teacher more conspicuous than the celebrated William of Champeaux,[104] afterwards S. Bernard's friend. William of Champeaux, Student in Philosophy, raised the Cathedral School of Notre Dame to eminence by

his able work as professor. Here Peter Lombard afterwards taught. And hence originated the University of Paris, of which William of Champeaux may be considered the practical founder.

William was at the height of his reputation and influence, when there entered among his pupils a young student from Brittany, whose strange meteoric career is the subject of the following pages—Peter Abélard.[105] The peculiar features of the Breton temperament have been studied by a modern French philosopher, V. Cousin, who says that he finds them singularly realized in the person of Abélard. These features are, a certain natural originality, an amazingly independent spirit, self-confidence coupled with contempt for opponents, more vigour than depth, to which must be added a disposition to undervalue the labours of past ages.[106]

Abélard has left us a picture of himself in the singular autobiography entitled the story of his misfortunes,[107] which certainly bears this out. In this painful narrative Abélard exhibits himself alike in his weakness and in his strength. Vain, acute, restless, self-confident beyond description, his logical faculties were developed to the fullest extent; but there was no corresponding development of the faculty of reverence, the grace of humility, and the power of devotion. He is a perfect master in the art of logical fencing. But adoring prostration of self before stupendous truth

accepted but partially understood, was not in Abélard's character.

Abélard entered the Cathedral School at Paris, eager to measure lances with the renowned logician, attacked him, discomfited, and surpassed him. William of Champeaux thus disconcerted and silenced, never entirely recovered the shock of his defeat. Abélard meteorlike leapt suddenly into distinction, and eclipsed the master's hardwon fame. Eventually William retired to the Bishopric of Chalons, where we have already found him as the adviser of S. Bernard's youthful zeal. Meanwhile during the years spent by Bernard in severe obscurity and self-discipline, Abélard's brilliant gifts were dazzling the eyes of Paris. But the rise of his reputation was the ruin of his spirituality. Crowds of admiring pupils gathered round him in the Schools, offering incense to his self-esteem, while the young reasoner pursued his speculations into every field save one of human thought.

But Abélard had not yet ventured on the precincts of theology. Made boundlessly self-confident by success, Abélard determined to add Religion also to the subjects of his lectures. Challenged to say what he thought of lecturing on Holy Scripture, Abélard replied that the immense array of human authorities was not needed, and that all we want could be gathered from the Book itself. The students laughed ; and inquired whether Abélard would lecture on the Bible. Certainly, he

replied, at once. And he offered to lecture forthwith on any, even the most unfamiliar, passage they might give him. They proposed ironically the Prophecies of Ezekiel; but seeing that he seemed in earnest, ventured to suggest the desirability of some delay. Abélard's pride, however, was wounded. It was not his way, he exclaimed, to advance by slow laborious plodding, but by intellectual power. He declared that he would lecture on Ezekiel the following day. This he did. Few attended at first, regarding the whole procedure as a mere intellectual freak. But Abélard's power delighted all who came, and the lectures succeeded. Such was this singular man's introduction to teaching in theology.

But, adds Abélard himself, the prosperity of fools destroys them, and nothing enervates mental vigour so much as a period of tranquillity and success.

And certainly, in this gifted man, mental ability was neither balanced nor controlled by moral strength. His miserable fall is but a pathetic illustration, if such were needed, of the fact that intellectual refinement is no guarantee for moral excellence, that intellectual power and moral weakness may too easily coexist, and that one side of human nature may be developed, to the neglect or at the expense of another.

We approach the darkest period of Abélard's stormy life. Fulbert, Canon of the Cathedral in Paris, dazzled by Abélard's fame, entrusted to his

charge the education of Heloise, his niece. Heloise was learned in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. She was also well read in philosophy, and in the higher studies of the age. Abélard found in Heloise an exceedingly intelligent pupil. But the mere intellectual relationship developed into a closer connection, and teacher and pupil fell in love. Abélard, with deliberate cruelty, shamefully wronged the confidence placed in him. Afterwards he promised to make what amends he could by marriage, to which it appears that Canon Fulbert gave consent. Other relatives of Heloise, however, took the law into their own hands, attacked Abélard, and punished him with great severity. Heloise entered a convent. Abélard concealed himself in monastic obscurity. But his restless mind could not long endure obscurity. He came into notoriety again for a work on the Holy Trinity. Here Abélard's powerlessness to rise beyond mere logic displayed itself. He wrote for the sake of pupils who would accept nothing which could not be demonstrated, and would believe nothing by faith which their reason could not comprehend.

Abélard's book on the Holy Trinity created much sensation. It was challenged, argued over, and ultimately condemned by the Council of Soissons. Abélard was compelled publicly to recant, and to burn the book with his own hand. The Council appear to have treated the scholar with great severity. They made him

A.D. 1121.

repeat the Creed, and, as if assuming him to be unfamiliar with its language, placed a copy before him, that he might read it. And he, as best he could, amid confused emotions of anger and grief, and with many tears, read out the words before them. He was then handed over to the Abbot of S. Medard, as a convict to a prison.

The Abbot of S. Medard regarded his charge somewhat in the light of a wild beast, to be licked into shape, and treated him with inconsiderate severity. Naturally, under such *régime*, the unfortunate philosopher in the convent cell, became like a lion in a cage. In his passionate indignation he almost lost his faith, crying out repeatedly, "Good JESU, where wast Thou?" Time, however, calmed him down, and he became somewhat more reconciled to his cell, which he was ultimately permitted to exchange for a dwelling in the great monastery of S. Denys, in Paris.

But the unhappy philosopher could not rid himself of his inborn love of disputation. Controversial, aggressive as ever, he succeeded before long in stirring strife among the brethren of S. Denys. He perpetrated the unpardonable offence of assuring the monks that S. Denys, their founder, was not the Areopagite, the convert under S. Paul's teaching at Athens.

Historically correct, but prudentially ill-advised, Abélard raised a perfect storm of indignation. To question whether S. Denys were of Athens, was to

imperil the position of their patron saint, and thereby not only to inflict a wound on the prestige of the religious house, but to deprive them of a powerful patron in the other world. And Abélard seems to take a bitter malicious delight in maintaining, from the standpoint of superior knowledge, a position which his ignorant opponents could not possibly refute. But Abélard found that the only escape from the storm was departure from the precincts of S. Denys. Once more then the wanderer issued forth from a house which, acknowledging his mental power, was reluctant to lose him, yet unwilling to retain him. Once more he became a teacher, and once more crowds gathered round him. Abélard profanely describes his enemies as saying of him, the whole world has gone after him.

Restless as ever, this phase of his storm-tossed life passes rapidly away. Through friends he obtained a site and money, and attempted to found a monastery on his own account. He called the house the Paraclete. But this again jarred on the minds of his opponents as a separation between the Persons of the sacred Trinity. Nothing that Abélard did seemed right. He was one of those unfortunate persons, the exact contrast to Peter of Cluny, who invariably strike the wrong chord, and are out of harmony with their surroundings. Abélard's convent was a failure. He abandoned the attempt.

Far away from the haunts of civilization, in the

south of Brittany, on the edge of the Atlantic, stood in bleak isolation, facing the dreary outlook, and the storms of the Bay of Biscay, the Abbey of S. Gildas.[108] Scantiest vegetation fringed the wind-swept shore, half-barbarous natives lived around, laxity and disorder reigned within. Here the celebrated student of Paris takes refuge, at their express invitation. They called him to be their Abbot, and Abélard the wanderer figures as a superior of a religious house.

Abélard's ideal of an Abbot was a pious and firm ruler, at the head of a devout and obedient brotherhood. But this was by no means the ideal prevalent in the Convent of S. Gildas. S. Gildas was a home of lawlessness, pervaded by low moral standards, the spirit of devotion having long since taken flight; and if the community desired Abélard to rule over them, it was Abélard the lover and singer of sweet songs, not Abélard the penitent, whom they sought. Nor indeed was Abélard the man to restore a self-indulgent community to austerer life. If the first element in reforming others is the conquest of self, the brilliant scholar needed himself to be a learner. Once more the clever reasoner is out of place, once more his logic is powerless. He meditates departure, yet dares not go, lest it be said of him, as in the Gospel: this man began to build, but was not able to finish. If Abélard had taken refuge at S. Gildas from his pitiless antagonists, he had fallen into a

hornet's nest. Everywhere, says Abélard, the devil hindered him. He was a fugitive, and a wanderer upon the face of the earth. The curse of Cain rested upon him.

Abélard unexpectedly reappears in the active world. By a bold stroke he obtains Pope Innocent's permission to instate Heloise as Abbess of the Paraclete. He returns to his turbulent home at S. Gildas. But his unpopularity had increased, and his monks conspired against him. Awful desecrations ensued. They attempted to poison him even in reception of the Eucharistic Chalice. The failure of their fearful crime was followed by efforts to poison him in the refectory. A brother who partook of food intended for the Abbot, died. The cook revealed his guilt by instant flight. At last Abélard despaired, resigned his office, and withdrew. Once more he regains publicity, which was the breath of life to one of his disposition. Bold and confident and audacious as ever, invading the deepest problems of Christian theology, and making startling departures from the traditional Faith, he is busy teaching again. One of Abélard's publications, which must have created a great sensation among his contemporaries, was the work entitled, "Yes and No."[109] It consists of selected passages from Scripture and the Fathers, which appear to contain contradictory statements.

If Abélard's plan had been to state strongly

what might be said on both sides of an open question, his method would be above suspicion. But since some of the subjects with which he deals are not open questions, but integral parts of the Revelation once for all delivered, his method is one which no true believer can adopt. Abélard's method leads to no conclusion, unless it be that of general uncertainty. That minds anxious to avoid insecurity, and to promote the Catholic Religion, should shrink from Abélard's work, is certainly most natural.

All this could not escape the notice of the great Abbot, guarding the Faith of France, from his watch-tower at Clairvaux. Bernard warns the Roman authorities of the dangerous character of the New Speculations. He intreats them to read the Theology of Peter Abélard, his book of Sentences, his treatise entitled Know thyself, and to see for themselves the erroneous nature of Abélard's writings. On the doctrine of the Trinity Abélard was an Arian, on that of grace a Pelagian, on that of the Person of CHRIST a Nestorian. And this formidable accusation, says Victor Cousin, was just.[110]

Bernard warns Innocent that Abélard's teaching is doing mischief. Needs must be that offences come, but they are none the less deplorable. Bernard is weary of his life. The cry of the Hebrew is his cry. "Oh for the wings of a dove, that I might flee away and be at rest." (Ps. lv. 6.) The disap-

pointment of the Prophet is his also. "It is enough, O LORD, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." The leonine madness is passed away. But if we have escaped the lion, we have fallen upon the dragon, who is none the less dangerous for his subtlety. Abélard wrote concerning virtue and vice without moral insight, concerning the Sacraments without faith, concerning the dogma of the Holy Trinity without reverence. Bernard fully acknowledges Abélard's great ability. Goliath and his armour-bearer, Arnold of Brixia, have issued forth; Satan is transfigured into an angel of light.[111]

As a crucial instance of Abélard's errors Bernard selects his idea of Faith.[112] He defined faith as opinion. As if, says Bernard, every man was to believe what he liked, and that the dogmas of Christianity were all vague and uncertain, and at the mercy of individual impressions. If the faith fluctuates, surely faith is vain. Did the martyrs die for problematical and uncertain ideas? Did they not rest on solid and invariable truth? Are the Incarnation, the Passion, the Redemptive Death, the Resurrection, merely opinions, or are they not facts? Faith is not conjecture nor insecurity. Faith is certain knowledge. The Christian cannot adopt the philosophic attitude of suspense, challenging all things, knowing nothing. "Faith," says the Epistle to the Hebrews, "is the substance of things hoped for." The substance,

not the dream of mere conjecture. The substance, not a shadow. Matters of faith cannot be open to challenge by the believer as if not yet determined. He cannot put himself outside the region of certainty without ceasing to have faith and becoming an unbeliever. He cannot, if he believes, wander hither and thither through the interminable by-paths of opinion and uncertainty. The very idea of substance implies permanence and security. It involves definite limits. Faith is not opinion but certitude.

Abélard approached the subject of Redemption rather with the air of a critic, than of one who already believed the fact of our LORD'S divinity. What necessity, he asked, was there, what reason, what advantage in this excessive expenditure? By a single word the Divine compassion could have set man free from servitude to sin. Why then the Incarnation? Why the opprobrium of the Passion, the ignominy of a cruel death, the bitter anguish enduring the Cross?

Bernard replied that although many methods of Redemption lay within the disposal of the Almighty, yet this fact did not impair the efficacy of that method which GOD was pleased to select. Possibly that method was selected which by the appalling anguish it brought on our Deliverer should appeal most forcibly to the affections of mankind. But after all attempts at ex-

planation are exhausted, it must ever be remembered that we do not know, and we cannot fully know what effectiveness of holy influence, what harmony with perfect wisdom, what appropriateness for our redemption are contained in the Passion of JESUS CHRIST. We do not know, and must confess our ignorance, and adore. But if we cannot fathom the motives which determined the Will of the Eternal Wisdom, we can at least accept the fact and receive its practical blessings. We can believe that "it is a faithful saying and worthy of all men to be received, that while we were yet sinners, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON." Cf. Rom. v. 10. We may be assured that we have redemption through His Blood. Ephes. i. 7. If you ask, why through His Blood, rather than through His Words, I cannot tell. Ask Him. It is mine to know that so it is; but why it is, I cannot tell.

Bernard and Abélard may be taken as representing two opposite tendencies of the human mind.

The Universal Church as embodying a divine revelation of unalterable truth, sent with a message to deliver, was the Catholic conception to which Bernard clung. The human reason, eliciting truth by logic, and accepting nothing which it could not demonstrate, was rather Abélard's ideal. Bernard's is the devout, the adoring mind: Abélard's the critical, the doubting. Bernard is full of the sense of human ignorance; Abélard, of human

cleverness. With Abélard theology consists of a series of discoveries, problems of the intellect. With Bernard the main interest is in the application of revealed truth to life.

To counteract Abélard's influences men turned to Clairvaux. Bernard must be summoned from the solitudes he loved. Bernard's name was on all men's lips. But Bernard shrank altogether from the encounter. The scholar and the monk would be unfairly matched—the trained disputant and the uncultured brother; the rustic against the acute philosopher; the countryman reared amid oaks and woods, against the polished disciple of the schools! What place had Bernard in subtle disputations? Abélard was a scholar from his youth. Was the Church so badly off for learned men, that her cause must be confided to the guidance of a simple monk? There was Hugh Victor and Richard Victor in the cloister near Paris. These were the men qualified alike by genius and by culture for such a task. Bernard would meanwhile resort to the weapon whereby he would best advance the Catholic cause, namely to prayer. So Bernard shrank from a burden to which he felt himself unequal. But those who knew him best gave a different estimate of his powers. Accordingly he was summoned by those whose authority he could not well resist, that is to say, by the French Episcopate, to challenge and refute Abélard at a Council at Sens, A.D. 1140.[113]

It was an hour of the keenest interest for France. The announcement that two of the ablest men of the day were to meet in public disputation was in itself sufficiently attractive. But Bernard and Abélard were more than distinguished individuals, they were representatives of two contrasted tendencies of the age. The one represented the principle of Divine authority; the other, the primacy of human reason.

The Council of Sens (1140 A.D.) was a brilliant assembly of all the eminent ecclesiastics in the realm of France. The King himself attended. The Bishops, Abbots, learned theologians, were fully arrayed to hear Bernard answer the novelties of Abélard. The Archbishop of Rheims was present, and numerous Suffragans. But the central figure of that Council was the Superior of Clairvaux.

Bernard did not attempt the subtleties of abstruse reasoning. He produced before the Council a copy of Abélard's "Theology," from which he read extracts.

Confronted with Bernard, Abélard's dialectic powers suddenly seemed to forsake him. His fluent speech was gone when he needed it the most. The trained and brilliant reasoner seemed helpless as a child. Before the Bishops, and Abbots, and learned men, and the King, Abélard was practically silenced. Passages from the scholar's writings were produced containing statements ad-

verse to Catholic truth. The author was invited to explain or disown them. This he was totally unable to do. Deserted as it seemed by his own abilities, he faintly appealed to Innocent at Rome, anxious to elude the threatened decision, and transfer his case to other hands.

Abélard's inability is the most natural thing in the world.[114] He felt himself hopelessly alone. Twenty years had passed over him since last he stood before a Council, but the remembrance of the day when he had to burn his own writings was scarcely effaced, and in the twenty years he may have learnt many things. His appeal to Rome was an act of prudence, superior to many acts for which he is responsible. By that appeal his opponents were for the moment certainly disconcerted.

This appeal from the Gallican Episcopate to the Roman Bishop need not have been permitted. Such appeals had been a perpetual contention for centuries. In this case, however, although the appeal was irregular, (licet appellatio ista minus canonica videretur,) yet out of respect for Innocent, the French Bishops put no obstacle in the way. Indeed they could not well do otherwise. To put obstacles in the way of Abélard's appeal would obviously have created at Rome a prejudice in his favour.

Thereupon Bernard calls upon "Peter's successor" to decide whether he who abandons Peter's

Faith shall find refuge at Peter's Throne. The bold Abbot tells Innocent, When thou wast little in thine own sight, did not GOD enthrone thee over nations and kingdoms? For what purpose, unless to pull down and to destroy, and to build and to plant? Accordingly he urges the Pope to act with decision.

But Bernard knows very well that Abélard has adherents even in the Court of Rome itself. Indeed Abélard made no secret of the fact that he felt himself secure. Cardinals and priests were among his disciples. Scandalized that error should be defended in Rome, Bernard wrote indignantly to his friend Cardinal Ivo, describing Abélard's opinions and character. This quondam monk, Peter Abélard, subject to no order, and held by no rule, a man totally unworthy of trust, without he is John, within he is Herod, slippery and deceitful, having nothing of the monk about him except the dress and the name. That is his character. However, what is that to Bernard? Every man must bear his own burden. But what concerns Bernard is, that this man has corrupted the integrity of the Faith, injured the doctrinal purity of the Church. The Abbot trusts that GOD will through the Roman clergy deliver His Church from lying lips and a deceitful tongue.[115]

Innocent replied, condemning Abélard's teachings, and imposing upon him as a heretic the penalty of perpetual silence. His followers and

defenders, should any presume to be such after this Papal admonition, were excommunicate.[116]

Abélard published a sort of recantation. He submitted to the authority of the Church. He had no desire to be a philosopher in such a sense that he repudiated S. Paul, nor to follow Aristotle in such a manner as to be shut out from CHRIST.[117]

The condemnation of Abélard appears to have been one of Innocent's last public acts.

By a strange vicissitude of history, Innocent's immediate successor was Celestine II., Abélard's pupil and friend. When Celestine II. was known as Guido, Cardinal Priest at Rome, Bernard's watchful eyes detected his sympathy with Abélard, and wrote to warn him of the danger. Celestine's pontificate was brief, and almost obscured in the interest of subsequent events.

Abélard's stormy, fitful, if brilliant career, ended at last in peace. Cluny opened its gates to receive the broken-down and sorrow-stricken wanderer. The gentle Abbot of Cluny was as true as Bernard to the Faith, but gifted as a rule with fuller sympathy. The venerable Peter wrote to Innocent, asking the Pope's permission to retain Abélard at Cluny. Abbot Peter succeeded in effecting a reconciliation between Abélard and his former opponent Bernard. The days of controversy were passed. Abélard consented at Peter's instigation to erase from his writings such statements as were repugnant to Catholic minds. Of Abélard's learning

Innocent is well aware. Peace being now restored, it was becoming that Abélard's old age and increasing infirmities should find at Cluny a shelter and a haven of rest. Abélard himself intreated leave to pass the remainder of his days, which in all human probability would not be many, in the cloistered calm. Abbot Peter's kindly letter was the outcome of a singularly loveable disposition, and to his request Rome could scarcely fail to accede.[118]

The last chapter of Abélard's life we owe to the Abbot of Cluny. It fell to Peter's office to acquaint Heloise of the fact of Abélard's death. And this he did with wondrous delicacy and gentleness. Abbot Peter described Abélard's exemplary life at Cluny. It would be difficult to do justice to Abélard's humility and devotion. The Abbot, with all his experience, had rarely seen a deeper earnestness. Content with the humblest garb and the lowliest place, no one would have imagined him to be the brilliant scholar of world-wide reputation. In food he was most sparing. His time was dedicated to constant study and prayer, or to preaching before the convent; a duty which Peter thankfully intrusted to him. He was constantly present at the Holy Sacrament. In brief, his mind and conversation continually dwelt on things learned and things divine. So he lived among them, upright, simple, fearing GOD, while labouring under the burden of ever increasing infirmities. Abbot Peter sent him away to their most healthily

situated monastery in Burgundy, in the hope that a more genial and sunny spot might improve his wretched health. There Abélard renewed his studies. There he devoted himself afresh to holy exercises. And there the advent of death found him, not sleeping, but watching for his LORD. So, like the wise virgins, Abélard was called to the eternal marriage feast. As he lay upon his bed of death, he made confession alike of the Catholic Faith and of his sins. He received the viaticum, the pledge of life eternal, the Body of the Redeeming LORD, with what singular reverence and devotion the whole convent knew. Thus Abélard, the brilliant teacher, the able master in many sciences, the man of European reputation, passed away.

And so the kindly Abbot fulfilled the last offices for the dead. He wrote Abélard's epitaph. At Heloise's request he sent the body to be buried at the convent where she presided. He also sent a document which certified Abélard's absolution.

Thus closes a stormy, passionate, brilliant, fitful career. The singularly gracious form of Peter Cluny stands out in beautiful pre-eminence in the closing episode of Abélard's life. Peter had evidently watched the rise and fall of this gifted but unstable character. He had gazed with exceeding pity on talents spent in propagating error, and an able mind misled through over-confidence. Peter was full of sympathy. He thoroughly understood

the difficulty which this restless, eager lover of admiration would have in submitting himself in lowliness to receive the truth. Peter hated the error, but he succeeded in winning the erring. That which the decisions of Councils could not do, Peter's persuasive gentleness achieved. The evening time of life, when the glitter of praise and the attractiveness of reputation had sobered down and lost their former power, was surely the time for calmer judgment and nearer approach to truth. Abélard by this time might fairly be expected to have come to know himself better than of old. He would, by force of past experience and riper knowledge, mistrust the reasoning powers upon which he rested everything when he was younger. He would see the limits of human capacity, and how soon those limits are reached. He would feel the need of some authority to declare the truth to the most gifted, as well as the most ignorant among men. Thus he had come round to Bernard's side. But it was Peter Cluny's CHRIST-like gentleness which effected this, and soothed the once aggressive and hard and argumentative and self-reliant man. This picture of the peacemaker is one on which the heart rests with vivid satisfaction. Bernard's eminent grandeur may have eclipsed the fame of his less distinguished contemporary, but among all the interesting personages of that wonderful century, none is more kindly and more gracious than the Abbot of Cluny.

Was it this tragic tale of Abélard's misfortunes which suggested to Bernard, in his addresses to the monks at Clairvaux, the subject of human ignorance alike of self and of GOD? Was it this brilliant but blighted life which made Bernard say, that if the knowledge of learning is good, the knowledge of our own weakness is more profitable to salvation? We cannot tell. But the facts must have given peculiar force to his assertions, that neither genius nor teaching are indispensable for entrance into the kingdom of heaven; that there is a knowledge which puffeth up, as well as a knowledge which edifies; that while learning is very glorious, when subordinate to our LORD, men are made acceptable with GOD not for literary acquirements, but for a pure conscience and a faith unfeigned. Men please GOD, said Bernard, by the merits of their character, not the capacity of their brain. Singular fact, that Peter and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee, were not chosen from the trained and learned circles of rabbinical schools, but from the simplicity and ignorance of the Galilean shores; and yet by these was saving truth enshrined in the hearts of men.[119] Self-knowledge was of all things most essential for the suppression of ostentatious vanity and pride, for the grace of that humility which is the only secure foundation for spiritual growth. Self-knowledge always abases. Can it be otherwise as man comes to see that he is laden with much wrong-doing, burdened with this dull mortal frame, ab-

sorbed in earthly cares, tainted with low desires, blind, earth-bound, weak, entangled in errors, exposed to endless dangers, beset by fears, careworn with anxieties, easily led into evil, and very weak towards good. Perhaps it was reflection upon his own powerlessness to win Abélard, and the contrast between himself and the gracious Abbot of Cluny, which led to the following beautiful utterances on the fall of the angels and the pride of man:

Verily I hearing these things, and turning mine eyes in upon myself, and searching diligently, discover in myself that very plague-spot which the LORD repudiated in His angels. A horrible dread has come upon me, and I exclaimed, If thus it befell His angels, what will become of me who am nothing but earth and dust? If he were proud, it was in heaven, but I upon a dunghill. Pride is less intolerable in the wealthy, than it can be in the poor. Woe unto me! if judgment fall with such severity on him, because his heart was lifted up, what will be required of me, who am alike miserable and proud? Deep languor and heaviness of mind have fallen upon me. I did run well. But the stone of stumbling was in my way. I struck against it, and I have fallen. Pride is found within me, and the LORD has in anger departed from His servant. Hence this spiritual dearth within me, this indevotion with which I am scourged. . . . The holy songs are no joy to me, I find no delight in prayer, no peace in meditation. Whither has that ecstasy

departed? that serenity of soul, that peace and joy in the HOLY GHOST? . . . Alas, the LORD has visited all the high hills round about me, and I alone am left unvisited! In one character I see the grace of wonderful unselfishness, in another the grace of a most winning patience, in a third a profound humility and gentleness, another is all-merciful and full of piety, another soars heaven-ward in frequent meditation, another knocks often at the gates of GOD by fervent prayer, others are gifted with many glorious gifts. All these, fervid, devout, peace-loving, enriched with many graces, rise like spiritual heights, which the LORD has blessed. But I, who see in myself none of these graces, what else can I think but that I stand among these fruitful hills as the mountains of Gilboa, upon which there was to rest neither dew nor rain, barren and bleak as a mountain height, which the blessed Giver of all fruitfulness has in His anger and indignation passed by?[120]

LECTURE VIII.

BERNARD AND THE CRUSADE.

It was Christmas Day in the year 1145. Godfrey, Bishop of Langres, had just returned from the Holy Land.[121] He was the bearer of the latest news, and the witness of recent disaster. Preaching before the French king and the French episcopate, Godfrey described in glowing terms of indignation the misfortunes of the Sacred Land. Eastern Christendom was crushed beneath Turkish oppression. The ancient city of Edessa—the city to which, according to tradition, our Lord once wrote, when Abgarus was their king—had fallen under Mohammedan power. Proud, insolent barbarians were in possession there. The fall of Edessa was the prelude to general ruin. The infidel powers were advancing. Antioch itself stood paralyzed with fear, unable to meet the swarming multitudes. Destruction was drawing on even to Jerusalem, which was powerless without Antioch, and under the government of a woman (Queen Melisende).

Godfrey's eloquence made a profound impression. The young King Louis was deeply stirred, and,

under the impulse of the moment, vowed that he would inaugurate a crusade for the protection and recovery of the sacred places. But Louis's zeal met no response from his chief adviser, Abbot Suger. Suger was an older man. Suger had passed through a world of experience. Far-sighted, statesmanlike, Suger was the last person to be swept away in a passionate emotion. He had no belief in the advantage of Crusades, and strongly dissuaded the young monarch from committing himself to such rash and unprofitable enterprise. Public feeling was not then as it once had been. This was not the first Crusade. Experience of past misfortune might well have extinguished the national zeal for these undertakings, and have rendered the very name of a Crusade a word of warning and a memory of defeat. Suger, too, in his secret heart had no belief in the religious efficacy of Crusades. And protests raised here and there against such enterprises show that Suger was by no means alone in his conviction. Eight hundred years before, Jerome had urged against mistaken ideas of the value of pilgrimages, that the essential duty of man was not to visit Jerusalem, but to lead a holy life. And even in Bernard's age, some were found to rectify the popular misconceptions concerning visits to the Holy Land. It was repeated from earlier days that S. Hilarion had spent his life not far from Jerusalem, and yet had not entered the city gates, nor stood where the Re-

demption of the world was won. "A disciple of CHRIST is to bear His Cross, not seek His grave," said Hildebert. Peter of Cluny protested that it is a nobler thing to serve GOD in humility and self-denial, than to join the proud pageant of a pilgrimage to Zion. And if it were good to see Jerusalem, where the feet of the LORD once rested, it was incomparably better to long for heaven, where He shall be confronted face to face. It was not holy places, but holy works which save. Peter reminded men that the Roman poet was true to nature, when he said, they change their surroundings, but not their heart, who cross the seas.[122]

Suger, however, called in Bernard's aid. If Suger expected Bernard to confirm his opinion, the king's adviser was grievously mistaken. Bernard was on the other side. With the spirit of such an enterprise Bernard fully coincided. Years ago he had written in glowing terms his eloquent apostrophe to Jerusalem: "Hail to thee, O holy city, whom the Highest has sanctified to be His own abiding place. Hail to thee, city of the Great King, city whence wonders ever new have at all times risen, gladdening all the world. Hail to thee, mistress of the nations, chief of provinces, possession of patriarchs, mother of prophets and apostles, the inaugurator of our faith, the glory of the people of CHRIST. Hail, land of promise, ages ago with milk and honey flowing, now extending

to all the earth the remedy of redemption, and the strength of life eternal."[123]

The attractiveness to Bernard's mind of the sacred places in the Holy Land is strikingly shown in a letter sent by him to the Roman Patriarch at Jerusalem. Bernard held it a most singular and glorious privilege to be entrusted with that holy region where sprung the light of the world. To enter daily into His tabernacle, and worship in the place where the Feet of CHRIST once stood, might well recall the words of long ago, "the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." How awful is that place, where first visited us the Dayspring from on High. How awful that place where the gracious and sinless LORD poured wine and oil upon our wounds.[124] So Bernard wrote. Accordingly King Louis wrote to Eugenius for his approval. Bernard had also written, expressing himself in favour of the movement; and Eugenius gave the enterprise his benediction, regretting that the disturbed condition of Rome rendered his absence from that city inexpedient, and leaving the practical organization in Bernard's hands.

To the French people Bernard appealed in behalf of the Crusade, by motives such as the following. Now was the acceptable time, and the day of overflowing salvation. *God is in danger of losing His territory.* GOD'S territory, urged Bernard, the land where the Word of GOD once taught, where He abode more than thirty years, as a man among

men, the land which He immortalized by miracle, consecrated by His own Blood, the land in which the first-fruits of the Resurrection arose. The promised land, which we have lost through our sins. Profane enemies of the Cross are advancing. They will overthrow the city of the living GOD, the arena upon which Redemption was worked out, the soil empurpled with the blood of the Immaculate. He bids them gird on their armour. Here is the field for true distinction. Victory is glory, death is gain. He recalls the labours of Peter the Hermit, and the first Crusade, and by such memories as these bids them rally round the Redeemer's Cross.[125]

But Bernard must not only write letters, he must issue forth in person. Bernard must be torn again from his beloved seclusion. Fifty-five years of age, the careworn Superior of Clairvaux was far older than his years. His physical weakness craved for rest. Controversy, self-discipline, activity, anxious work, had worn him away almost to a shadow. Some time ago the Abbot had resolved not to be drawn out from his retreat. But Bernard was not permitted to rest. He was forced into an undertaking more exhausting than any previous labour, and at a period of his life when the worn-out frame could scarcely respond to the demands even of his indomitable and mastering will.

So Bernard issued forth once more into the tumultuous world. Supported by the French King, sanctioned by the Pope, the movement was

already in the air. The losses of the Oriental Church appealed forcibly to the popular imagination. The advance of infidel hosts, the fall of Edessa, the danger of Antioch, the misfortunes of Jerusalem, the Saracen supremacy, stirred strongly to the depths the chivalrous forces of the empire, and it needed but a spark to kindle all things into flame.

A.D. 1146. So when Bernard arose in their midst at a great public assembly at Vezelai, clothed in all the authority of his order and personal character and noble life, the enthusiasm knew no bounds. No building was spacious enough to contain the crowds who pressed eagerly upon the preacher of the Second Crusade. A wooden platform had to be hastily erected in the open air. Louis and Bernard ascended it together, the King wearing upon his breast the Cross, the emblem of their enterprise. Then Bernard spoke. Attenuated, fragile, transparent, worn to a shadow, he seemed all enthusiasm, and fire, and zeal. His wonderful persuasive influence swayed the crowds as one man. Crosses numerous enough could not be made for the people. Robes were torn into fragments that crosses might be given to all who came. Princes, and nobles, and every rank from the throne to the lowest degree, pressed round the preacher to be enrolled in the great Crusade. In the overwhelming zeal of the hour, they even urged upon Bernard to act as their

commander-in-chief, and to lead in person the forces to the East. Very prudently the saint declined the honour. Imagine me, he afterwards wrote, ordering a battle array, and riding at the head of armed men![126]

Eugenius fully agreed that the Abbot's place was not to advance sword in hand to the work of destruction. But neither Bernard nor Eugenius appeared to see anything inconsistent with their profession as ministers of the Prince of Peace, to urge upon Christians an exterminating war.

Meanwhile Louis VII. was not idle. He organized his forces through France. He wrote letters to Manuel Comnenus, Emperor at Constantinople, to ensure a friendly reception when his army should depart for the East. Bernard, of course, wrote in every direction. The chronicler says he "flew about." He passed through France from city to city. Everywhere he preached the Crusade. Everywhere crowds responded to his burning appeals. Bernard's intimacy with the leading minds in Europe enabled him now to exert unrivalled influence in behalf of the great movement. Bernard invites Peter Cluny to attend the Assembly at Chartres, (A.D. 1146,) assuring him that the Bishops and the King will be there, and urging him to display his zeal in the great undertaking. The Abbot of Cluny was unable to attend, but he wrote to the French King that although unable to accompany the King in person, he concurs with his attempt.

History is repeating itself. Joshua is advancing against the Kings of Canaan. The Christian King threatens the East. The Holy Land is to be won to CHRIST. Let Louis destroy the infidel population with the sword. Let him acquire their territory for GOD and himself.[127] So the peaceful Abbot waxes warlike.

A.D. 1149.

After energetic efforts for the Crusade, Bernard was often sorely distressed by unworthiness among his own people. They could not sustain themselves at this high level. Among the very chief noblemen who had vowed themselves to the Crusade quarrels arose. A duel was arranged to come off after Easter between Duke Henry and Duke Robert, a brother of the French King. Bernard was dismayed. Was this the spirit of the Crusader! He wrote an urgent letter to Abbot Suger of S. Denys, at Paris, expressing his indignation and grief. "We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed." Jer. li. 9. Bernard implores Suger to exert his influence to suppress the duel at all costs.[128]

Not satisfied with overrunning France, Bernard passes into *Germany*. He traverses the borderland of the Rhine. Here the spirit of the Crusade exhibited itself in another form—*persecution of the Jews*. If all who disowned the saving Name were to be objects of Christian animosity, there was a race in Europe itself upon which such bitterness must logically be expended. The Saracen after

all was far away, but the Jew was in their midst. Strong antipathy to the Jews was indeed prevalent in Bernard's age. Attempts were made to turn the Crusading movement against the Jews in Germany as well as against the Saracens abroad. Even the gentle and conciliating Peter of Cluny, peacemaker as he was on most occasions, could not rise superior to this popular hatred against the Hebrews. The Abbot of Cluny is the author of a fierce attack, the most lamentable page in all his writings, the one exception to that universal spirit of justice and forbearance which otherwise reigns in him.

What use, urged Peter, in conquering the Saracens far away, if prosperity were permitted to the Jews at home? To his mind the Jew was far more detestable than the Saracen. He does not recommend that the Jews should be slain; rather he would have them reserved for the more awful doom of Cain the fratricide. They richly merited spoliation of those ill-gotten and immense resources which their craft and subtlety had extorted from Christian hands—resources which Peter with cruel irony suggests might be well employed in providing for the expenses of the new Crusade.

If the venerable Abbot of Cluny went to this excess, popular repugnance to the hated race went further still. A rumour traversed Europe that the Jews had crucified an English boy. Not the faintest historic foundation for the rumour exists, but

popular feeling was ready to catch at anything, and grew menacing. Precisely at this excited moment the spark required to set everything in flames fell into the German mind. Rudolf, a Cistercian monk, took upon himself the office of preacher, and endeavoured by fiery harangues to kindle the popular passions against that maligned and distrusted race. Unhappily in the state of popular excitement among the masses he was only too successful. A pathetic narrative of a contemporary Hebrew writer[129] remains to testify to the Jews' misfortunes.

"And it came to pass after Edessa was taken, that the kings of the West heard a saying, 'The Turks are come into the land of Judah, and into the land of Aram; and they have destroyed the best part thereof; and the cities of the uncircumcised they have taken; and their males they have slain with the edge of the sword.' And when Pope Eugenius heard of it, he sent priests unto all the kings of the Gentiles, saying, 'The children are come to the birth, and no man layeth it to heart; and now, arise ye, and let us go unto the land of Israel; and let us make a breach therein for ourselves; and we will destroy the Turks from being a nation; and their name shall not be remembered.' And the priest S. Bernard, of Clairvaux, went from province to province, and from city to city; and he read in their ears the oppressions and tribulations which had befallen the uncircumcised

in the land of Canaan. And it came to pass, when he was in Spires, that the Emperor Conrad took him with both his hands, and drew him up to himself; for he feared lest the people of the country, who came to hear his report, should trample upon him, for they were more than the locusts. And the Emperor heard it, and all the people of the country heard it; and they became willing to go unto Jerusalem.

"Then the Emperor Conrad and Louis the King of Tzarphath, assembled themselves together, united in heart to go unto Jerusalem with a strong hand. And they put the cross upon their clothes for a sign; and they arose to go in the month of May, which is the second month, in the year four thousand nine hundred and six of the Creation, which is the year one thousand one hundred and forty-six.

"That year was also unto the house of Jacob a time of sorrow and oppression, of emptiness, desolation, and destruction, and of smiting of the knees together; and much pain was in all loins, and their faces gathered blackness; for the priest Rudolf came unto the land of Ashkenaz to search out those which would join themselves to go unto Jerusalem. And he spake falsehood against the Jews, the remnant which was left from the first persecutions; and he thought in his heart, 'It is time to act and to speak against the people who have not been forsaken; to dissolve, to kill, and to destroy them.'

And he went along, crying in the name of his GOD, in order to stir up people to go unto Jerusalem. And in all places he passed through, he stirred up the dogs in them, saying, 'Avenge ye our LORD'S vengeance on His enemies, who are before us: after that we shall go.' And when the Jews heard it, their heart melted away; and they cried unto the LORD, and said, 'Alas, O LORD, behold, fifty years, like the years of a jubilee, have not passed by, since our blood was spilt like water, because of the sanctification of Thy great, mighty, and fearful Name, in the day of the great slaughter. If Thou forsake us for ever, what wilt Thou do for Thy great Name? Wilt Thou appoint misery a second time?' And the LORD heard their cry, and remembered His covenant, and turned Himself unto them, according to His great loving-kindness. And He sent after this Belial, the Abbot S. Bernard from Clairvaux, a city which is in Tzarphath.

"And he called also after their manner, saying, 'Come, let us go up unto Zion, to the sepulchre of their Messiah; but take thou heed that thou speak to the Jews neither good nor bad; for whoever toucheth them, is like as if he had touched the apple of the eye of JESUS; for they are His flesh and bone; and my disciple Rudolf has not spoken aright, for of them it is said in the Psalms, Slay them not, lest my people forget.' And they hearkened unto his voice, for he was exalted in their eyes; and they returned from their burning wrath

and ceased to do evil to them, as they had devised to do.

"And he took no ransom of the Jews, for he spake good of Israel from his heart. 'I will praise Thee, O LORD; that though Thou wast angry with me, Thine anger is turned away, and Thou hast comforted me, to leave unto us a remnant in the land, to preserve of them a great remnant, as it is at this day.' If it had not been for the compassion of the LORD, that He had sent this priest, there would have none escaped nor remained of them. Blessed be He Who ransometh and delivereth. Amen."

This singular passage, with its naïve declaration that Bernard made no money out of it, is a striking testimony to Bernard's character and Bernard's influence from an unsuspected source.

But in the German cities Jews were massacred, or fled for refuge, and hardly escaped with life. Deeply distressed by this disgraceful form of preaching the Cross, the German Bishops remonstrated with Bernard, whom they supposed to have some sympathy with the doings of his subordinate.

Bernard replied in a letter to the German episcopate, disowning Rudolf's teaching altogether, which he characterizes in very strong terms as a heartless approval of homicide. Rudolf had no mission either from GOD or man. The Abbot quoted Scripture to show expressly that the Jews

were not to be slain. Was it not written, "Slay them not, lest my people forget it: but scatter them abroad among the people, and put them down, O LORD, our defence?" Ps. lix. 11. Thus Bernard refused to go with the stream of popular dislike. He exerted his great influence on the side of justice and truth. With his usual energy and promptness, Bernard himself appeared on the spot, ordered the mischievous preacher away to his monastery, and endeavoured as far as possible to turn away the popular indignation into more distant channels. At Mayence Rudolf's disappearance was the cause of sullen murmurs and threatened outbreaks. And it needed all Bernard's authority to quell the storm once raised.

Bernard triumphed over Rudolf. But the French Abbot must come to terms with Conrad the German king. Bernard met with a brilliant reception. But with this reception all zeal evaporated. The German princes and nobles in general viewed the Crusade with strong disfavour. None seemed prepared to promote the expedition. Conrad definitely declined all personal responsibility for so hazardous an undertaking. He warned Bernard expressly that he could take no share in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The Abbot quietly replied that it was not for him to teach a monarch his duty. The heart of the king was in the hand of GOD. But Bernard was depressed. He almost resolved to return at once to Clairvaux. His mission to Germany seemed

branded with the mark of failure. But Conrad, in his secret heart, profoundly respected his guest. And the more Bernard was eager to depart, the more anxious grew Conrad to retain him. Bernard's intensity of spirit communicated itself even to those who did not understand his language. If he preached in French before a German audience, yet it is said he moved them even to tears by his earnestness and overwhelming solemnity. It was Bernard's personality, the manner as well as the matter, which powerfully affected all classes of his hearers. Bernard's manner was very fervid, yet very sweet, persuasive and convincing. He seemed to understand his hearers perfectly, and to know instinctively what truths were suited best, and in what way they would find entrance most securely into the hearts of men. In brief, he was a master in real eloquence. The popular veneration for Bernard was unbounded. Once he was almost crushed to death by the pressure of the crowds. Bernard restored a paralyzed person to health, and the crowd pressed round the saint almost to suffocation. The stalwart king forced his way into the mass of the people, caught up in his vigorous grasp the attenuated saint, bore him aloft in the air, and carried him to a place of safety in the chapel of S. Mary. Still the leading personages continued unconvinced. The king still hovered in hesitation. At last, however, two days after Christmas, on the festival of S. John the Evangelist, Conrad promised

that on the morrow Bernard should have his final reply.

So on the festival, the Emperor and the Court were assisting at the Sacrifice, and Bernard was the celebrant. He paused, and, quite against his usual custom, preached during the solemnities of the Mass. He said that he could not permit the day to pass without addressing them. In awfully solemn tones, he depicted the final judgment, and the soul before the tribunal of JESUS CHRIST. The Redeemer was described reproaching the sinful soul: What more could I have done for thee that I have not done? Bernard described the accumulated blessings which this soul had once received. It had been endowed with strength of mind and body, with vast wealth, with high position in the world, nay more, it had been a king. The eloquent monk contrasted in glowing terms the great endowments of this gifted soul, with the darkness of its final and fatal condemnation. And Conrad could endure it no longer. He burst into tears. He interrupted the preacher, and cried out, in the church itself, "I acknowledge the unmerited mercies of the divine grace. I will not be ungrateful. Let Him only give me a signal of His will, and I obey." The whole congregation broke out into loud exclamations of warm approval. And the emperor received from the altar the sign of the Redeemer's Cross. Duke Frederic, his nephew, afterwards known under the name of Barbarossa, followed the imperial ex-

ample, and the nobles, in a body, gathered round the preacher, and took the Cross.

Having secured the German king and his nobles, Bernard's mission was accomplished. He returned to France by Cologne, where the crowds became so vast, that he dared not leave the house, but gave his blessing from a window to the assembled multitudes. "I myself," says Gerard, his companion, "wishing to enter, was unable; and from nine in the morning to evening-tide I waited in the street, without being able to reach the door."[130]

At last the Abbot found himself safely ensconced in the calm refuge of Clairvaux. Beside his successful mission for the Crusade, Bernard returned with many a recruit for his monastery. Thirty novices went before him, thirty follow him. So he returned not unattended.[131] But rest was not to be yet. It was the eve of the general departure for the Holy Land, and at the exodus Bernard must not be wanting. After a fortnight's repose at Clairvaux, the indefatigable Abbot issues forth to attend the general assembly at Etampes, A.D. 1147. Letters were read from the Greek emperor, Manuel Comnenus, conveying assurances of sympathy and friendship. The order of the expedition was discussed. One party proposed that the journey should be made by sea. This would have been incomparably the safer plan, for it would have secured the Crusaders from the treachery of the Greeks, and within a brief space have landed the host direct in some Syrian

port. Unhappily for that assembly, these prudent counsels were rejected, and it was determined to go by land. One problem of deep importance remained. Who should govern France during Louis's absence? By general consent the responsible office of vice-regent was forced upon the unwilling Abbot Suger.[132] Finally, to crown all these preparations for the war, Eugenius himself appeared in Paris. The Pope stood at the high altar of the Abbey Church of S. Denys, and blessed the sacred standard in presence of a vast congregation. Louis knelt to receive from the Pontiff himself the oriflamme, the banner of the Cross, and the Papal benediction. The young king passed from the solemn ceremony, to prepare himself in religious seclusion. He visited the hospital of the lepers. He passed the night in the cloister of S. Denys, joined the brethren in the refectory, and with a kiss of peace departed on the distant enterprise.[133]

So the great expedition moved onward to the holy places. The almost deserted cities, the cessation of trade, the market-places where no man walked, testified to the monk's tremendous influence in guiding the popular movement, and showed how the Crusade was draining away the strength of Europe into the desperate encounters of the East. Thus departed for the Holy Land the choicest and best of Europe's enthusiasm, hosts animated by splendid zeal, buoyed up by most confident hopes.

The details of this ill-fated expedition yet remain

recorded by an eye-witness. Odo, monk of S. Denys, at Paris, accompanied his monarch to the Holy Land, and wrote back to his Abbot, Suger, of S. Denys, the tragic tale. The French and German armies were wisely kept apart. The Germans commenced their march at Easter. Louis and the French did not follow till Whitsuntide. From Ratisbonne the German host, under Conrad, passed down the course of the Danube, into the territory of the Greek empire. Arrived at Philippopolis, an unfortunate incident betrayed the undisciplined character of the German troops. A desperate encounter between Germans and Greeks arose from the most trivial cause. A Greek conjuror swallowed a draught of wine, and then produced from his mouth a living snake. The ignorant Germans were terrified, and being under the impression that this was a plot to poison them, drew their swords, and cut the unlucky performer to pieces. A general uproar ensued, the Crusaders fell upon the Greeks, and set fire to the suburbs of Philippopolis. National hatred also broke out. Germans quarrelled in Greek markets with the French, over the purchase of food, which the wily Greeks doled out in small quantities at exorbitant prices. Neither party understood the other's language. So fierce grew the jealousy, that blood was freely shed, and they cut one another to pieces, until night prevented further conflict. Totally unable to maintain discipline in his ranks, Conrad was the helpless witness of endless

irregularities. His soldiers perpetrated outrages in almost every country which they traversed. At Constantinople the Emperor Manuel awaited their arrival with anxiety. Their character had preceded them. Outside the city was a vast and exceedingly beautiful garden, a sort of Paradise, where Oriental fancy revelled in all kinds of inventiveness; artistic watercourses and groups of costly flowers. Into this spot of all places the German swarms must needs pour themselves, running wild, destroying everything, trampling down, breaking, ruining; while from the walls of the city the Greeks looked down upon the destruction of their property. But the Greek emperor concealed his indignation, and took measures for a subtle revenge. Professing as sincere friendship as ever, he provided the German host with guides, secretly bribed to lead the army to destruction. Seventy thousand horsemen crossed the Straits under this guidance. For eight days they pressed forward into a region of which they were absolutely ignorant. And there they woke one morning to the fact that their guides had fled, their provisions were exhausted, their way was lost, and the Turkish host was upon them. On the hills above them appeared the Mohammedans everywhere, occupying every post of vantage, harassing the advance, swooping down upon their weariness, well acquainted with every inch of the country, vigilant, innumerable. In the unknown labyrinth of the mountains, the Crusaders became perplexed,

exhausted, discouraged. To retreat was death without honour, without achievement, inglorious. To advance was possibly death also, but death, perhaps with glory. The Germans voted for progress, and went forward. They fed upon their worn out and dying horses. But their weakness necessarily grew upon them. The Turkish hordes besetting them became increasingly more bold, in proportion to the invaders' increasing feebleness. From the hills the Turks rained arrows down upon them, and while refusing a closer engagement, did terrible execution from afar. Huge stones were hurled, crashing down into the valleys as the troops passed through a narrow defile. The inaccessible enemy lost no one, while the wounded and dying Crusaders were strewing the whole passage of the hills. It was impossible to describe the awful horrors of the way. Conrad and a wretched remnant alone survived to return to Constantinople.

Meanwhile the French, unaware of the Germans' fate, entered Constantinople. There the unhappy consequences of the schism between East and West made themselves felt. Diversities in ritual usage disturbed the French adherents to Rome. The Greeks differed in their way of celebrating the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Oriental priest actually cleansed and re-dedicated the altar where the Western priest had celebrated. It was even whispered that the Greeks baptized every person who came to them from the Western Church. East and West

met in the streets of Constantinople with angry suspicions and fierce recriminations, regarding each other as heretics from the Catholic Faith. The intense bitterness survives in the chronicler's page. He declares that he would not defile his narrative with these heresies, could he possibly avoid it. He mutters something about disgraceful errors which only death could expiate. The possibilities of sincere union among the adherents of the Cross were evidently remote. The Greeks were considered not to be Christians, their destruction scarcely a crime. Perjury was no sin among the Greeks, if perpetrated in behalf of their holy empire.

Profound mistrust increased. Rumours of Greek treachery reached the French host. It was said that Manuel was in league with the Turks against the Crusaders. Indignation broke out in fiercest flames. A Council was held under the very walls of Constantinople to consider the advisability of laying siege to the treacherous city. The Bishop of Langres, the same whose burning words had first kindled the French monarch's zeal, urgently pressed upon the Crusaders the duty of war. However his fiery counsels did not prevail. They had come, it was answered, to conquer the infidel, not to fight fellow Christians. But bitterly does the chronicler lament that the Bishop's advice was not taken. Meanwhile the subtle Greek was anxious to speed his guests' departure. A lying

rumour was circulated of a great victory won by the German host. Instantly the French fell into the trap, crossed the straits, and advanced to join them. They had scarcely landed on the other side of the Hellespont when Frederick Barbarossa arrived with the awful news of disastrous defeat. Afterwards Conrad himself, covered with wounds, and accompanied by scanty fugitives, attested the melancholy truth.

Constantinople was the glory of the Greek empire, rich in reputation, richer in gold, so wrote the chronicler as he entered it. Constantinople, proud in possessions, treacherous in morals, corrupt in faith, so wrote the Crusader in wrath as he looked back upon it.[134] He will not write the name of the Greek emperor in his pages, because that name is not written in the Book of Life.

So Louis VII. moved onward between Mount Ida and Mount Olympus, through Smyrna and Pergamos; they reached Ephesus; they stood at the mound which marks the resting-place of the Apostle S. John. They pushed on through the rushing torrents down the Ephesian Valley. They bought food at famine prices. But worst of all was the subtle treachery of the Greeks. The transit ships were purposely delayed; they were supplied at ruinous expense. Every sort of misfortune seemed to gather round the armies of the Cross as they vainly strove to cope with the Mohammedan forces under Noureddin, Sultan of Ico-

nium.[135] The flower of the French army perished long before they reached Damascus.

Rumours of the great disaster, fragmentary news of misfortune and repulse, reached Europe now and then. Louis modified as far as he could venture the terrible facts in his communications with France. Suger implored him to return. But Louis remained a year in the Holy Land. No conquest was made, no brilliant achievement secured. The feeble remnant which escaped the severity of the passage, was rendered feebler by oriental luxury in Antioch. At last he must return. In the year 1149 Louis returned by Rome, where he spent a brief time with Eugenius, and at length, as if reluctant to reappear in his own kingdom with the manifest tokens of miserable and utter defeat, slunk back to his palace with the scanty shreds and relics of the once glorious multitude of more than 100,000 men.[136] They returned with tales of disgrace and disastrous irreparable defeat. And by a strong and violent revulsion the indignant populace turned on the Abbot, whose burning words were responsible for directing their armies to ruin.

Bernard felt the overthrow most keenly. No eloquence could now avail to turn the stream of general mistrust and disapproval. The fickle crowds regarded Bernard as the main author of their misfortunes. Men of deeper insight than the rest pointed to the true causes of reverse. They

spoke of the untrained, ill-disciplined multitudes totally unqualified for military life. They drew in dark colouring the story of shameless immoralities, and all kinds of selfish excess by which the Crusading hosts were enfeebled and demoralized, and overcome. They drew the just conclusion that not with such degraded materials as these would the Eternal permit the deliverance of the holy places where the Redeemer's Blood was shed. Others pointed out that, after all, good had been providentially drawn forth from disaster and defeat. Misfortunes had had a purifying effect upon many in that ill-disciplined host. Survivors from the enterprise could relate the story of many a penitent and edifying death. Reverse and suffering had been made instrumental in securing the conversion of souls.[137] These just and true reflections moderated no doubt the wrath which fell on Bernard's head. But no reasonings could hinder the mass of men from regarding the Abbot of Clairvaux as personally responsible for their miseries.

Not that Bernard was distressed by the mere loss of popularity. The distressing element lay in the fact that he had, in absolute assurance of the Divine approval, predicted success. He had spoken as a prophet, but his promises had failed. Bernard was shaken by the melancholy issues. He writes to the Pope, exclaiming, "We have said Peace, and there is no peace. We promised blessings, and lo, confusion!" It bore the appearance of

rashness. It seemed as if the mere enthusiasm of a shallow mind. And yet the Pope had fully concurred, nay, GOD Himself approved. Why have we therefore fasted, and He has not heard? Why have we humbled ourselves, and He regards it not? For in all this His anger is not turned away, but His Hand is stretched out still.

The Abbot attempted to comfort himself and the Pope with the reflection that Moses promised the Israelites a better land, into which however he was not permitted to lead them.[138] And if the people challenged him to prove the truth of his mission by miracles, if they said, What sign showest thou that we may believe, there was an answer ready, were it not for the fact that humility would be endangered by it.

Bernard here distinctly alludes to the signs by which his preaching had been accompanied. But Bernard's heart was deeply wounded in his hour of failure and reverse.

LECTURE IX.

BERNARD'S LATER YEARS.

FROM the reproaches which the outer world poured upon Bernard after the failure of the Crusade, he sought refuge within Clairvaux's gates in quiet converse with Archbishop Malachi, Primate of Ireland, a brave champion of the Catholic Faith. Malachi delighted in Clairvaux. He had visited the monastery ten years before, and pleaded with the Pope for permission to continue there, but pleaded in vain. Malachi, after ten years' struggles with Irish barbarism, was now returning to his province for the second time from Rome, and rested at Clairvaux on the way. Here a sudden illness came upon him, and he ended his days with Bernard and in peace.

When the dust of Clairvaux was laid on the dead form of Malachi, Bernard sat down to write the Archbishop's life. Bernard's life of Malachi[139] is one of those deeply interesting records in which, while writing the life of another, the writer reveals his own ideal of what life should be. Malachi was a mediæval apostle; a man who in the barbaric wilds of Ireland had undergone incredible hard-

ships in propagating truth. And Bernard undertook to place on record the outlines of his brave career. It was always a useful labour, said Bernard, to write the lives of saintly men. It may help to rouse the morally dead. Therefore he will restore to the world one of whom the world was not worthy. Among all who read, Malachi's memory will be blessed. The Archbishop lay buried at Clairvaux, accordingly Clairvaux's monk must naturally become his biographer. Bernard owes him a personal debt. The hands of the dying Primate have rested on the Abbot's head. Bernard inherits his blessing. So Bernard relates how Malachi was born among a sunken and degraded people, from whose barbarism he imbibed no more than the fish do from the saltness of the sea; how he grew up singularly serious-minded and devout; how he was ordained priest at what was then the exceptionally early age of twenty-five; how he laboured to enforce the apostolic rules, Confession, "the Sacrament of Confirmation," the sanctity of the marriage vows, among an ignorant and sensual crowd; how his sister led a worldly life and died; how the priest had a dream, in which the dead woman appeared in great misery, having tasted nothing for thirty days, and Malachi reflected that for those thirty days he had omitted to offer the Holy Eucharist in his sister's behalf; how he celebrated the Sacrifice for her needs, and dreamed that she was restored, and thence learned

the effective influence of that prevailing Sacrament not only in this world, but in the next.

Bernard relates that Malachi received the site of the great Irish Monastery of Bangor, which pirates had destroyed. At the age of thirty, Malachi was consecrated Bishop of Connaught. Bernard describes with horror the condition of the diocese, nominally Christian, but in reality pagan. They paid no tithes, they disregarded the sanctity of marriage, they never went to confession. It was difficult to find a confessor anywhere. Very few ministered at the altars. There were no preachers, and scarcely any chants were heard in the House of Prayer. It was a perfect desolation. Among these conditions the Apostolic Malachi laboured splendidly. Shortly afterwards, Celsus the Irish Primate died. On his dying bed he pointed to Malachi as his fit successor. But by an almost unique departure from Catholic precedent, the Irish succession was in those days hereditary. The episcopate was secured in the tribe and the family. Bishops were multiplied to a very great extent. Almost every separate Church possessed its own Bishop. Malachi was duly consecrated Primate, but not without a long-continued resistance. Maurice was a relative of Celsus, and according to this bad tradition, claimed for himself the Primacy, and invaded the see five years. He was succeeded by another usurper, Nigellus. Nigellus secured the most valuable relics, heirlooms of the primacy,

including a copy of the Gospels which had belonged to S. Patrick, a staff covered with gold, and adorned with jewels, called the JESUS staff, from a tradition that our LORD had held it in His hands, and had in fact made it. Armed with these relics, for which the popular veneration was unbounded, Nigellus endeavoured to hold his own. But Malachi's power was increasing. His adherents enthroned him in the diocese of Armagh. The Archbishop then set off to Rome to seek the pallium. Innocent was at that time Pope, and Malachi asked leave to resign, and live at Clairvaux, a request which Innocent declined to grant. The Irish Primate then asked the Pope to confirm him in his metropolitan see. Innocent granted this at once. Malachi next sought the pallium. Innocent replied that this could only be done in response to a request from the entire Irish episcopate. The Pope then placed his own mitre on Malachi's head, gave him his own maniple and stole, which the Primate ever after wore while celebrating, and sent him away with the kiss of peace. All this Malachi himself related to Bernard and the monks at Clairvaux. The Archbishop returns to his Irish troubles. So passed away ten years, of which many events are told, legendary, wonderful, which Bernard himself implicitly believed. One tale relates how a woman sought for extreme unction at the hands of Malachi. The Archbishop refused it under the impression that she was not

C. A.D. 1139.

dying. That night, however, the woman died. Malachi, in deep distress, prayed that she might live again ; and live again she did, sufficiently long to receive the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, and to die in peace, much to Malachi's satisfaction. The tale exhibits profound veneration for the Sacraments, and vivid sense of their utility.

The Irish priest was evidently a man of strong moral ascendancy. Other men were strong while resting upon him. When departing for the second time to Rome, armed with a council's request for the pallium, a poor sufferer from epilepsy, who felt himself safe from recurrence of his terrible malady so long as the Archbishop was near, approached him with bitter lamentations. Malachi, with fatherly tenderness, drew him to himself, signed him with the sign of the Cross, and said, with impressive authority, "Be sure you shall never suffer from this again until I return." He has never suffered since, says the biographer. And, Bernard adds, with quiet pathos, Malachi never will return. So Malachi came down to the sea-shore, about to leave Ireland for ever. As he was departing, two most intimate friends made him promise to grant their last request. "What is it?" Malachi said. They declined to tell him until he had promised to grant it. Malachi was rash enough to promise. "Give us your word," said they, "that you will return." Malachi was snared. Convinced that the future would be otherwise ordered, he knew not what to say, but thought

it best to leave the event in GOD'S hands, and set sail. But soon a storm arose, and the boat was compelled to return. So Malachi kept his promise. But the next day he sailed away, and was never seen again. Then follows in rapid succession the Primate's visit to Rome, and at Clairvaux his death. In his last illness they could not believe that he was dying, for no signs of death seemed visible in his face. He asked for extreme unction. He refused to allow the monks to come up to his cell, but arose and went down to meet them. It was the festival of All Saints. Malachi communicated with the brotherhood. "I have earnestly desired," he said, "to eat this Passover with you. I praise the Divine mercy that I am not deprived of my desire." And at midnight Bernard rose and stood beside his bed. It is the hour when the light shineth in the darkness; the monks assembled; the room was full. They followed the departing soul with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. So Malachi slept, in his fifty-fourth year. By the motionless calm upon his features, they knew that he was dead. We thought him dying when he slept, and sleeping when he died. (Mortuus vivere et vivens mortuus putabatur.) Why should Clairvaux mourn for Malachi? Right dear in the sight of the LORD is the death of His saints. He giveth His beloved sleep. The Sacrifice was offered for the Primate's repose. And in the chapel of the Holy Virgin Mother of GOD, that chapel in which

Malachi had delighted, he was laid to rest, in the year of our LORD'S Incarnation, 1148.

No sketch of Bernard's life would be complete without including Bernard as a biographer. His admiration for Malachi's character, his enthusiastic description of the life of a great contemporary, gives us a fresh insight into the beauty of Bernard's own mind. It shows us once more what he had most at heart, and the ideal after which he strove.

Although the Crusades had ended in a complete collapse, yet Bernard's preaching had not been unproductive of good. His incessant labours had brought him into contact with many minds, widened enormously the circle of his influence, and effected a deep impression on the more religious of the day. These now sought him out in his cloister. They came from every order of social life. Three times the monastery had to be enlarged, to meet the requirements of the ever-increasing community. Bernard's dream was coming true. Seven hundred brethren were enrolled in Clairvaux before the great Abbot's death. And beyond this 160 religious houses in France, Spain, Germany, and England, acknowledged him as general of their order.[140] Clairvaux was perpetually receiving fresh accessions. It was also sending out her sons to occupy important places in the Church. Many of Bernard's followers became Bishops. They issued forth from the solitudes to discharge the practical duties of a diocese. But amid the cares and the interests of a

great position, they never forgot the quiet convent and its seclusion. Their hearts were at Clairvaux still. They loved it as men love their home. They ever delighted to lay aside the responsibilities of public ministrations, and to return to the monastery as a blest retreat. They held it a precious privilege to be permitted to die there.[141] There was Guerric, in whom all the brothers acknowledged a high degree of sanctity. Like Bernard, constantly a victim to bodily infirmities, but most spiritually minded. He was peculiarly noted for his reverence in reading the lessons, in fact it was said that they saw an angel accompany him when he left his stall, and devoutly kneel beside him while he read. Guerric was subsequently made head of a religious house. And when Abbot Guerric lay dying, remembering the strict account which he must give, he carefully examined his conscience by the Benedictine rule. After which he summoned the convent, and told them that he bitterly accused himself of breaking the monastic discipline in one respect. He had written a volume of Addresses, and issued them without the permission of his superiors. Had not Samuel said that disobedience was as idolatry. Guerric besought the brothers to recall the book, and ruthlessly to commit it to the flames. But, says the biographer, it was otherwise ordained. The Church was not to be thus deprived of the precious fruits of his spiritual meditations. And,

as a matter of fact, they are still prefixed to S. Bernard's work. Master and disciple are still together in their writings.[142]

Bernard's later days were sorely disturbed by forgeries of his seal and signature.[143] There was a brother at Clairvaux to whom the Abbot had been, if possible, exceptionally considerate. Bernard made Nicolas his private secretary, and trusted him entirely. But Nicolas was unprincipled and dishonest. He brought upon his Abbot incredible distress by forging his seal and issuing letters in his name. This continued for a long time undiscovered. At length Nicolas absconded, and his miserable frauds became known. Bernard, patient as ever, made as little reference to his dishonest secretary as the case permitted. But it cost him untold anxieties before he could set right the mischievous results of the forged letters.

A.D. 1151.

He was perforce compelled to acquaint Eugenius with the facts. That Nicolas, he wrote, has gone out from us, because he was not of us. But he has left the most deplorable witness to his depravity. Bernard had long ago suspected the man, but with his usual patience had hoped against hope. Either, thought Bernard, GOD will convert Nicolas, or else, like Judas, the betrayer will betray himself. He stole books and money, but, worst of all, three seals; the Secretary's, the Prior's, and Bernard's own, a new seal which Bernard had

lately substituted for the former seal. This was why Bernard had complained that he lived among false brethren. Who could tell to what mischievous uses the unscrupulous Nicolas had put the Abbot's seal? Nicolas had been forced by evidence to confess that he had forged a letter to the Pope. Bernard will say no more than is necessary by way of warning and defence.

Bernard was distressed by the insolent conduct of the Papal Nuncios. Your legate, writes Bernard to the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, your legate has passed from nation to nation, from one kingdom to another people. And everything which he has touched he has defiled. This apostolic person has propagated not the Gospel, but sacrilege. He has reaped a rich harvest from the Churches, appointed mere boys to ecclesiastical offices. Many have bribed him to keep him at a distance. He has made himself a byword in the schools, the courts, the public places. Seculars and religious alike complained of him. The poor, the monks, the clergy—none will say a good word for him. Read this, adds Bernard, to the Pope. Let him decide what ought to be done. I have delivered my soul. It will be well for the Pope if he cleanses the Court of Rome, and so delivers his own conscience.[144]

The strain of a life's incessant exertions told grievously on a constitution naturally frail, and further enfeebled by severe ascetic discipline. I

have determined, he is obliged to say, not to leave the monastery any more. My strength is broken, I can no longer wander about as I used to do. I shall sit still and be silent. "It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the LORD." Lam. iii. 26. It was also written, "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." Isa. xxx. 15. Bernard wanted peace, and it was not long delayed.

Writing to Andrew his uncle, one of the Knights Templars at Jerusalem, Bernard expresses a strong desire to see him before his death. But if he is coming, Andrew must come quickly, or he will be too late.

The days of Bernard's incessant activity were drawing to a close. He no longer possessed the physical force necessary for wanderings across Europe, and for personal intervention in the interests of widely separated cities. But the mind was as active as ever. In these days of his decline, the Abbot saw no more his beloved Eugenius. But Eugenius, far away in his dangerous dignity, was ever very near and dear to Bernard's heart. In the quiet of Clairvaux and the broken intervals of rest, Bernard was writing wise counsels, and grave warnings for the guidance of his friend and brother monk, the Pope. The manual "On Consideration," is one of Bernard's best known works. It is written to Eugenius by the man who in all Europe had probably the profoundest knowledge

of religious affairs in that age. And it is written with the express purpose of deepening the Pope's spiritual life, of securing his usefulness to Christendom, and of protecting him from the perils of a unique and isolated greatness, strangely contrasted with the simple-minded monk's obscure position in early days. We catch in this memorable writing many glimpses into the inner working of the Pope's Court and surroundings at Rome. We have the lofty ideal of a chief Bishop in Christendom drawn by the pencil of one of the most genuinely apostolic among men.

Bernard reminds Eugenius how insensibly we slide away from our first intentions and our pure ideal. That which first appears insufferable, in course of time assumes a less repulsive form, and then afterwards it becomes tacitly endured, and later still we do not notice its presence, and finally we become reconciled to it, and accept it as of necessity. We cannot trust to the permanence of our present emotions. Nor is the heart so firmly fixed in right that by the solvent of time and neglect it cannot be dislodged.

The incessant burden of secular affairs which found their way to Rome, Bernard deeply deplores. The papal palace echoed less the laws of CHRIST than the laws of Justinian. Let Eugenius see to it that they deserved the name of Just. The scenes in Rome contrasted oddly with the saying of our LORD, "Who made Me a judge or a divider

over you?" S. Luke xii. 14. The Apostles were not found rectifying boundaries or apportioning estates. They appeared indeed in court, but as prisoners, not as magistrates. Their office was not to administer farms, but to forgive sins. Secular affairs have their appropriate functionaries whose business is to attend to this very thing. Why should the spiritual invade the duties of the secular, and thrust in their sickle into a harvest which is not theirs?

Amid the distractions of the papal life, the only safeguard was reflection, consideration. Called to do good to all men, among all men Eugenius must include himself. He must take his own turn among the souls with which he deals. Care for others is not compatible with neglect of self. "He that is evil to himself, to whom will he be good?" Ecclus. xiv. 5. It is Eugenius' first duty to look to his own spiritual state. He must not dissipate his strength by too incessant activity. The essential thing is *consideration*, that is occasional withdrawal for thought and reflection upon eternal truths. To the restless mind in the cares of high estate there is peculiar significance in the words, "Be still then, and know that I am GOD." Ps. xlvi. 10. Consideration helps to govern the emotions, to guide the conduct, to correct excess, to regulate character, to strengthen and ennoble life, to bring home to the mind the knowledge alike of things human and things divine. Consideration

unravels the confused, binds the broken, gathers the scattered, penetrates the unknown, discovers the true, dispels the false. Let Eugenius reflect upon himself, his nature, his office, his character. What art thou by nature? a man, a creature, rational and mortal. By office, a servant, not a lord. (Ministerium non dominium datum.)

Eugenius has the care of all the churches but not dominion over them. Hear S. Peter himself, "Neither as being lords over GOD'S heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 S. Pet. v. 3. This was our SAVIOUR'S teaching. "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; . . . . but ye shall not be so." S. Luke xxii. 25, 26. Clearly dominion is forbidden to the Apostles.

After this Bernard ascribes many lofty titles to the Pope, and then bids Eugenius consider the peculiar dangers of his work. Ambition was a more frequent visitant than devotion at the thresholds of the Apostles. The Abbot vigorously denounces the injustice and waste entailed by the practice of appeals to Rome. How long, he cries, will you be deaf to the murmurs of the world? How long before you awake to the confusion and the abuses of appeals? The character of the Roman Cardinals for wealth and rapacity does not escape the scourge of Bernard's indignant rebuke. It has become proverbial, he says, When does Rome ever say no to money?

Bernard had not a very high estimate of the

Italian character. The populace were a fierce and unruly throng. The more cultured class were unwilling to obey and incapable of ruling; faithless to their superiors, insufferable to those beneath them; audacious in pushing their own self-interest, never resting till their ambition was secured, and thankless when successful. Singularly facile in the arts of cunning and dissimulation, their slippery character escaped at every turn. Bernard was not happy in association with Italians. The outward trappings of the Papacy met with the Abbot's strong disapproval. Peter the Apostle was a stranger to this dignified display of glittering gems and silken robes. He rode not forth in embroidered apparel upon a white palfrey, accompanied by an armed force and servants innumerable.

In the absence of all these accessories he believed it possible to fulfil the command, If thou lovest ME, feed My sheep. In these things you are not Peter's successor, but Constantine's.

Bernard would sternly reprove the secular element which was in danger of obscuring the spiritual aspect of the Church. Why do you again attempt to usurp the sword which you were bidden to put back within its sheath? Bernard's idea of the relationship between secular and religious power is instructive. There are two swords, the spiritual and the material. The former alone is to be employed by the Church herself, the latter by the world in the Church's behalf. The priest holds

one, the soldier the other; but the secular should be directed in subordination to the spiritual.

The Abbot counsels the Pope on the exercise of his patronage. Let him select neither him that willeth nor him that runneth, but rather those who draw back and refuse, men who fear none besides GOD, and hope for nothing except from GOD, men of recognized goodness, obedient to discipline, catholic in faith, trustworthy stewards, seekers after peace, lovers of unity. Men who will be like John the Baptist to kings, like Moses to the Egyptians, like Elijah to idolaters, men who will not despise the ignorant, but teach them, nor flatter the rich, but warn them, nor wrong the poor, but help them, nor fear the powerful, but rebuke them. Men whose advent is peaceful, whose departure regretted, whose word is edifying, whose life is exemplary, whose presence is welcome, and whose memory is blessed. Men who will not enrich themselves or their relatives with the patrimony of the Crucified.

Another matter which set Rome in an unfavourable aspect before Europe was the aggressive and presumptuous arrogance of the Papal legates. Their overbearing conduct was ridiculous. Above all things, says Bernard, remember that the Holy Roman Church, over which GOD has placed you, is the mother of Churches, but not their mistress; and that you yourself are not master over the Bishops, but one among their number.

It is not every man who would have ventured to say these things to an occupant of the Papal throne. And for a man holding a place so distinguished in Christendom, it was simply invaluable to have the plain truth told him with the authority of a father, and the independence of one who cared not whether his boldness brought him loss or gain. Bernard spoke plain words. He rebukes and exhorts the Pope, and teaches him the limits of his position, and all this with a freedom most remarkable. Did this ideal of the Roman episcopate lie before the successive occupants of the Papal chair? Was it read in the awful degradations inseparable from the name of Borgia? We do not know. But it had been well for the progress of Christendom, during the centuries which ensued, had this pure and noble utterance been followed out and obeyed. Who knows whether the divisions which have weakened Christendom to this hour, had ever been, if the successors of Eugenius had followed the guidance of S. Bernard?

It must have gladdened Bernard's heart to receive a letter from Peter of Cluny,[145] describing a visit to Rome, and giving his impressions of Eugenius. The powerful head of the great society of Cluny was received in Rome with every token of deference. But nothing struck him so much as his interviews with Eugenius. Eugenius was as a friend most faithful, a brother most true, devoting himself with endless patience to all who sought

him, conducting himself with a lowliness and humility which almost made men oblivious to the fact of his exalted position. Not a trace of vanity, parade, self-seeking, could be detected in his amiable character. Peter found the Pope most willing to grant his requests, or most reasonable when declining. It was no new thing, added Peter, with pardonable pride, that the House of Cluny should, in the person of its superior, be respected by the occupant of the Papal throne. But this transparent sincerity in word and deed was a new experience at Rome. Thus the lessons learnt in Clairvaux bore fruit in the great Italian Patriarchate, and Bernard's influence in training character displayed itself in the person of the Pope. The saintly Abbot's declining days must have been so far comforted. He was permitted to see the fruit of his labours, in the man whom he described as formerly his son, but now his father.

Odo,[146] the Subprior of Clairvaux, saw with grief the Abbot's failing strength. Odo for years had aided in the government of the house. He was a monk of the best and purest type. Genial and kindly, but very firm and rigid in observance of the rule. Odo had seen Clairvaux through its most famous days, and he had no desire to survive them. Odo prayed fervently he might die before Bernard was taken away. And the subprior's prayer was granted. Bernard stood by his dying bed, and strengthened him in the last passage of

mortality, and the solemn experiences which he himself was soon to undergo.

Half-way through the twelfth century, or more exactly, in the year 1153, Bernard's increasing infirmities gave warning that the end was approaching. I am sick even to death, he wrote; I am even weaker than you would believe. Meanwhile the whole brotherhood, in their devotions, pleaded most fervently against the saint's departure. And Bernard intuitively knew that his death was being hindered by their prayers. Accordingly, one day, he gathered up his strength, as the brothers stood round his bed, and besought them to hinder his decease no longer. "Why will ye keep so miserable a creature here? I beseech you spare me, and let me go." Bernard lay in perpetual suffering. There was no intermission granted by the obliviousness of occasional sleep. He tossed from side to side in continual wakefulness. The signs of dropsy set in, and the sick man could take no nourishment. But in all the ruin of his physical frame, Bernard never lost the serenity of mind, the gentleness and graciousness of character which had distinguished him all life through. Sensible of his increasing infirmity, he told the brothers, I shall not continue much longer on the earth. He withdrew himself, during the few remaining weeks, as far as possible from the distractions of worldly affairs. He wanted to secure his footing most firmly on the further shore; and when a Bishop came to consult the

dying man on business connected with his see, Bernard seemed bereft of his usual interest. Marvel not, he said; I am no longer of this world. Afterwards, conscious that what strength remained was ebbing fast away, the dying Abbot summoned about his bed certain best beloved and most trusty members of the community, and gave them his parting charge. Since, he said, I can leave you no great example of holy life as your inheritance: there are three things which I have laboured to observe during my career, and which I commend for your imitation. My aim has been to trust less in my own senses than in those of others; never to revenge myself on those who have injured me; to give offence to no man, and if unhappily offence was given, to make amends as speedily as I could.

Thus the great Abbot of Clairvaux breathed his last. The body, robed in priestly vesture, rested in the Chapel of the Virgin. Upon the altar was offered the Holy Sacrifice for Bernard's soul.

When it became known beyond the precincts that the saintly Abbot had expired, mourning multitudes collected at the monastery gates. There the women sobbed and bewailed him. According to the monastic rule, women might not enter the monastic church. But the men pressed on crowding, and choking all the avenues of approach. They gathered round the dead form, and gazed on the noble face which death had not altered, or if altered, had yet further refined and dignified. They

kissed the cold hand. They laid coins upon the vesture of the dead, as if by contact with the sacred clay, some virtue would be communicated even to these. Throngs pressed in to Clairvaux from far and near. The dense masses of eager visitants became unmanageable. All the world seemed coming to Clairvaux. Confusion ensued. The monks could not restrain the impulsive and mourning multitudes. The community were obliged to hasten the funeral secretly. Early on the morning of the third day, the Eucharistic Sacrifice was offered again, and the holy dead laid quietly in his grave, before the altar of the B.V.M. Upon his heart were placed some relics of the Apostle Thaddæus, which had been sent to Bernard from Jerusalem, and which the saint desired to have buried with him when he died.

Thus passed away, at the age of sixty-three, one of the purest realizations of Christian principle which has ever appeared in human flesh and blood. As a writer, contemporary with Bernard, truly says: he was one to whom many miracles were attributed, but the greatest miracle which he displayed was himself. Calm and serene in aspect, humble in bearing, prudent in speech, devoted to meditation, believing more in prayer than any other form of human industry, vigorous in faith, unflagging in hope, overflowing with love, crowned by lowliness. Marvellous was the force of character which, although himself abiding in lowly position,

enabled Bernard to win his elder brothers to embrace monastic life, to infuse new vigour in an already severe monastic house, to attract his fellow-countrymen towards that obscure corner of Burgundy, to obtain ascendancy over whole peoples, to guide the consciences of kings, Henry of England, Louis of France, and Conrad of Germany; to decide and finally settle the claims of rival Popes; to order the affairs of Christendom from the Abbot's chamber in Clairvaux; to direct the current of popular enthusiasm into the disasters of the second Crusade; to win, without seeking it, the adoring reverence of multitudes; and yet to decline all outward honours, and to live and die merely the Superior of an undistinguished cloister in a wild and repellent vale. In one way this saintly hero of far-off days is with us still, for we join in singing the language of his hymns. The familiar hymn—

> "JESU, the very thought is sweet,
> In that dear Name all heart-joys meet:
> But oh! than honey sweeter far
> The glimpses of His Presence are,"

comes to us from the cloisters of Clairvaux, and from Bernard's pen. It is a fragment of the beautiful lines beginning, JESU dulcis memoria.

Our labours now are ended. We have tried to catch glimpses of a far-away time—to make the men and women of a bygone age live before us

again. We have attempted to realize what they were like in their modes of thought, their devotion, their manner of living. We have passed into a mediæval atmosphere widely contrasted with this in which our own lot is cast. We have heard strains very unfamiliar to modern conceptions, enthusiasms which possibly wake no echo in minds of to-day. But we have also seen profound unworldliness and all-conquering faith. We have seen that, notwithstanding the diversity of centuries, human nature is everywhere the same. We have seen one impressive phase in the development of Christian character. We have seen a spiritual grandeur, an intensity of conviction which we shall not easily find surpassed. We have found men who, at whatever sacrifice, were animated with a spirit of intense reality, men who put Christianity in the very forefront of all they sought and all they loved. We have seen the Cross exerting its influence over the passions of ignorant nobles and half-civilized throngs; the power and authority of the Church arresting the lawlessness of sinful men.

And in the centre of it all, as the embodiment of all that was best in the tendencies of the age, there rises a singularly unearthly figure, physically weak but morally powerful, a strangely beautiful ascetic saintly form; the childlike simplicity, the unquestioning faith, the fervent personal devotion to our LORD, the single-minded unselfish sacrificial life, of one who exercised enormous power, but

never exercised it in his own behalf; the man who with few and slight imperfections universally exhibited in human nature as we see it, was one of the purest examples of Christian principle which history can anywhere present, the gentle yet strong, the spiritually-gifted—Bernard, first Abbot of Clairvaux.

APPENDIX.

S. BERNARD'S REJECTION OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

S. BERNARD is lavish in the glorious titles which he heaps upon S. Mary. She is "the Lady of the world," she is "the Queen of Heaven." The royal Virgin is "the way whereby the SAVIOUR came near to us." The familiar contrast between Mary and Eve, the mother of all living, and the mother of the LORD, the introducer of sorrow into human life, and the bringer in of Redemption, is one upon which S. Bernard, as his predecessors, delighted to dwell. He calls on Eve to go to Mary, the mother to put her confidence in her daughter. He tells Adam that he must now retract his accusation against Eve, for the woman whom Thou gavest me has now given me of the Tree of Life, and by it I live again. In a passage of extreme beauty and refinement, S. Bernard describes the entire human race as waiting in breathless suspense for Mary's answer to the angel. Her word is to be the fiat of the new spiritual creation. S. Bernard represents Mary, if not with theological accuracy, at least with exceeding dignity and grace, as deciding by one word the destinies of mankind. All the human race is prostrate at her

feet. The angel waits for her reply. "Behold, there is offered to thee," S. Bernard exclaims, "the price of our redemption; if thou consentest, we are free. Upon thy lips depends the consolation of the sorrowful, the freedom of the enslaved, the rescue of the lost, the salvation of all the sons of Adam, of all thy race."[147] Upon this a writer of our own communion remarks :—

"I have indeed thought it an exaggeration, when some writers of books of devotion have delighted to dwell on the Incarnation as though our Redemption depended upon the 'fiat' of Mary. For although GOD—in conformity with that His wondrous condescension, whereby He reverences (if I may so speak) the free will with which He has endowed us, and will not force our will—would not accomplish the Incarnation without the free will of His creature, yet, of course, there was nothing really in suspense. Had He indeed, amid the manifold failures, which He has allowed in His work of grace, willed to allow this scope also to free will, that it should reject the privilege of being Theotokos, and so have offered it to one who would not accept it, the Incarnation might have been delayed for a while; it could not have failed."[148]

But S. Bernard goes further. "Let us strive through her to ascend to Him, Who through her descended to us." "*Through thee we have access to thy Son.* O blessed discoveress of grace, bearer of life, mother of Redemption, that through thee He may receive us, Who through thee is given us." "Our Lady, our mediatrix, our advocate, *reconcile us to thy Son.*"[149]

This language of S. Bernard implies that GOD has constituted the B.V.M. as a mediatrix between JESUS CHRIST and mankind; that all our approach to JESUS CHRIST

must be through her; that she again dispenses His grace to all the human race. And this language has been re-echoed and widely adopted in subsequent writers.

S. Bernard is responsible for this doctrine. According to S. Bernard, one unique prerogative of Mary is her mediatorship between CHRIST and the Church. CHRIST indeed, S. Bernard admits, would have sufficed, and as it is even now, all our sufficiency is of Him. But it was not good for the Man CHRIST JESUS to be alone. It was, Bernard thinks, becoming that both sexes should take part in our restoration. The faithful and most powerful mediator between GOD and man is the Man CHRIST JESUS. But human nature shrinks away in fear, awestruck at the recollection of His divinity. The manhood seems absorbed in Deity, says S. Bernard. Accordingly what more natural, more beautiful, than the erection of a mediator between the Mediator and the human race? Human frailty is terrified at the majesty of JESUS CHRIST. But human frailty has no fear of Mary. In her there is nothing austere, nothing terrible. Does she ever say a harsh word in the Gospel? If she does, let her forfeit her position. Do you want an advocate with the FATHER? GOD has given you JESUS CHRIST. Do you need an advocate with JESUS CHRIST? Take refuge in Mary. Mary, says S. Bernard, is placed as mediatress between CHRIST and the Church.[150]

To any mind, coming straight from the study of primitive Christian writers, all this is as novel as it is painful. The erection of a womanly ideal of mercy without justice, a feminine refuge for sinners, more tender and compassionate than JESUS CHRIST, is at once a wrong inflicted upon the character of our LORD, and also a lowering of

the severe Christian morality to the level of human frailty. The greatest glory of Christianity lies in its marvellous reconciliation of mercy with justice. Bernard felt this at other times most keenly. His wonderful Sermon on the words, Mercy and Truth are met together, plainly shows it. In fact, to separate the attributes of mercy and judgment is not really an act of kindness to the human race. We need the bracing, invigorating, if at times overwhelming Form of the awful Son of Man, Who is, although merciful, yet just, and although just, yet merciful.

There is also the painfully false light in which this separation of mercy from justice places the character of our LORD'S tenderness. If the sinner is bidden to take refuge in Mary, when afraid of his LORD, it seems implied that the mercy of the creature is greater than the mercy of the Uncreated. The rivulet seems pointed out as purer than its source. The human heart, which GOD endows with a ray of love, seems regarded as more sympathetic than the Giver of this endowment of love. No—

> "The love of GOD is broader
> Than the measures of man's mind
> And the heart of the Eternal
> Is most wonderfully kind."

The voice which spoke words such as no other gave utterance to—says not Go to My mother, but Come unto Me.

But S. Bernard strongly emphasized the wide distinction between the dignity of the mother and the dignity of her Blessed Son. On the words, Blessed art thou among women, S. Bernard writes:—Not because thou

art blessed, therefore blessed is the fruit of thy womb; but because He has prevented thee with the blessings of goodness, therefore thou art blessed. Truly blessed is thy Child, in Whom all nations of the earth are blessed, of Whose fulness hast thou also received as others, although differently from others. Moreover, thou art blessed, but it is among women; but He is blessed, not merely among men, nor among angels, but, far above all: for this is He of Whom the Apostle exclaims, He is GOD, blessed for ever.[151]

Again, if S. Bernard says, "whatever we say in praise of the Mother reverts to her Son," he immediately adds, "and when we honour the Son, we do not depart from the glory of the Mother." And unquestionably the gaze of S. Bernard is fixed not upon the Mother, but upon the Divine Son. It is JESUS CHRIST Who is the perpetual theme of his praise, and the centre of his adoration. At the same time the beauty of S. Bernard's teaching, the intensity of his devotion to Mary undoubtedly gave great impulse to the popular tendencies. Bernard certainly helped to advance in several ways the ideas of Europe on the B.V.M.

But there were limits even for S. Bernard. A claim was being made in Mary's behalf which even S. Bernard's mind could not accept. And the enthusiastic readiness with which he accepts many things contributing to her honour, makes the contrast of his refusal all the more striking. There must be strong reasons indeed when S. Bernard refuses to ascribe a new title to S. Mary.

We propose to sketch in the following pages the history of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.

I. *S. Bernard's Letter.*

The Festival of the Conception of the B.V.M. was now (A.D. 1140) being observed for the first time in Christendom. The ever-watchful S. Bernard is instantly on the alert. He writes his celebrated letter[152] to the Canons of the Church of Lyons. He assures them that among the churches of France none has been more distinguished hitherto in influence, in learning, and in life than the Church of Lyons. A matured and judicious community it has never as yet been betrayed into youthful levity. Accordingly Bernard is all the more amazed to find that Church introducing a novel observance—he means the Festival of the Conception—which, he adds, is foreign to the usages of the Church, discordant to reason, and destitute of the authority of tradition. Are we, asks S. Bernard, more learned than the Fathers, or more devout?

But, interposes an objector, the LORD'S Mother is surely to be highly revered. True, replies S. Bernard, but the queen's honour loveth judgment. The Royal Virgin needs no false glories. The genuine dignities which crown her are numerous indeed. Honour her as Ever Virgin, revere the holiness of her life, venerate her divine Son. She was honoured by the Angels, desired by all nations, predicted by Patriarchs and Prophets, chosen alone from all, preferred before all. She is the discoverer of grace, the mediatress of Redemption, through her the world is restored. So the Church has taught him to say. That she was sanctified from her birth S. Bernard rejoices to believe. This was said of Jeremiah and S. John Baptist; but how far that sanctification availed

with reference to original sin, S. Bernard is not prepared to say. What was granted to these prophets was certainly not denied to her through whose instrumentality all mankind has entered into life. Unquestionably the LORD'S Mother was sanctified before her birth; and S. Bernard himself believed that all her life through she was by special grace secured from actual sin. It was becoming that it should be so. Are not these privileges sufficiently great? No, answers the objector, we must also believe that she was conceived by her parents without sin. Why not also that her grandparents and great-grandparents, and so on for generations, says S. Bernard, were also exempt from original sin? There is no limit to it. But the defenders of the Immaculate Conception produce some writings upon which they rely. As if any one could not as reasonably infer from the text, Honour thy father and thy mother, that the Virgin's father and mother were also exempted from the inheritance of sin! As for such apocryphal writings, neither resting on reason nor authority, S. Bernard is not to be influenced by them. That she was sanctified is the proof that she was not immaculately conceived. S. Bernard is quite clear that being born of the ordinary marriage union of her parents, her conception was not sinless. He reads Gabriel's prediction that the HOLY GHOST shall overshadow her. The HOLY SPIRIT comes *upon* her in her maturity, but was not *with* her in her nativity. If S. Bernard may repeat the mind of the Church, and assuredly the Church is right, he would say that the B.V.M. conceived by the HOLY SPIRIT, but not that by the HOLY SPIRIT she was herself conceived. Otherwise where is the Virgin's unique prerogative if the Virgin's mother also possessed the same? This

is not to honour the Virgin, but to deprive her of honour.

Although then it has been granted to a very few among human beings to be *born* in holiness, not one among them has been so *conceived;* CHRIST alone excepted, Who sanctifies all men, and coming alone without sin, cleanses all from sin. But with that sole exception, Mary, like the rest must say, "In sin hath my mother conceived me."

Hence what is the meaning of a festival of her Immaculate conception? How can that Conception which was not sinless be observed by festival? The glorious Virgin may well do without this honour. S. Bernard denounces this festival. He calls it a bold innovation, the mother of rashness, sister of superstition, daughter of levity. Indeed even if the Canons of Lyons had been maintaining the truth, which S. Bernard is convinced is not the case, yet before taking such steps the Apostolic See ought to have been consulted. They ought not to have followed the simplemindedness of a few unlearned persons.

S. Bernard had detected this error on a previous occasion. But he was reluctant to interfere with a devotion which sprang from simplemindedness, and well-intentioned zeal. But when he discovered learned men like the Canons of Lyons, and that great Church led away into superstition, he felt that the time for silence had passed by. S. Bernard concludes with an expression of deference for the opinion of any person more learned than himself, and especially of the Roman Church by whose authority he is purposed to abide.

S. Bernard's rejection of the Immaculate Conception

of the B.V.M. is in this celebrated letter rested upon two grounds—1. *Argument*, and 2. an appeal to *Tradition.*

The appeal to tradition has an independent value, whatever may be thought of the validity of S. Bernard's reasonings. Reasonings such as these exhibit to some extent the individual mind alone. But in the appeal to Tradition is S. Bernard's witness to the teaching and practice which the Church had set before him. S. Bernard's position, his friendship with successive Popes, his incessant correspondence with leading Bishops and theologians of his age, his wide and intimate knowledge of the century in which he was living—none knew it better than himself—all these facts contribute to add enormous weight to his witness when he asserts that the Catholic Church had no traditions of the Virgin's Immaculate Conception.[153]

II. *The Council of Basle.*

But this doctrine to which the last of the Fathers of the Latin Church had half-way through the twelfth century accorded his emphatic denial, was to be the theme of violent contention in the ages succeeding. The theory of the Virgin's exemption from mortal taint which barely struggled for place and existence in the twelfth century, had become more powerful and prevalent in the fifteenth. If the entire Dominican order was identified with its rejection, the Franciscans supported it with all their strength. And the subject hitherto confined to the discussion of individual theologians, at length emerged into the council chambers of the Catholic Church.

John of Torquemada,[154] Cardinal of the Roman Church, protested with all his force against the introduction of this new theory among the dogmas of the Church. Cardinal John was supported by the whole order of S. Dominic.

It was the desire of Pope Eugenius IV. that the subject of the Immaculate Conception should be discussed at the Council of Basle in 1431. Accordingly the Pope selected two theologians, one in defence of the doctrine, and the other in denial, whose office was to show what might be said on either side. John of Torquemada was the theologian chosen to show reasons why the Church should not erect this opinion into a dogma of the Faith.

In fulfilment of his office the Cardinal wrote an exceedingly elaborate treatise at great length, in support of the position adopted by S. Bernard. Cardinal John rose in his place in the council chamber at Basle, and proposed to introduce his thesis in accordance with the Pope's desire. But the absorbing question of the Greek Church occupied the Council's attention at first, and the subsequent discord, and division, and failure, and ultimate departure of the vast majority of Bishops defeated the Pope's desire, and the treatise of Cardinal John was never read. The Cardinal himself, disgusted with the unhappy state of the Council, returned to the Pope. After John of Torquemada and the majority of the Bishops had departed, an insignificant minority passed a canon enforcing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of S. Mary. This decree was received in France, but ignored in Rome. Such was the first introduction of the doctrine into the Council Chambers of Christendom.

Cardinal John scornfully characterises this decree as worthless, invalid, as indeed it is generally acknowledged to be.

But the Cardinal's laborious compilation was laid aside, and was in danger of becoming lost in the archives of Rome, had not Pope Paul III., a century later, ordered the work to be published (A.D. 1534). Whether or no the increasing unpopularity of the cause defended by Cardinal John contributed to the oblivion of his labours need not be discussed; but the treatise, although published with Papal sanction, became very rare and inaccessible. In the present century, no library in England possessed a copy. The volume was obtained almost accidentally by Dr. Pusey, who had it reprinted in 1869, and dedicated to the Bishops assembling for the Vatican Council in the following year. The contents of this remarkable document, which deserves a better fate than has been accorded it, exhibit the strong repugnance which existed in the Roman Communion to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, half-way through the fifteenth century. Elaborately argumentative, occupying some 800 closely printed pages, containing the teaching of a vast number of learned and saintly writers of all ages, the work is doctrinally and historically of the greatest interest, notwithstanding its scholastic and unpopular form, as showing the influence of S. Bernard's teaching, and the struggles and dangers awaiting the new theory before it could obtain its present recognition.

Defenders of the Immaculate Conception urged, says the Cardinal, four points. They asserted—

1. That GOD *could* preserve S. Mary from original sin.
2. That it was *becoming* that He should do so.

3. That therefore He *ought.*
4. That accordingly He *did.*

In reference to the first point, the Cardinal replies that unquestionably the power of GOD abstractedly regarded has no limit. But the divine power is commonly viewed by theologians as (1) *absolute*, and as (2) *conditioned.* Absolute, without reference to special cases. Conditioned, when controlled by the divine character, or by the laws of His working. Abstractedly, it was undoubtedly possible for the Almighty to raise S. John the Baptist or S. Mary, or any other human being, above the universal taint of sin; but when conditioned by the divine will, that our LORD was to be the universal SAVIOUR, the preservation of any individual from original sin became no longer possible. *Our Lord's prerogative* is to be *the Redeemer of all the human race* without exception. By Him has every human being been redeemed. Mary then, like all the rest, has been redeemed. But from what? Assuredly from sin. Preservation is not identical with Redemption. That the Divine Power could, if He pleased, have preserved Mary from original sin, and therefore from the need of Redemption, Torquemada admits and asserts. But she cannot at once be above the need of redemption, and yet redeemed. And she could only need redemption on the ground that she was born in sin. To say that any were redeemed by JESUS CHRIST, who were never under the influence of original sin, is to say exactly what S. Augustine strongly condemned the Pelagian heresy for saying. They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. To say that the B.V.M. needed a physician, yet that she was never sick, is a contradiction. Not one individual of the human race exists who was not

once in need of the physician, not one who was not healed by the grace of CHRIST. The purpose of the Redeemer's coming was "to save sinners." In this S. Mary must be included. If she was one of those whom our LORD came to save, she also was a sinner. And when Mary sang her Magnificat, among all the titles of GOD, that which she expressly selects is "GOD, my SAVIOUR." But any one to whom our LORD is a SAVIOUR, must once have been in a state of sin. At least so thought Pope Zosimus, when he wrote that no one can be truly called redeemed, unless he was first a servant of sin. CHRIST died for sinners. Yes; but He died for none but sinners. It is exclusively for sinners that the SAVIOUR died. If the B.V.M. come not under the category of sin, how is she included in the range of redemption? This line of thought evidently struck home in the thirteenth century. For it was suggested, as a means of escape, that CHRIST JESUS our LORD died for the angels also. "All must be redeemed by CHRIST," wrote S. Thomas; "but this cannot be, if one soul be found which was never infected with the stain of original sin."

2. On the second point, that the B.V.M.'s exemption from all contact with sin, was appropriate and *becoming*, it was urged that the Queen of Heaven and the Mother of GOD could never surely have been a slave of Satan. Torquemada replied by a question. Why should the B.V.M. be more acceptable to GOD, if preserved from evil, than if cleansed from evil by the precious Blood of JESUS CHRIST?

3. On the third point, that GOD *ought* to preserve the B.V.M. immaculate from all taint of original sin, it was urged, original sin is a curse upon the race. But it can-

not be ascribed to the B.V.M., for our LORD Himself quoted with approval the words of Moses: "Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death." S. Mark vii. 10. Our LORD cannot have cursed His own mother.

This argument, says Torquemada, was considered crucial. Torquemada, accepting his opponent's position, reminds him that a man may no more curse his grandmother than his mother. If then it be alien from piety to place the B.V.M. under the curse, so also would it be alien to place S. Anne, the Virgin's mother, under it. And so on with previous generations. Indeed, is it not written, bless and curse not? Accordingly the entire human race ought not to have been placed under the curse of original sin. A logical conclusion, which, when contrasted with known facts, may teach the value to be set by Catholics upon arguments of this nature.

4. On the fourth point, namely, that GOD *did* actually exempt the B.V.M. from all contact with original sin, passages of Scripture were quoted which, to the mind of Torquemada's opponents, appeared to prove the fact. The passages quoted are significant. The principal seem to be the following:—Gen. iii. 15. "*She* shall bruise thy head." And it was inferred that if the B.V.M. was to bruise Satan's head, she could never have been under Satan's dominion. But S. Bernard had applied these words to S. Mary, yet denied the inference. Esther xv. 10 was also quoted, in which the king stretches forth his golden sceptre, and laid it upon Esther's neck, exempting her from the common penalty of death, saying, This law is not for thee, though it is for all the rest. The beauty of the application might almost excuse its irrelevance as an

argument. Psalm lxxxvii. "The Most High shall stablish her." Cant. ii. "As a lily among the thorns." Cant. iv. 7. "Thou art all fair, My love; there is no spot in thee." There *is*, echoes Torquemada, not there *was*. This is no argument to prove what Mary *was* in her conception. That she was sanctified before her birth, the Cardinal, as S. Bernard centuries before him, piously and firmly believed, yet as firmly rejected the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Again, it was argued from Gabriel's salutation, Did not Gabriel say Ave to Mary? And what is Ave, but a word composed of *a* negative, and væ=woe? Does not then Gabriel salute Mary as one who is a-væ, that is, exempt from all woe? And what is the great and principal woe of the human race? Is it not original sin, in which all other woes are implied? Accordingly the triumphant inference is, that herein the angel Gabriel ascribes to the B.V.M. immunity from original sin.

One single line from Torquemada's reply to this exegesis will probably suffice. Ave was also said by our LORD to the women at the sepulchre. Did this imply that they were all sharers in the same exemption with Mary?

Torquemada's argument against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception consists, *first*

(A) in an *appeal to Holy Scripture.* Scripture teaches in the plainest terms that immunity from original sin is a prerogative of the Divine Redeemer alone. Scripture has included *all* under sin. "*All* have sinned, and come short of the glory of GOD." In Adam *all* die. There is a persistent monotony of reiteration about this mournful truth. CHRIST alone is excepted. "Holy, harmless, undefiled,

separate from sinners." And the reason for this immunity from original sin, in the case of our Blessed LORD'S human nature, is that He was not born of a marriage union, but by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary. No sinful, earthly passion marred that Immaculate Conception. But Mary herself was the child of earthly parents, and born of an ordinary marriage union. Immunity from original sin is accorded alone to those who are born not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but conceived by the HOLY GHOST.

"The exemption of our LORD'S human nature from original sin, is ascribed, by the Fathers, to the difference in the mode of His conception. All, those Fathers teach, have been born subject to the original sin, who received their being after the way of nature; our LORD'S human nature *alone* was not so subjected, because He was *not* conceived after the way of nature; He was conceived, not of man, but of the HOLY GHOST."[155]

Moreover, urged Torquemada, *Scripture is* absolutely *silent* about this supposed prerogative of Mary. The doctrine is not involved or implied in any teachings of Holy Scripture. That the B.V.M. is the Mother of the Eternal SON of GOD is true. But it does not follow by any logical or spiritual necessity that she was therefore by a special grace and favour of GOD exempted from all contagion of original sin. This has to be proved. It cannot be assumed. That she, selected from the entire human race for her awful and unique prerogative, and thus isolated from the world of intelligent beings, was indeed marvellously endowed, mysteriously gifted with many dignities befitting her for her glorious office, that she never in deed or word offended her Divine Son,

all this every Catholic will joyously acknowledge. But all this by no means involves the assertion, nay is perfectly consistent with the denial of the doctrine that Mary was immaculately conceived. There can be produced in its behalf no single authority from the records of inspiration. Certainly it is not probable that so supreme a privilege, had it been really bestowed upon the Mother of JESUS CHRIST, should be passed over in perfect silence in the pages of the Holy Scriptures, while this very prerogative is not passed over in the case of our LORD Himself. For the mention in His case seems less necessary than in hers. Christian piety must from the first have certainly ascribed to Him this prerogative even if Scripture had not explicitly declared it, but in the case of Mary a Scripture statement is essential, since we could not know it unless we were told. This silence is unaccountable were the doctrine true.

(B.) To the Scriptural argument Torquemada adds various other reasons which may be grouped together as *doctrinal.*

1. Among these he notes the fact of the Virgin's death. Death, says the Cardinal, and here his opponents could not possibly contradict him, for he was following the authoritative teaching of innumerable saints, death is the consequence of original sin. To be exempt from original sin, to be immaculately conceived, is to be exempt from the necessity for physical death. In virtue of this Immaculate Conception our LORD Himself could claim exemption from death of the body. That He did not claim exemption was because He identified Himself with the sinful race, and voluntarily became the Redemptive Sacrifice. But why did Mary die? Her

death was no expiation for the sins of the world. What possible construction can be placed upon the fact of her dissolution, except that it is a witness to her share in the universal evil inheritance? So at least thought no less an authority than S. Augustine.

"Adam died because of sin. Mary died because of Adam's sin. And the flesh which the LORD took of Mary also died, but it was to take away the sins of the world." (On Ps. xxxiv.)

If it be objected that grace could remove the cause without removing the consequence, that original sin might be removed, yet physical death remain, Cardinal John answers that for consequences to follow a non-existent cause is at once irrational and unjust. Nor is there any proof to show that grace actually did what was asserted to lie within GOD's power. "Our body is dead because of sin. The body of CHRIST also is dead without sin."[156]

(C.) Torquemada's third and strongest argument is the *historical*, the appeal to Catholic Consent. He quotes a hundred writers—Saints, Bishops, doctors, teachers in Christendom, demonstrating in a way beyond refute that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was not the tradition of the Catholic Church. Authorities of such weight as S. Ambrose, S. Leo, S. Augustine, S. Anslem, S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, are all producible for language which cannot be reconciled with the more modern teaching, and in many cases for positive and definite rejection.

1. S. Augustine,[157] when writing on actual sin, refuses for the honour of our LORD to include the B.V.M. in the range of the discussion, but he makes no corresponding

exemption while discussing the subject of original sin. "The very pains which people have been at to make the occasion in which he exempts the B.V.M. from *actual* sins to include original sin also, brings out the more the force of the omission."[158] The reiterated assertion of S. Augustine is that CHRIST alone was conceived without sin. And that this was not meant to imply a reservation in the case of the B.V.M. is clear from the ground upon which Augustine bases the sinless conception of CHRIST. According to S. Augustine JESUS alone is innocent, because JESUS alone was born of a Virgin. "Whoever then thinks that there was or is in this life any man or any men, except the One Mediator of GOD and man, to whom remission of sins was not necessary, contradicts Divine Scripture."[159]

Mary His Mother, of whom He took flesh, was born of the carnal concupiscence of parents, but not so did she conceive CHRIST. . . . .[160]

2. Pope Zosimus[161] again had taught that no one can be described as set free, unless he was once the slave of sin, nor said to be redeemed unless he was once bound by sin. Plainly then, adds Torquemada, according to this Pope's teaching, unless Mary was once a captive to original sin, she was not redeemed by the Blood of CHRIST.

3. Pope S. Leo[162] wrote,—"For *this* Nativity [i.e. of our LORD] has no concern with what we read in regard to all men. No one is clean from defilement, not even an infant whose life on earth is but one day old. And thus no element derived from carnal passion or from the law of sin passed or flowed into this peerless Nativity."

. . . . He in Whom *alone* the nature of all men was innocent.

4. "For not even the Mother of the Redeemer was free from the bond of the primæval sin."—Eusebius[163] of Gaul.

5. S. Thomas[164] wrote: "It is erroneous to say that any one was conceived without original sin, our LORD alone except. For he who is conceived without sin needs no redemption. And thus CHRIST would not be the SAVIOUR of all men."

And again, "The Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin."

6. S. Bonaventura.[165] "This mode of speaking is more common, and more reasonable, and safer. More common, because almost all hold that the Blessed Virgin had original sin; . . . . more reasonable, because the being of nature precedes the being of grace. Safer, because it is more concordant with piety and the authority of the Saints. It is more concordant with the authority of the Saints, for the Saints commonly when they speak of this subject, except CHRIST alone from that universality wherewith it is said, 'all have sinned in Adam.' But there is no one found of those whom we have heard of with our ears, who said that the Virgin Mary was free from original sin. It is more concordant with piety, because although the mother is to be had in reverence, and great devotion ought to be had towards her, yet much greater is to be had towards the Son, from Whom all honour and glory come to her."

7. S. Bernard's emphatic rejection of the doctrine in his letter to the Canons of Lyons and elsewhere, was all the more significant and difficult to set aside from

the very fact of his profound reverence for all which tended to the Virgin's honour. But it was urged in mitigation of his witness, and the argument has since been repeated, that the Abbot of Clairvaux had after all, at the close of his letter, submitted its contents to the judgment of the Apostolic See. Torquemada replied that this submission to the Apostolic See is distinctly qualified by the emphatic and determined tone of the entire letter. S. Bernard is evidently making an appeal to universal tradition, which he regards it morally impossible for the Pope to contradict. There is an intensity of conviction, an assurance of certainty. He is absolutely convinced that any appeal which the Canons of Lyons or others might make to the authority of the Church could only result in a triumphant vindication of his own teachings, and a rejection of this intruded novelty. Moreover since S. Bernard wrote 300 years had passed, and no reversal of his teaching had ever issued from the Councils at Rome.

Torquemada might have strengthened his reply by observing the actual form in which S. Bernard's remarks are cast. He makes no simple appeal to the decisions of Rome, nor does he really leave the matter in the Pope's hands. What he says in effect is that even supposing the Canons of Lyons to have been maintaining the truth, a supposition which he emphatically denied, yet even then they ought not to have ventured upon the course of introducing observances upon their own authority. The conditional form of the sentence renders S. Bernard's reference to the papacy something quite different from an act of submission.

It was then attempted to get rid of S. Bernard's

authority in another way. Bernard, they boldly said, had found cause to change his mind on this subject when he reached the other world. He had reappeared in vision to a certain monk, very glorious, except for a mark upon his breast, which was the penalty for daring to deny the Immaculate Conception. The Cardinal grows very scornful over this legend. But Bernard's denial of the doctrine remained. In fact the teaching of S. Bernard's letter is repeated in his Sermons. "But though she derived the original stain from her parents, yet Christian piety prohibits our believing that she was less sanctified before her birth than Jeremiah, or not more filled with the HOLY GHOST than John [the Baptist]; for neither would she be honoured at her birth with festival praise, if she were not born holy."[166]

Torquemada asks, in a tone which certainly carries conviction, whether the theory of which all these, and other luminaries of the Church, representatives of many places and ages, were either ignorant, or by implication rejected, or knew only to condemn, is ever to be rightly erected into a dogma of the Catholic Faith? Is it possible that these illustrious teachers and guides of the centuries before we were born, did not know the highest privilege of the Mother of JESUS CHRIST? nay more, that they refused it, and contradicted it, and taught against it? Was the tradition of the first fifteen Catholic centuries no guide for the present? The theory was an innovation in Christendom. And to say that a doctrine is a novelty, is to say that it is false. Identity with the Catholic past is a note of essential truth.

This statement roused a storm. It is not new, they

asserted. It was being argued in Torquemada's time, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had been taught for centuries. But the Cardinal refuted this by a passage from S. Bonaventura, written only a century and a half before, in which he says that of the teachers whom he had heard with his own ears, none had ever asserted Mary's immunity from original sin. Now Bonaventura, like Torquemada, was a Cardinal of the Roman Church. But this most distinguished light of the University of Paris, this teacher, named by common reverence the Seraphic, noted among all men for his devotion to Mary, had never taught, nor heard taught, nor could he bring himself to believe the opinion of Mary's immunity from original sin.

In face of these authorities, and this overwhelming tradition, the Cardinal's opponents hazarded, (1) *an argument from development.* Conceding the weight of past tradition, at least to some considerable extent, this, they argued, is a case of development. A truth has become fully known which was not fully known before. The implicit conviction of past ages has been transmuted into the explicit assertion of later generations. We must not then infer the erroneousness of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception merely because the doctrine seems unknown to S. Hilary or to S. Cyprian.

To this fifteenth century attempt to support dogmatic additions by a theory of development, Torquemada replied that the Faith differs from human science precisely in this very respect, that while human departments of knowledge admit substantial increase, the Catholic Faith does not. The Faith is like its LORD, the same

yesterday, to-day, and for ever. It is an indispensable condition, that any doctrine claiming acceptance from Christendom in the later days, must be contained in the teachings of previous ages from the first. Torquemada, in fact, talks just as S. Vincent of Lerins did nearly a thousand years before him. No doubt, in a sense, the Faith admits development. A truth may be further amplified and explained. But later teachers are not better informed than the Apostles. No new truths can be added to the ancient immemorial Faith. And, above all things, one doctrine cannot be revealed to primitive ages, and its contrary to later days. But this is exactly what would have been the case if the Immaculate Conception of Mary were an article of Faith. For it is not simply that early ages were ignorant of the fact. They contradicted it. They refuted it. They committed themselves traditionally to doctrinal positions and teachings totally irreconcileable with the more modern idea. Thus the theory of the Immaculate Conception sins against the first principles of development. If the Immaculate Conception be erected into a dogma, it will be no development, but a contradiction. It will make the faith of the present hopelessly at variance with the historic past. The Cardinal appeals strongly, even passionately, to the writers of the past. The teaching of modern doctors is not to be accepted against that of earlier ages. He implores the Council, in the language of Solomon, "remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set." Prov. xxii. 28. What are we now, he asks, men of to-day, contrasted with the masters of bygone times, that we should in any way sanction departures from their faith?

Cardinal John also bitterly complains that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had been supported, (2) *on spurious writings*, and on statements attributed to some of the greatest of the Fathers—statements for which the saintly teachers in question would have altogether declined to make themselves responsible. The following passage, among others, was ascribed to S. Augustine[167]:—"Were it possible for My mother to be sin-stained in the day that I created her, then could I also be sin-stained in the day when I was born of her." Now, in the first place, S. Augustine did not write these words. Whatever authority they may possess, they do not derive it from him. They originate from some unknown writer, probably of the fifth century. But, in the second place, the passage as edited by the Benedictines, runs as follows: "Were it possible for Me to be sin-stained in the day that I created her, then could I also be sin-stained in the day when I was born of her." The object being to show that no deterioration of the divine Majesty, or of the perpetual Virginity, was involved in the mystery of the Incarnation. Torquemada's comment on this is brief but emphatic. It is disgraceful to corrupt the writings of the Saints. This complaint about spurious and misquoted authorities opens out one of the most painful features of Christian history. How far the misquotation was accidental, and how far immoral, is a question which need not be decided. But it is certainly most unfortunate that some of the controverted subjects in Christendom should be rested upon such misquotations. Cardinal John's complaints reached further than he knew. Even the passage in which S. Augustine declines to include the B.V.M. in his discussions on actual sin, becomes

changed from the form of a question to the form of a positive dogmatic assertion. S. Augustine's famous words, "for whence do we know what grace was accorded her," were misquoted as "for thence we know that grace was accorded her—for victory over every sin," *unde enim scimus quid*, into *inde enim scimus quod*.[168] Thus the hesitating reflective language of a reverence which confesses its ignorance, becomes transformed into the definite expression of a clear and certain knowledge. This indeed may be nothing but an accidental variant. But there can be little doubt that the positive assertion places a very different construction upon S. Augustine's mind. A curious instance of the way in which writings have been *interpolated*, and thus reversed the writer's judgment, is the following:—The words, "All men died for sins, no one whatever being excepted, save the Mother of God," have been quoted as from a twelfth century writer (Hervé of Dole, 1130,) in behalf of the modern teaching. But the words, save the Mother of God, form no part of the original. They are an unauthorized addition, exactly contradicting what the writer meant to say. Very possibly the words were a marginal alteration made by some possessor of the MS., to whom the sentiment of the original was repugnant, little dreaming, it may be, what would flow from his marginal corrections. Other cases occur in which passages asserting the B.V.M. to have been conceived in original sin, were removed from the author's works. The Cardinal complains (3) that his opponents freely accused those who agreed with S. Bernard of being irreverent towards S. Mary. To charge those who denied the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception with *irreverence towards* the B.V.M., was, urged

Torquemada, to go in the face of facts. For was there ever a more devout servant of Mary than S. Bernard of Clairvaux, or S. Bonaventura? Yet both denied it. The very writers who accord to Mary the tremendous titles of Reparatrix and Vivificatrix are those who assert that S. Mary was conceived in original sin.

It is to be wished that this work of Cardinal John had been placed before the Council at Basle. Its powerful arguments could not but have taken effect. As it was, the decree was passed without any hearing being granted to the other side, and the work of this laborious writer was consigned to unmerited oblivion.

III. *The Council of Trent.*

The subject of the Immaculate Conception of B.V.M. was brought into the Council of Trent in 1546. The decrees asserted the transmission of original sin to the whole human race. Upon this Cardinal Pacheco proposed the following addition: that "as regards the Blessed Virgin, the Council does not intend to define anything; although it is piously believed, that she was conceived without original sin." "This opinion," says a Roman writer on the Council of Trent,[169] "had a majority in its favour, but was opposed by all the bishops of the Dominican order, and by a few other prelates, as a deviation from the resolution not to condemn any opinion prevalent in the Church: for, as it seemed to them, to declare an opinion pious, was indirectly to condemn the contrary as impious. It was at length, after much debate, agreed that the obnoxious words should be expunged." All then that the Council of Trent effected upon this matter was to leave

the subject undecided. "This same holy Synod doth nevertheless declare, that it is not its intention to include in this decree, when original sin is treated of, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of GOD; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV., of happy memory, are to be observed, under the pains contained in the said constitutions, which it renews."

IV. *The Seventeenth Century. Bossuet.*

To transfer ourselves from Basle, in the fifteenth century, to Paris in the seventeenth, and from Cardinal John of Torquemada to Bossuet,[170] the greatest of French preachers, is to be the witness of a doctrinal change which is simply amazing. The University of Paris compelled all its students to defend the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. And Bossuet himself approved this course, although frankly acknowledging that the Church even then did not require her children to believe that Mary was immaculate. Being requested by a student to explain the inconsistency of compelling belief when the Church did not compel, the great Bishop of Meaux was reduced to a difficult position, from which he did not extricate himself with honour. But Bossuet threw all the power of his genius into the defence of the doctrine, and his wonderful sermon shows what may be built without historic foundation. Yet Bossuet himself is obliged to admit, "the Church has not yet ventured to decide whether Mary was exempt from original sin. Many distinguished personages have not believed it, and we are forbidden to condemn them."

V. *The Eighteenth Century. Father Zoller.*

On into *the eighteenth century*, the two opinions both prevailed within the limits of the Roman Communion. One of the most extraordinary productions of that century is the work of the Jesuit, Father Zoller, on the Conception of the Holy Mother of GOD. It is a folio volume, containing a hundred reasons, a hundred authorities, and a hundred historical illustrations, to prove that Mary is indeed Immaculate. After the majestic eloquence of Bossuet, and the dignity of his ideas and language, to descend to the pages of Father Zoller is about as bewildering a change as can well be made. Here is an elaborate, laborious, and learned work, filled with the most puerile absurdities, most painful, considering the solemnity of the subject, and its nearness to the Person of our Blessed Redeemer. One does not know what to make of Father Zoller. It is difficult to realize what class of minds he is writing for, or how he convinced himself that the cause of truth could be promoted by the type of argument and illustration in which his work abounds. The criticism is severe, but let the reader judge. A priest, in the name of the Holy Trinity, compelled the Devil to confess what he knew of Mary's exemption from original sin. Immaculate, immaculate, returned the tempter. Who then will venture to deny when even the devils believe and tremble?

Zoller's selection of *texts* to prove his thesis includes the following :—

Gen. xii. 14. The Egyptians saw the woman that she was fair.

His *reasons* for the Immaculate Conception of Mary are, among others—

1. That otherwise Gabriel could not have said, Ave, nor Gratia plena, nor Dominus tecum.

2. That CHRIST is beautiful above the sons of men, therefore also His Mother.

3. That a tree is known by its fruits, therefore Mary is immaculate, as well as her Son.

5. What concord hath CHRIST with Belial? neither the LORD'S Mother with sin.

6. That if the root be holy, so are the branches; therefore a holy branch presupposes a holy root, the holy Son involves a holy Mother.

7. That no one ever yet hated his own flesh. But Mary was the flesh of CHRIST; therefore—

8. That CHRIST was made so much better than the angels; therefore so was Mary, for she was His Mother.

11. That because she did not commit actual sin, therefore she is not to be thought tainted with original.

17. If Cicero is for his own house, according to the proverb, why is not GOD for Mary?

18. That silence gives consent; and since Rome has not condemned the doctrine, therefore it undoubtedly approves it.

30. That the Immaculate Conception of Mary adds to GOD'S glory, whereas Mary's contact with sin would have brought dishonour upon GOD.

32. That a son, if he had the choice, would select the best parent he could.

41. That He could not be born in original righteousness, unless from a mother possessing the same.

47. That a friend is another self; much more a mother must share His immunity from sin.

51. Universities and peoples say this, and we know that vox populi vox Dei.

52. It is attested by many miracles.

53. A bishop elect, before his consecration, has certain prospective privileges of his rank; much more Mary, who was elect from eternity.

55. That you could not elect as an abbess one who was not a virgin, much less as the queen of all the saints, one who was tainted with sin.

81. She could not be mediatrix between God and sinners, unless she was acceptable to both; therefore no sin.

89. Prevention is better than cure. Ergo, Immaculate Conception of Mary.

VI. *The Nineteenth Century. Pius IX.*

The period from the Council of Trent (i.e., 1546) to the middle of the nineteenth century (A.D. 1854) saw the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of B.V.M. perpetually acquiring wider extension. Roman Catholics of this century had been trained to believe in it from their childhood as a truth, although still of course only as a pious opinion. Thus the way was prepared for a step which would certainly have made a schism in the Church if attempted some centuries before. Pius IX. sent a letter to the bishops of the Roman communion, inviting their opinion on the desirability of erecting the Immaculate Conception of B.V.M. into a dogma of the Faith.

This letter of inquiry produced some significant re-

sults.[171] A large majority of the Bishops replied expressing their warm concurrence with the implied proposal. But a minority as strongly expressed disapproval. Among these the most striking is the reply of the Archbishop of Paris. After consulting the ablest theologians in his diocese, he concludes that in conformity with the principles of theology, the Immaculate Conception of the most holy Virgin is not a matter which can be defined as a truth of the Catholic Faith, and in no case can be imposed as a belief obligatory under pain of eternal damnation. He asks among others the following questions: Can the Church make a definition as to a doctrine which rests neither on Holy Scripture nor tradition? Did not the Council of Trent ordain that both opinions were free, and so in themselves indifferent? After this decree of Trent who will dare to assert that opinion is not free upon the subject? Since the Immaculate Conception cannot be demonstrated either by Holy Scripture or by tradition, if the Church were by a solemn decree to declare it obligatory, the Catholic controversy would on this point become weak and powerless.

The Archbishop of Rouen considered that this belief is not clearly contained in Holy Scripture, and that tradition upon the subject is wanting in precision and unanimity; otherwise S. Anselm, S. Bonaventura, S. Bernard, S. Thomas, Bellarmine, and so many others could not have been ignorant of it; that the belief in it cannot be clearly traced back beyond the eleventh century; that if it were decreed on such foundations the incredulous world might think that no Christian truth rested on better basis or more certain tradition.

An Italian Bishop replied, that if the Church after so many centuries imposed upon the faithful a new mystery of which we find no testimony either in Scripture or the Fathers, excepting allegorical statements, great occasion would be given to the enemies of the Church.

Another Bishop considered that it was not necessary to make it a dogma even if true. For although all dogma is truth, yet all truth is not necessarily dogma.

Another drew attention to what would be regarded as a remarkable fact, that in general the *denial* of this doctrine was based on Scripture and tradition, while its *defence* was taken chiefly from sermons, prayers, and hymns, which express the affection of the heart rather than the judgment of the mind, the feelings of piety, rather than the conclusions of the understanding.

Another ventures to hope that if the Pope does decide for this doctrine, he will so modify his decree, that S. Thomas Aquinas, who denied it, may still retain his honoured place in the Church.

Another anticipates the accusation which will certainly come, that the Church is acting on a new principle. Lo! the Church of the Catholics has devised a new article of faith after ages, which as is evident, was not believed everywhere, nor always, nor by all! What new light then dawns now upon that Church which was denied to the Council of Trent? He thinks that this is a fallacy which well instructed minds will easily dissipate. But he also thinks it will be an obstacle to the conversion of many.

But when Pius IX. in 1854 erected the opinion as to Mary's exemption from original sin into an article of faith, he ignored the replies of the minority. He sum-

moned no Council. And in a manner impossible to reconcile with the authority inherent in the Episcopate and expressed in General Councils, he alone pronounced what had hitherto been a pious opinion, as henceforward an essential portion of the Catholic Faith. He declared that "the most Blessed Virgin Mary was in the first instant of her conception, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty GOD, in view of the merits of JESUS CHRIST, the SAVIOUR of the human race, preserved free from all taint of original guilt."

The action of Pius IX. raises a new and most serious difficulty. Quite apart from the doctrinal question itself, and quite apart from the historical question whether the doctrine has been held from the first, comes a very serious difficulty from *the manner* in which the opinion has been erected into an article of faith for the Roman Communion.

The great teachers of the early Christian centuries would never for a moment have acknowledged that the power to raise any matter into an article of faith resided solely in the successor of S. Peter at Rome. S. Augustine for example would never have admitted the necessary finality of any decision made by contemporary occupants of the Roman See.

VII. *The English Church.*

The following passages from recent English Theologians may be fitly added here, showing how S. Bernard's influence lives among us, and how completely the English Church is at onewith the Abbot's famous letter.

1. "We can express the truth indeed that the blessed

Mary was the Mother of GOD, as we can express the doctrine of the Trinity, in all modes and forms which amount but to the expression of that truth; and the truth itself invests her with incommunicable dignity. But when the reasoner goes further and says, She was the Mother of our LORD, therefore she was born without original sin, in the first place; therefore she was the 'created idea in the making of the world,' in the second place; therefore she is the one channel through which all grace flows, in the third place; it is right to ask, Why? How do these second truths follow necessarily from the first? show for example, that it inevitably follows, from her being the Theotocos, that her own conception was immaculate. 'Can a clean thing come from an unclean?' we are told. But it is evident that on such an application of Scripture as this, the mother of the Virgin must be immaculate, for the same reason that the Virgin herself was; and so the stream of original sin is driven backward till no place is left where it ever could have existed. The truth is we are not sufficiently acquainted with the nature of the mystery of the Incarnation to be drawing such conclusions from it."[172]

2. "Between the imposition of the Homoousion and the recent definition of the Immaculate Conception there is no real correspondence. It is not merely that the latter is accepted only by a section of the Christian Church, and was promulgated by an authority whose modern claims the Fathers of Nicæa would have regarded with sincere astonishment. The difference between the two cases is still more fundamental; it lies in the substance of the two definitions respectively. The Nicene Fathers did but assert a truth which had been held to be of

primary vital import from the first; they asserted it in terms which brought it vividly home to the intelligence of their day. They were explaining old truth; they were not setting forth as truth that which had before been matter of opinion. But the recent definition asserts that an hypothesis, unheard of for centuries after the first promulgation of the Gospel, and then vehemently maintained, and as vehemently controverted by theologians of at least equal claims to orthodoxy, is a fact of Divine revelation, to be received by all who would receive the true faith of the Redeemer. In the one case an old truth is vindicated by an explanatory reassertion; in the other the assertion of a new fact is added to the Creed.

"The Nicene Fathers only maintained in the language of their day the original truth that JESUS CHRIST is GOD; but the question whether the conception of Mary was or was not sinless is a distinct question of fact, standing by itself, with no necessary bearing upon her office in the economy of the Incarnation, and not related in the way of an explanatory vindication of any originally recorded truth beyond it. It is one thing to reassert the revealed Godhead of JESUS; it is in principle a fundamentally distinct thing to 'decree a new honour' to Mary. The Nicene decision is the act of a Church believing itself commissioned to guard a body of truth which had been delivered from heaven in its integrity, once for all. The recent definition appears to presuppose a Church which can do more than guard the ancient faith, which is empowered to make actual additions to the number of revealed certainties, which is the organ no less than the recipient of a continuous revelation. It is one thing

to say that language has changed its value, and that a particular token which was once considered misleading will now serve to vindicate an acknowledged truth; it is another thing to claim the power of transfiguring a precarious and contradicted opinion resting on no direct Scriptural or primitive testimony, and impugned in terms by writers of the date and authority of Aquinas, into a certainty claiming submission from the faith of Christendom on nothing less than a Divine authority. There is then no real reason for the statement that those who now reject the Immaculate Conception would of old have rejected the Homoousion. There is nothing to show that those who bow with implicit faith before the Nicene decision are bound as a matter of consistency to yield the same deference of heart and thought to the most modern development of doctrine within the Latin portion of Catholic Christendom."[173]

NOTES.

LECTURE I.

Note 1, p. 1. The materials for the life of the great Abbot of Clairvaux are most ample.

The large collection of his letters (466) gives constant help throughout his career.

First come three contemporary biographers.

1. William, Abbot of S. Theodoric, near Rheims, who died before S. Bernard.

2. Arnold, Abbot of Bonnevale, near Chartres, who continued the unfinished work of Abbot William.

3. Geoffrey, S. Bernard's secretary.

4. Alan, Bishop of Autun, who spent some years at Clairvaux immediately after S. Bernard's death.

5. John the Hermit.

To these must be added the Chroniclers of the twelfth century. Ordericus Vitalis. And among the English Historians, The Annals of Nicholas Trivet, a London Dominican, Student in the Schools of Oxford and Paris, c. A.D. 1150—1228. Chronicle of Florence of Worcester. William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, and Historia Novella. See publications of the English Historical Society.

Among Continental historians, Otto of Frisingen for Germany: Suger, Life of Louis VI. for France: Matthew of Paris.

At the head of modern efforts stands the exhaustive Life of S. Bernard in the Bollandist Acta Sanctorum, which embodies the contents of the three contemporary lives.

But the literature which gathers round a Saint so distinguished as Bernard would form a library by itself. See Xenia Bernardina.

Among recent writers may be named, in France—

Abbé Ratisbonne, Histoire de S. Bernard, written from the Roman standpoint in exceedingly clear and flowing style.

Abbé Chevallier, Histoire de S. Bernard, somewhat more controversial than the former, but full of admiring reverence for the saintly worker of whom it treats. This has passed through five editions.

In Germany—Böhringer, Kirchengeschichte. Neander, with all the virtues and defects of that great writer. Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen Lexikon.

Among English works—J. C. Morison. Dr. S. J. Eales, extremely interesting outline of S. Bernard's life in the S.P.C.K. series of Biographies of Saints. We are also indebted to Dr. Eales for a translation of S. Bernard's Letters, and of the Sermons on the Song of Solomon. Dr. Storrs, Bernard of Clairvaux. This is a course of Lectures by an American writer.

2, p. 2. Cf. Böhringer, Kirchengeschichte. Bd. xiv. 436. Ratisbonne, Histoire de S. Bernard, I., 90.

3, p. 4. See Matthew of Paris, Chronica Majora, I., 100. Roll's Series. For Anselm, Florence of Worcester, Chronicle.

4, p. 5. Ratisbonne, I., 103.

5, p. 6. Persius.

6, p. 6. S. Bernard, Sermones in Cantica, xxxvi., Vol. IV., pp. 968—9.

7, p. 6. S. Matt. xi. 29.

8, p. 9. S. Bernard, Serm. Cant. xiv., tr. S. J. Eales. Life of S. Bernard, p. 76.

9, p. 11. Life of S. Bernard by Abbot William, Vol. IV., p. 234.

10, p. 13. Ib., cf. Acta Bollandist., in Migne, Vol. IV., p. 660.

LECTURE II.

11, p. 15. See Robertson, Ch. Hist., II., 346.

12, p. 15. Stephen Harding's Life is gathered from William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, Bk. iv. Eng. Hist. Soc.,

Vol. II., pp. 511—516. See also Dugdale, Monasticon Anglic., Vol. V. Exordium Magn. Cist. in Migne, IV., 1010.

13, p. 18. Cf. Milman's Latin Christianity.

14, p. 19. Isa. xlix. 18—20.

15, p. 19. Exord. Magn. Cist., Migne, IV., p. 1013.

16, p. 21. Milman's Latin Christianity, IV., 311.

17, p. 21. Exord. Magn. Cist., I., xvii.

18, p. 23. Ratisbonne, I., 177.

19, p. 24. Ratisbonne, I., 147.

20, p. 25. S. Bernard's Works, Vol. IV., 670. Cf. Böhringer, p. 444.

21, p. 30. In vestibus ei paupertas semper placuit sordes nunquam.

22, p. 30. Cf. Ecclus. xix. 30.

23, p. 32. Letter 104.

24, p. 32. Letter 11; Works, I., 114.

LECTURE III.

25, p. 36. Letter 115.

26, p. 36. Letter 254.

27, p. 37. Letter 190.

28, p. 37. Exordium Magnum Cisterciense, VI., 1. This is an early collection of stories relating to the Order of Citeaux. For a critical estimate of its value, see Hüffer, Vorstudien.

29, p. 39. Exord. Magn. Cist., V., xvi.

30, p. 40. Exord. Magn. Cist., IV., xxvi.

31, p. 41. Cf. the Dream of S. Perpetua.

32, p. 42. Exord. Magn. Cist., I., viii. Works, IV., 1003.

33, p. 43. Exord. Magn. Cist., IV., xx.

34, p. 44. Exord. Magn. Cist., V., xiii.

35, p. 45. Works, IV., 550.

36, p. 45. Letter 102. Melius est enim ut pereat unus, quam unitas.

37, p. 47. Exord. Magn. Cist., V., xi. Cf. the story how Bernard excommunicated the flies.

38, p. 49. Exord. Magn. Cist., IV., xx. Works, IV., 1108.

39, p. 52. This is S. Bernard's favourite expression, often repeated. Cf. Letter 3. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., xvi. Letter 377.

40, p. 52. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., xxv.

41, p. 54. Letter 109.

42, p. 54. Letter 64.

43, p. 56. Works, Vol. IV., p. 580.

44, p. 57. Letter 73.

LECTURE IV.

45, p. 59. See the brilliant description in Milman's Latin Christianity. Cf. Neander, Der Heilige Bernhard, p. 76, n., and an interesting passage in Grant's Bampton Lectures on Missions, p. 124, 125.

46, p. 59. Exord. Magn. Cist., I., vi. Works, IV., 1004. Robertson's Hist., IV., 166; V., 22.

47, p. 60. For Pontius cf. Ordericus Vitalis, XII., xxi. and xxix.

48, p. 62. S. Bernard, Works, I., 409. The Apology.

49, p. 65. Letter 229 among Bernard's.

50, p. 66. Letter 28. Peter Cluny to Bernard on the disputes between White friars (Clairvaux) and Black friars (Cluny). Cf. Letter 131 among the Letters of Peter Venerab., and Letter 157 ib.

51, p. 69. Ordericus Vitalis, XIII., xiii.

52, p. 70. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., ix., x. Works, IV., 1060.

53, p. 71. For Adam of S. Victor, see Digby Wrangham, Liturgical Poetry, Three Vols.

54, p. 72. Tractatus de Bapt. Works, I., 1042.

55, p. 74. Letter 78.

56, p. 74. For Thurstan see S. Bernard's Letters, 490. Appendix, Works, IV. Dixon's History of the Archbishops of York, Vol. I., pp. 170, 200. Additional Letters are given in Canon Raine's Historians of the Church of York, Roll's Series. Narrative of the founding of Fountains Abbey by Hugh, Monk of Kirkstall, in Dugdale, Monasticon, Vol. V., 286. S. Bernard, Works, I., 700.

57, p. 83. Letters 8 and 9.

58, p. 84. Letter 82, and notes to Bernard's Works, I., 202.

59, p. 84. Letters 15, 13, 114.

60, p. 84. Letter 18.
61, p. 85. Letter 24.
62, p. 86. Letters 87—90.
63, p. 86. Tractatus de moribus et officio Episc.
64, p. 89. Letters 39, 37.
65, p. 90. S. Bernard, Works, I., 150, n.
66, p. 90. Ordericus Vitalis.
67, p. 91. S. Bernard, Letter 45.
68, p. 92. Letter 46.
69, p. 93. Letter 48.

LECTURE V.

70, p. 94. See William of Malmesbury. Gesta Regum Anglorum. English Hist. Soc. Series, Vol. II., pp. 445, 536.
71, p. 96. For Peter Leo cf. Ordericus Vitalis, XII., xxi.
72, p. 97. Cf. The Letters of Peter of Cluny, I., p. 66.
73, p. 98. Cf. Neander, Heilige Bernhard, p. 90.
74, p. 99. Ordericus Vitalis. Böhringer, 492.
75, p. 99. Neander, p. 91.
76, p. 100. Milman's Latin Christianity, IV., pp. 57, 59, 292.
77, p. 101. S. Bernard, Letter 125.
78, p. 102. S. Bernard, Letter 124.
79, p. 102. S. Bernard, Works, IV., 286.
80, p. 103. S. Bernard, Letter 126.
81, p. 103. S. Bernard, Works, IV., 288.
82, p. 106. Ordericus Vitalis.
83, p. 106. Ratisbonne, I., 409.
84, p. 107. Letter 130.
85, p. 107. Letter 314.
86, p. 107. Letters 131, 137, 139. Neander, p. 106.
87, p. 109. Bernard's Works, IV., p. 753.
88, p. 109. Neander, p. 115.
89, p. 111. Acta, p. 763. Serm. in Cant.
90, p. 114. Cf. Mabillon's preface to the Sermons, Works, II. 27.
91, p. 116. Life of S. Bernard, Works, IV., 295.
92, p. 116. Ordericus Vitalis.
93, p. 117. Letter 317.

LECTURE VI.

94, p. 118. Letter 132.

95, p. 120. Ratisbonne, I., 505. Letter 213.

96, p. 121. Letter 236.

97, p. 122. Letters 155, 211, 198, 202.

98, p. 122. This narrative is gathered from Letters 164, 166, 168, 170 of S. Bernard. Letter 29 of Peter Cluny.

99, p. 126. On appeals to Rome, see Letters 178, 179, 180. Innocent's exemption granted to the Cistercian order, is found among S. Bernard's letters, 352.

100, p. 130. Sermones in Cant. xxvi.

101, p. 131. Letter 177.

102, p. 131. On the marriage question, see Letters 216 (to Innocent,) 221 (to the king,) 222 (to Suger, the king's adviser,) 219, 224.

103, p. 134. On the alienation cf. Acta, p. 813. Letter 220.

LECTURE VII.

104, p. 137. For William of Champeaux, cf. V. Cousin, and Michaud, Guillaume de Champeaux et les écoles de Paris.

105, p. 138. For Abélard, see writings in Migne. V. Cousin's edition of the unpublished works. Cousin's sketch of his philosophy for the dispute between Realists and Nominalists. Remusat, Life of Abélard. Hausrath's P. Abélard, to whom this lecture is much indebted. Böhringer. Hauréau, Histoire de la Philosophie Scolastique, Pt. I., p. 362, ff. See also Jules Simon, Life of V. Cousin.

106, p. 138. V. Cousin.

107, p. 138. The following narrative is principally from Abélard's own sketch in the Historia Calamitatum.

108, p. 144. Cf. Hausrath, p. 108.

109, p. 145. See Abélard, Œuvres inédites. V. Cousin.

110, p. 146. S. Bernard, Letters 188, 189, 192. V. Cousin, Frag. Philosoph., p. 237.

111, p. 147. S. Bernard, Letter 189.

112, p. 147. See Bernard, Tractatus de Err. Abelardi, Works, I., 1055.

113, p. 150. S. Bernard, Letter 337. Ratisbonne, II., 48.

114, p. 152. See Neander, p. 259.

115, p. 153. S. Bernard, Letters 189—193, 230.

116, p. 154. Among S. Bernard's Letters, 194.

117, p. 154. Abélard's Works, Migne, p. 576.

118, p. 155. Letters of Peter Cluny, Bk. iv., Ep. iv., p. 316; and Book iv., Ep. xxi. p. 352. Cf. Neander, 284. Peter of Cluny's life deserves a separate study. His tract on the Divinity of our LORD is specially worthy to be read. Works, Migne's edition, p. 487 ff.

119, p. 158. Sermones in Cantica, Serm. xxxvi., p. 967.

120, p. 160. Sermones in Cant., Serm. liv. p. 1042.

LECTURE VIII.

121, p. 161. On the subject of the Crusades, see the contemporary Odo's Itinerarium, in Migne, IV., p. 1202 ff. Suger's Letters. Michaud's Histoire des Croisades; 5 vols. Ratisbonne, II., 178.

122, p. 163. On earlier ideas about pilgrimage, cf. Neander, Heilige Bernhard, p. 448, from whom these passages are mostly taken. P. Cluny, Letters, Bk. ii. 15, ch. 44.

123, p. 164. Liber ad Milites Templi, by S. Bernard, cap. v. Works, I., 929.

124, p. 164. S. Bernard's Letters, 393.

125, p. 165. S. Bernard's Letters, 363.

126, p. 167. S. Bernard's Letters, 256, and Works, IV., 858.

127, p. 168. Letters of Peter Cluny, Bk. iv., Ep. 35, p. 366, Migne.

128, p. 168. Letter 376.

129, p. 170. See the Chronicles of Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir. Tr. Oriental Translation Fund. The passage is quoted in most of the histories, e.g., Ratisbonne, II., 226; Vilken, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge; Böhringer, Kirchengeschichte, 531.

130, p. 177. De Miraculis, p. 1194.

131, p. 177. Ratisbonne, II., 285.

132, p. 178. Radulf de Diceto. Abbreviationes Chronicorum, I., 257; Roll's Series.

133, p. 178. Odo, Itinerary, Book i., from which the following narrative is principally derived.

134, p. 183. Odo, Book iv. and Book v.

135, p. 184. Matthew of Paris, Chron. Maj., I., 101.

136, p. 184. Cf. Ratisbonne, II., 376.

137, p. 185. Letter 386.

138, p. 186. S. Bernard, De Consideratione.

LECTURE IX.

139, p. 187. Works, I., 1118.

140, p. 193. Böhringer, B. iv., 360.

141, p. 194. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., xxi. xxiii.

142, p. 195. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., viii.

143, p. 195. Letters 284, 269, 298.

144, p. 196. Letters 290, 288.

145, p. 203. Peter Cluny, Letter 46, Bk. vi. p. 467.

146, p. 204. Exord. Magn. Cist., III., vi.

APPENDIX.

147, p. 212. Works, Vol. II., p. 84.

148, p. 212. Pusey's Letter on the Immaculate Conception, p. 23.

149, p. 212. Works, Vol. II., p. 43.

150, p. 213. S. Bernard, Sermons, pp. 429—441.

151, p. 215. S. Bernard, Works, Vol. II., p. 73, 78.

152, p. 216. Letter 174.

153, p. 219. Cf. Church Quarterly Review, 1895, April, p. 242.

154, p. 220. Card. Turrecremata de Conceptione B.V.M. Ed. Pusey. Bail's Summ. Concil., I., 511. Pusey's Letter, p. 290.

155, p. 226. Pusey's Letter, p. 78, cf. p. 66.

156, p. 228. S. Aug. De pecc. Merit. et Rem., II., 49, Works, Vol. X., 278.

157, p. 228. S. Aug. de Natura et Gratia. Works, Vol. X., 395.

158, p. 229. Pusey, Letter, pp. 68, 70, 101, 107.

159, p. 229. S. Aug. de Perfect. Justit., 44, Works, X., 463. Cf. Pusey, Letter, 65.

160, p. 229. S. Aug., Op. Imperf., vi. 22.

161, p. 229. Quoted by S. Aug. Letter 190 (to Optatus). Works, II., p. 1061. Torquemada, p. 156.

162, p. 229. S. Leo, Serm. i., Nativ. Tr. Dr. Bright, p. 20. Cf. Turrecremata, p. 128 ff. S. Leo, Serm. xii., on the Passion. Tr. Dr. Bright, p. 48. T., p. 129.

163, p. 230. Quoted from Pusey, p. 122.

164, p. 230. S. Thomas. T., pp. 138, 296.

165, p. 230. S. Bonaventura, in Sentent., III., D. iii. § 2. Cf. Pusey, p. 219.

166, p. 232. S. Bernard. Serm. ii., Assumpt. B.V.M., and Pusey, Letter, 176.

167. p. 235. Incert. Auct. int. Op. S. Aug. Works, VIII., 1534. Contra quinque Hæreses, and T., 709.

168, p. 236. S. Aug., de Natura et Grat. Works, X., 395. Pusey, Letter, 179.

169, p. 237. Waterworth, Decrees of Trent, p. xcvi. Conc. Trid. Sess. V. Decree concerning Original Sin, 1546. Waterworth, p. 24.

170, p. 238. Bossuet's Works, Vol. XI., p. 14.

171, p. 242. Pusey's Eirenicon, p. 352, &c.

172, p. 245. Mozley, Theory of Development, p. 54.

173, p. 247. Dr. Liddon, Bampton Lectures, p. 443.
See also Rev. R. M. Benson, The Virgin Birth.

J. Masters & Co., Printers, Albion Buildings, S. Bartholomew Close, E.C.