

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

The subject is by no means exhausted. In some cases I have laid more stress on the phenomena than others would do. But I have pointed out certain linguistic features in Genesis which seem to testify both to its antiquity and to its originality, and which indicate a literary distinction between the Hebrew text of this book as it stands and the usages of the centuries which elapsed between the time of Samuel and the Exile. These phenomena must neither be exaggerated nor minimized. Some may be accidental; but the fact stands forth that in a number of places where an ordinary word might have been used it was not forthcoming, and terms and forms were in vogue when the materials which compose our Genesis were written down which dropped out after the age of Samuel. It would be interesting to confirm this argument by taking the converse, and by showing that many words are freely used in the time of Samuel which are conspicuous by their absence in Genesis. How is it, for example, that "the Lord of Hosts" is never named by this grand title in the whole Pentateuch? How is it that so little is said about Jerusalem in Genesis? Why is it that the idea of God as a Saviour is not hinted at until we reach Jacob's blessing of Judah? (xlix. 18). There must be a reason for these things, and the "traditional" view seems to afford their true solution.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

---

ART. II.—ST. BERNARD.

LIVING in an island has its undoubted advantages, but it has also its serious drawbacks. It has its advantages, for by the sea which surrounds us we are protected from many ills, invasion and the like, from which the other nations of Europe have without exception suffered in the past, while we have dwelt in safety. It has its drawbacks, for a nation so situated is tempted to become insular in its ideas and narrow in its conceptions. Even if its vision is not so short-sighted as to prevent it seeing things which have or are happening elsewhere, it is prone to see them through insular-tinted glasses, and only to take an interest in them as they seem to affect its own well-being. But in so doing we are of necessity the losers, for we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of mankind even in thought without serious detriment. Our understanding of the true meaning of events in past or present is imperfect, our interest in them faint and uninspiring, our grasp of matters of world-wide importance feeble and enervated.

Certainly there is a great danger of this in our study of Church history. We are prone to regard it only as it concerns our own Church and country. "Catholic" becomes contracted in idea if not in word into "Anglican," and we forget that the great saints of Christendom in every age and land are our holy and noble ancestry, with whom we are linked by far closer ties than those of a merely earthly nationality.

On this account, then, it is profitable for us, in dwelling upon the period of Church history between 1100 and 1253, to look beyond our own insular horizon, and turn our gaze outward on some of those heroes of the faith who shone forth like brilliant stars in the darkness which still overspread Europe when the twelfth century began. Among these, St. Bernard, a French Churchman, has surely a special claim on our attention.

There has been from early Christian times a close connection between the Gallican or French Church and the Church in Britain. When, for instance, in the fifth century, the Pelagian heresy, which taught that man can keep God's commandments without God's grace, troubled the Church of this land, we find the ecclesiastics of that day, in their perplexity, inviting the help of learned Gallican divines, and we read that the Synod of the Church in Gaul, in answer to this appeal, deputed two of their Bishops, Germanus and Lupus, to cross over to Britain. They landed on our shores in 429, and were of the greatest service; and the preservation of the names of Gallican saints in our Kalendar, such as SS. Hilary, Britius, Martin, and others, tells us of the close connection which from that time, if not before, existed between the two Churches. Many sacred buildings, too, in this country are still dedicated to Gallican saints, and there seems little doubt that the Liturgy which Augustine found in use when he came to England at the end of the sixth century, and which differed in many respects from that used in the Roman Church, was Gallican in its source, and was founded on the Liturgy known by the name of St. Ino of Ephesus, from which place Christianity had been originally brought into France.

In trying to obtain, as it were, a bird's-eye view of Bernard, his life, character, work, and writings, there naturally occurs a preliminary inquiry. We cannot afford to separate a man from the times in which he lived. Great men not only help to shape the times and to make their history, but the times in their turn do much to create the man, develop his character, and interpret his actions. How often this has been forgotten. The lives of men who lived in the past, nearer or more remote, have been written by those who have judged them not by the

standard of morality or knowledge of the days in which their lot was cast, but of the times of the writers. They have taken them out of their proper surroundings, and the result has of necessity been unfair to the men they write about and misleading to the readers.

What, then, we must ask, was the state of things at the end of the eleventh century and during the first half of the twelfth, the particular period with which we have to deal? "Unsettled" is perhaps the best word by which to describe it. Everywhere it was characterized by a spirit of restlessness which came between a long time of darkness and the dawning of the light.

At home, with William the Conqueror as King of England, great changes had taken place. Having sworn at his coronation to do equal justice to all his subjects, Normans were everywhere favoured by him, and Anglo-Saxons treated with indignity, until it seemed hopeless for any Englishman to hold a high office in Church or State. He was succeeded in 1087 by William Rufus, who "feared God but little and man not at all," abused his power, and disgraced his crown. Bishoprics were purposely kept vacant, simony was rampant, corruption prevailed, until Anselm, Prior of Bec in Normandy, having come to England to look after the English estates which had been made over to his monastery, was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1093, and at once vigorously set about the much-needed work of reform.

Abroad we find everywhere a state of things even more unsatisfactory. A divided Christendom in the rupture between East and West, unhappily consummated on July 16, 1054, when the legates of Leo IX. laid on the altar of St. Sophia at Constantinople a writ of excommunication against the Patriarch, which was answered by anathemas on the part of the Patriarch and his clergy; a bitter conflict for supremacy between the ecclesiastical power as represented by the Pope and the temporal by Henry IV., Emperor of Germany; a Papal schism dividing the Western Church, Urban II. and Clement III. both claiming to be the rightful occupier of the Chair of St. Peter; insubordination and irregularities of the worst kind, in which popes and bishops, clergy and monks, were all involved. Such was the state of things at the close of the eleventh century. But dark as the times were, it was the intensified darkness which precedes the breaking of the approaching day, not the gloom of the coming night. The very unsettlement which prevailed told of movement, and movement belongs to life, not to death.

There was already the shaking of the dead bones, and the work of quickening had begun when Bernard saw the light, a

man destined to be a leader in the Church and the world, making his influence felt far and wide, and, under God's providence, directing the movement just beginning for the lasting wellbeing of humanity and the growth of true religion.

Born in 1091, dying in 1153, his life coincides with the central portion of the Middle Ages, and is well summed up by a well-known historian: "He saw the first and second Crusades, the beginnings of scholasticism, a great reformation movement in the Church, and the noblest period of growth and influence monasticism was destined to know." And in all these, as we shall see, we find Bernard a foremost actor, an energetic and zealous worker.

He was born near Dijon, of noble and pious parents. His father was a man of high character, a brave soldier, and a kind-hearted and charitable man. His mother was his worthy helpmeet, caring for her children, dedicating her six sons to the Lord from their birth, visiting the fatherless and widow in their affliction, and keeping herself unspotted from the world. Of the children Bernard was the third son, and one of his earliest recollections must have been the events connected with the First Crusade. We have no time to dwell upon this at any length. Enough to remind you of the terrible tales of suffering endured by the Christians in the Holy Land at the hands of the Turks, who had taken possession of Palestine in 1076; the preaching of Peter the Hermit, who had been to Jerusalem, and seen with his own eyes the cruelties which were being perpetrated; his triumphant progress through Europe, as he stirred up the people everywhere to an uncontrollable enthusiasm; the starting of the first expedition; its many disasters, and at length its final success, when in 1099, at the hour of three on a Friday afternoon, the army of Crusaders, with Godfrey of Bouillon at its head, mounted the walls of Jerusalem, and, "wading through the blood of the Saracens up to the knees of their horses," took possession of the Holy City.

The next memorable occurrence in his life was his mother's death, just as he was passing from boyhood to youth. She was a saintly woman, so highly thought of by those among whom she lived that the Abbot of St. Benignus at Dijon begged that her body might be buried in the church of his abbey.

We cannot doubt that these events left an indelible impression on the character of a boy who, we are told, was *mire cogitativus* ("marvellously thoughtful"), and that both the wild excitement of the Crusade and the peaceful memory of his mother's life were never forgotten, and their influence, like their remembrance, never effaced.

At last the day came when he must choose his career.

And when we picture him as he has been described—his great beauty of person, his charm of manner, eloquence of speech, love of literature, holiness of life, deep self-denial, we are not surprised to learn that amid the din and clash of arms he was attracted by the quiet retirement of the monastery. Opposed by friends who urged him not to cut himself off from the great future which evidently lay before him, he was for a time puzzled and in doubt, until on his way to visit his soldier brothers he came to a lonely church by the wayside, and “on his knees he lifted up his hands to heaven, and poured forth his heart like water in the presence of his Lord, and dedicated his life to his Master’s service.”

Accordingly, at the age of twenty-two he joined the humble and poor monastery of Cîteaux. It belonged to the Cistercian Order, and the rule of St. Benedict was strictly observed in it. The discipline was severe, and the asceticism practised by the monks in striking contrast to the luxurious self-indulgence which had found its way into many religious communities at that time. Having entered upon this life, Bernard did not rest until by the force of his character and the consistency of his life he so commended the step he had taken that in a short time he induced his brothers and many of his friends to follow his example. It is interesting to learn that the head of this monastery was Stephen Harding, an Englishman, whose great desire was to reform monasticism, and who found in Bernard a true friend, a like-minded enthusiast, and a wise adviser.

The life at Cîteaux was hard, but not severe enough for Bernard, who, with the proneness to extremes which so often characterizes the young, carried his austerities to an extraordinary degree of extravagance, which he himself lived to repent. We are told that he strove “not only to subdue the desires of the body, which come through the senses, but the senses themselves. He stopped his ears that he might not hear the idle talk of friends who came to visit him; passed whole nights without sleep, and but for the interference of his friends would have sacrificed his life.” In his later years he lamented much the excessive mortification he had practised, by which he had enfeebled his bodily powers, unfitted himself for work, and shortened his life.

After two years spent in this way, having been chosen by the abbot to go forth and begin a monastery where reforms could be more easily carried out, he left Cîteaux with twelve companions, and founded the abbey with which his name will always remain associated. There the purity of his life, the austerity of his self-denial, the wonderful influence he gained over all who came in contact with him, aided by the reputation of prophetic visions and miraculous gifts, soon made him

famous. The inmates increased to 700, among whom was Henry, brother of the King, and afterwards Archbishop of Rheims, and others whose names are well known in Church history. We are told that in a short time no less than 160 monasteries were founded by him and his disciples, while the very name of the valley where the monastery was situated was changed from the Valley of Wormwood to Clairvaux, or the Bright Valley.

But his influence could not be hid within the walls of his monastery. Gradually his reputation spread. He became the wise and trusted counsellor of Popes and Kings; the fearless reformer of abuses; the brave champion of the faith; the eloquent preacher and writer; and, withal, the humble follower of Him whom he loved to call Master.

We will try briefly to illustrate these various aspects of his life.

1. *The Wise Counsellor.*—He had been this to Stephen Harding in the monastery at Citeaux, and to the brethren of high and low degree in his own monastery at Clairvaux. But the time arrived when he was called to higher responsibilities, and became the chosen adviser of Emperor and King and even Pope.

His first great opportunity came to him in 1130, when, after the death of Pope Honorius II., two rival Popes were set up—Gregory, Cardinal of St. Angelo, under the name of Innocent II., and Peter Leonis, Cardinal of St. Mary, grandson of a wealthy Jew who had become a Christian, under the name of Anacletus II. In less than three hours on the same day these two men were consecrated Popes in Rome, and for eight years they struggled for the supremacy. Anacletus, by the lavish use of his great wealth and the power his family had gained in Rome, soon got the upper hand in that city. He took possession of (the then) St. Peter's by force, and Innocent was forced to betake himself to France for safety. There the important question was, What would the King and Church of France do? Whose side would they take in the dispute? For on that decision the ultimate issue in a great measure depended. A council was summoned by Louis VI. at Etampes to consider the matter, which, writes the historian, "the man on whom the eyes of the Church had long been fixed was commanded to attend." Bernard obeyed the summons very reluctantly, but once there he took a leading part in the discussion, and so powerful was his advocacy that his counsel prevailed, and the assembly pronounced in favour of Pope Innocent.

Spain and Germany quickly followed the example set by France, and then Bernard took on himself the task of persuading Henry I. of England. The King happened to be at the time on the Continent, on territory that belonged to

England, and there Bernard sought him. And when the King seemed inclined to listen to the prelates about him, who urged him to support Anacletus because of his wealth, Bernard said, "Are you afraid that you may sin by giving your obedience to Innocent? Think how you may answer for your other sins, and let this sin rest on me." At last Henry yielded, and accompanied Bernard to Chartres, where he promised his support to Innocent.

We are not surprised to learn that Bernard after this gained an immense influence over the Pope, and became his most trusted companion, so that when he left France and returned to Italy Bernard accompanied him, and by his splendid eloquence and winning power persuaded the people everywhere to acknowledge Innocent as the rightful Pope. At length, when Anacletus died in 1138 and a successor was set up, Bernard so prevailed with him that he renounced his claim, stripped off his insignia, and, led by the saint, prostrated himself at the feet of Innocent and paid him homage.

This is but one instance of his great influence over men. We read that among the many great men who sought his advice was Theodore, Count of Blois, elder brother to Stephen, King of England, and that Pope Eugenius III. in his earlier life had been a learner at his feet in Clairvaux.

The schism being thus happily ended, Bernard returned to his monastery to take up again the work to which he had long before put his hand as the reformer of abuses in the Church. There was plenty of scope for such work, but he began, as we might expect, with the monasteries. These communities had arisen from the necessities of the times, and it is difficult to over-estimate the debt the Catholic Church as a whole owes to them. But as years went on evils had crept in. The inmates had grown wealthy, lazy, worldly, and not unfrequently dissolute. As far back as the eighth century St. Benedict had seen the downward tendency, and tried to arrest it; and Bernard, in whose day this laxity had reached its climax, plainly and fearlessly denounced it. In his "Apology," which he wrote in defence of the Cistercian Order, he points out some of the chief abuses which needed correcting. "Many of the monks," he says, "though young and vigorous, pretend sickness that they may be allowed to eat flesh. At meals no man asks his neighbour for heavenly food. There is no conversation concerning the Scriptures nor the salvation of souls, but small talk, laughter, and idle words fill the air. At dinner the palate and ears are equally tickled, the one with dainties, the other with gossip and news. They dress themselves in the costliest furs, in silk and in cloth fine enough for royal robes. The walls of their churches are adorned, while the poor are



left in nakedness." And he concludes a strong denunciation of the luxury and ornamentation, the pictures and gorgeousness of the fittings of their places of worship and cloisters, by the vehement appeal: "What has all this to do with monks, with professors of poverty, with men of spiritual minds? Good God! if we are not ashamed of these vanities, why are we not grieved at the cost of them?"

But it is not only monks and monasteries that come under the lash of his righteous indignation. Bishops and clergy, too, he rebukes with a like plainness of speech. Two quotations from his writings will suffice to show how great was the laxity which had crept into the Church and was destroying her influence in the world, and how earnestly and fearlessly he endeavoured to bring about a better state of things.

In his tract on the office and duty of bishops he says: "At the present time people look only at the splendour of dignities, and not at the responsibility which is attached to them. A man blushes to be only a simple minister in the Church of God, and believes himself to be of no account, to become dishonoured, if he is not raised to some eminent post, no matter what it is. Do we not see children who have just left school, and youths who have barely reached manhood, raised because of their noble blood to the dignities of the Church, and passing from under the government of the ferule to exercise the government over presbyters? In truth, it is more a matter of rejoicing to them to have no longer to fear the rod than to see themselves raised to places of dignity; and they congratulate themselves less on being able to rule others than that they are no longer obliged themselves to obey. But that is only the beginning. With time they conceive the wish to rise higher, and, learning from these two masters, ambition and avarice, they are not long before they know how to invade altars and to empty the purses of those below them." This may seem to some to be an exaggerated statement, but when we remember that so short a time back as 1033 a boy of twelve years of age had been made Pope under the name of Benedict IX., we can well believe that we have here the sober language of a reformer who was brought face to face with terrible facts.

In the same way he writes to Pope Innocent of the condition of the clergy: "The insolence of the clergy, occasioned by the negligence of the bishops, is everywhere the cause of trouble and disorder in the Church. The bishops give holy things to dogs and cast pearls before swine, and then these creatures turn upon them and trample them under their feet. That is the just punishment of prelates who grow fat upon the goods of the Church and never correct its disorders. These well

merit to be tormented by those whom they bear with showing a culpable insolence towards them. When the clergy are enriched from the labours of others and seek the richness of the earth without making the least return for it, they grow corrupt in the very bosom of plenty, so that in order to describe them we need only say with the prophet: 'They sat down to eat and to drink, and then rose up to play.'"

But while he thus sternly rebukes the faults, what a splendid ideal he sets up of the character and duties of the bishops and clergy. We have it from his own pen: "A right intention of the heart in a Christian bishop consists in two things: in seeking the glory of God and the benefit of his neighbour; so that a bishop should in all his words and actions seek nothing for himself, but only the honour of God or the salvation of his brethren, or both together. It is thus he will be able to fulfil the office of a pontiff, become, as it were, a kind of bridge (*pons*) of communication between God and man. For as a bridge he reaches even unto God by the faithfulness with which he seeks God's glory and not his own. On the other hand, he touches his neighbours by the pious devotion with which he seeks to do good to them rather than to himself. The faithful priest is he who regards with dovelike simplicity all the wealth which passes through his hands, whether it be the benefits bestowed by God upon men, or the offerings of men to God, and keeps back nothing for himself, for he seeks not the gifts of the people, but their good, nor his own glory, but the glory of God. He loses his soul in this world, in order that he may find it in the life which is eternal."

Before we leave this part of our subject, it is worthy of notice that, strong believer as he was in upholding the authority of the Pope as the only defence in those days against the encroachments of the secular power, yet he foresaw with prophetic vision its dangers, too. His writings are full of warnings to the Popes as he unhesitatingly points out the evils which excessive centralization must inevitably bring with it, the dangers in which Papal supremacy would land the Church if not carefully guarded against. In these warnings time and experience have indeed proved him to have been a true prophet.

But soon a new field of activity opened out before Bernard, and, obedient to the call of duty, he stood forth when the need arose as the champion of the faith. A spirit of scepticism had sprung up, orthodox belief was at a discount. The old truths were called in question. The faith once for all delivered to the saints was openly attacked by those within the Church.

Foremost among these was one Peter Abelard. He was

born in Brittany in 1079. His name was Peter Palatinus, but when, having chosen the life of a scholar, he renounced his succession to the paternal estate, he took the name of Peter Abelard. At first he was a student of philosophy, in which he soon excelled, but having made up his mind to take up the study of theology, he went to the school at Laon, which had long flourished under Anselm, a pupil of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury. He did not, however, remain long there. Despising what he considered the old-fashioned teaching given there, and openly stating this contempt, he was challenged by his fellow-students, and in answer he proceeded to give a course of lectures on Ezekiel. He at once drew a large audience, and, returning to Paris, became very popular. By his immoral conduct, however, he was forced to retire into the monastery of St. Denys, but after a term, quitting the monastery, resumed his theological teaching, and soon had a very large following of disciples and admirers. His heresies were many, and had to do with the doctrine of the Trinity, the Divine attributes, the work of the Saviour, the operations of the Holy Ghost, the sinfulness of man, the inspiration and integrity of Holy Scripture, the Eucharistic Presence, the relation of faith, reason, and Church authority. In a word, there was hardly an article of the faith which did not come within the sphere of his dissecting-knife. Nothing was held sacred by him.

With this man Bernard was brought into open conflict at a Synod summoned at Sens in 1140 to deal with the matter. The King and a large number of ecclesiastics were assembled. Bernard had no desire to attend; indeed, he did his best to avoid the encounter, for he had already met his antagonist in a private interview, and reasoned with him. "Much against my will and with tears," he writes, "I yielded to the advice of my friends."

The scene must have been a remarkable one, as the two men, the representatives of speculative inquiry and of Evangelical truth, met face to face. "In a wooden pulpit," writes the historian, "stood Bernard, holding in his hands the book for which his opponent was impugned. He read passages marked for reproof, explanation, or condemnation, pointed out their discrepancy with received doctrines and the declarations of the Fathers. But he had not finished his case when, to the surprise of all present, Abelard rose up, refused to hear more, or answer questions, appealed to Rome, and left the assembly." In his absence he was condemned, and ordered to desist from public teaching, whereupon he withdrew to the Abbey of Cluny, where he died two years later, a penitent and humble monk.

A letter written by Bernard at that time to an abbot will best enable us to understand his standpoint in opposing Abelard. "It must needs be that offences come, so that those who are approved may be made manifest. If anyone is the Lord's servant, let him take the Lord's side, for His cause is now in question. The truth is attacked; the vestments of Christ are torn in pieces; the Sacraments of the Church divided. From the sole of the foot to the crown of the head the well-being of the Church is compromised, and the simple faith of believers ridiculed. Already Peter Abelard goes before Antichrist to prepare his ways, speaking differently from tradition with respect to matters of faith, of the Sacraments, and of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He writes, teaches, and disputes, and his words tend to the subversion of the hearers. With Arius, he distinguishes degrees and inequalities in the Trinity; with Pelagius, he prefers free-will without grace; with Nestorius, he divides Christ by excluding His humanity from the fellowship of the Trinity. May the Lord look upon it, and judge if the mouth of that man who speaketh unrighteousness be not speedily closed."

It is interesting to know that in 1140, while denouncing Abelard for sceptical teaching and taking from the faith, he wrote his celebrated letter to the Canons of the Church of Lyons to defend the faith from the opposite danger of men adding new dogmas to what was already held by the Church.

A new festival, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, was held, and he wrote a letter in which he made a vigorous but temperate remonstrance against such an innovation. The letter is too long to give at length, but some extracts will be of interest.

"It is well known," he writes, "that among all the churches of France that of Lyons is first in importance, whether we regard the dignity of its see, its praiseworthy regulations, or its honourable zeal for learning. Wherefore I cannot but wonder that there should have been some among you at this time who wished to sully this splendid fame of your church by introducing a new festival, a rite of which the Church knows nothing, and which reason does not prove, nor ancient tradition hand down to us. Have we the pretension to be more learned or more devoted than the Fathers? It is a dangerous presumption to establish in such a matter what their prudence left unestablished, and the matter in question is of such a nature that it could not possibly have escaped the diligence of the Fathers if they had not thought that they ought not to occupy themselves with it. The mother of the Lord, you say, ought to be honoured. You say well; but the honour of a Queen loves justice. The royal Virgin does not

need false honour, since she is amply supplied with true titles of honour and badges of her dignity. Honour, indeed, the purity of her flesh, the sanctity of her life, wonder at her motherhood as a virgin, adore her Divine offspring. Extol the prodigy by which she brought into the world without pain the Son whom she had conceived without concupiscence. Magnify her as the medium by whom grace was displayed, the instrument of salvation, the restorer of the ages, and finally extol her as having been exalted above the choirs of angels to the celestial realms. These things the Church sings concerning her, and has taught me to repeat the same things in her praise, and what I have learned from the Church I both hold securely myself and teach to others. But this is not to honour the Virgin, but to detract from her honour. Wherefore, although it has been given to some, though few, of the sons of men to be born with the gift of sanctity, yet to none has it been given to be conceived with it, so that to One alone should be reserved this privilege, even to Him who should make all holy, and, coming into the world, He alone, without sin, should make atonement for sinners. The Lord Jesus, then, alone was conceived by the Holy Ghost, because He alone was holy before He was conceived. He being excepted, all the children of Adam are in the same case as he who confessed of himself with great humility and truth, 'I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin hath my mother conceived me.' And as this is so, what ground can there be for the festival of the Conception of the Virgin?"

It is a strange commentary on this clear declaration of one who has been canonized by the Church that in December, 1854, the Pope of Rome pronounced the dogmatic decree of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and made that a dogma of the Roman Catholic faith which Bernard so sternly condemned.

Time does not suffice to dwell upon him as a preacher and writer. His sermons were the delight of the faithful in all ages, and were distinguished by their scriptural character. "They are," says Sixtus of Sienna, "at once so sweet and so ardent that it is as though his mouth were a fountain of honey and his breast a whole furnace of love."

We have a striking instance of the power of his preaching in the Second Crusade. Summoned by the Pope to preach a new Crusade in 1144, he at first hesitated. He was worn and exhausted by all he had gone through, and felt unequal to the undertaking. But regarding it as a call of duty, he threw himself into the work with all his accustomed fervour. Stirred up by his eloquence, Europe was aroused, and a vast army set out for the East, with the King of France and the Emperor of

Germany at its head. It ended in a great disaster and frightful destruction, but Bernard only saw in this feature the hand of God, and believed that the overthrow of the expedition was a just punishment from Heaven for the many and notorious sins of the Crusaders.

There are some who have blamed him for encouraging the Crusades, but surely he would have been a half-hearted Christian who could hear unmoved the cruelties to which the Christians in the Holy Land were subjected by their conquerors. Moreover, who can deny the beneficial results which came from these Crusades to Europe as a whole?

1. The nations of Europe became for the first time known to each other as bound together by a high cause.

2. All classes were brought into touch.

3. Religious enthusiasm was aroused, chivalry and Christianity acted and reacted on one another.

4. Christians were brought into contact with the civilization of the East, and learned to see good in those whom till then they had regarded as utterly bad.

5. Literature and science were benefited.

6. Navigation was improved, and the commerce of the East introduced.

His letters, sermons, and treatises tell of his power as a writer, while his hymns, translated from the original Latin, are well-known to us. We must, however, be careful to distinguish him from Bernard of Cluny, from whose pen we have "Jerusalem the golden," "Brief life is here our portion," "For thee, O dear, dear country," and "The world is very evil." The best-known hymns of St. Bernard of Clairvaux are, "Jesu, the very thought of Thee," "O Jesu, King most wonderful," "Jesu, the very thought is sweet," "O Jesu, Thou the beauty art," and "Jesu, Thy mercies are untold."

There remains little more to say of this great saint. He sought no honour, refused all dignities, and died, as for thirty-eight years he had lived, the Abbot of Clairvaux. Up to the last he did not spare himself, and the closing act of his life was a successful effort to reconcile the combatants in a fierce war which had sprung up between the town of Metz and the neighbouring barons. He rose from his sick-bed, was carried to the place in a litter, and, having accomplished his work of peacemaking, returned to the quiet of the abbey he loved so dearly, where he breathed his last on May 20, 1153.

A letter which he wrote to a friend only a few days before his death tells how, in perfect trust, he commended his spirit into the hands of a faithful Creator and most merciful Saviour.

“Pray ye to the Saviour who willeth not the death of a sinner that He would not delay my timely exit, but that still He would guard it. Fortify with your prayers a poor unworthy creature, that the enemy who lies in wait may find no place where he may fix his teeth and inflict a wound.” He died as he had lived, a humble follower of the Master he had served so faithfully. His contemporaries called him the thirteenth Apostle, and ten years after his death he was canonized by the Church as a saint and doctor. I cannot better conclude than by quoting the words with which Luther, writing some 400 years later, sums up his life and character, and which are given by a modern writer of St. Bernard’s life.

“Thus died Bernard, a man so godly, so holy, and so chaste that he is to be commended and preferred before all the Fathers. He, being grievously sick and having no hope of life, put not his trust in his single life, in which he had yet lived most chastely, nor yet in his good works or deeds of charity, of which he had done many; but removing them far out of his sight, and receiving the benefit of Christ by faith, he said, ‘I have lived wickedly, but Thou, Lord Jesus, dost possess the Kingdom of Heaven by double right: first, because Thou art the Son of God; secondly, because Thou hast purchased it by Thy Death and Passion. The first Thou keepest for Thyself as Thy birthright; the second Thou givest to me, not by the right of my works, but by the right of grace.’ He set not against the wrath of God his monastic state nor his angelical life, but he took of that one thing which was necessary, and so was saved.”

C. J. RIDGEWAY.

---

ART. III.—PLAIN FACTS AND FAITHFUL TESTIMONIES IN SUPPORT OF CHURCH DEFENCE.

THE *history* of the National Church undoubtedly furnishes an abundance of plain facts in favour of her position and maintenance. Her *work*, too, has long been, and still is, such as should strongly commend her to the intelligent and honest support of every candid mind. Such support is a matter for the earnest consideration, or rather the favourable decision, not only of her own members, but of all who are capable of arriving at a sound and unprejudiced judgment with regard to her position, history, and work. We need not—indeed, her true defenders will not—sanction any abuse which may admit of a sufficient and reasonable remedy. Whatever the abuse may be—and some will point to one thing, some to another—if such objectors have reason on their side when they speak of