

It follows that X can never give us the truth when all other manuscripts have lost it, although it has some value for reconstructing the (M) TAX archetype, which in the absence of Γ is our only source for the text other than the prose version. In the one passage¹ therefore where X appears to confirm a conjecture, X is also conjecturing and, as it happens, wrongly.

G. R. MANTON.

ARNOLD OF MORIMOND

THE following story may perhaps illustrate, as does that of Robert of Châtillon, the strong stand which St Bernard always made for transparently straight dealing and his indignation at any dishonest perversion of the Papal judgement.

The Abbey of Morimond was founded from Cîteaux on *V idus Iulij*, July 11, in the year 1115, that is to say, a little more than a fortnight after Clairvaux was founded on June 25 of the same year—and consequently ranked as fifth of the five *Ecclesiae Maiores* of the *Charta Charitatis*. Its site was a narrow valley in the Pays de Bassigny on the north-eastern fringe of the diocese of Langres, at a point almost touching the dioceses both of Besançon and of Toul on the borders of Lorraine and Champagne. There is some record, however, of its removal by the second abbot, Walter I, in 1130, and its remains may now be identified in the diocese of Langres, two and a half miles south-east of Damblain (Vosges) and not far from Bourbonne-les-Bains (Haute-Marne. Cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv 815 sq.; U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Âge, Biobibl.* 2019; Roussel, *Le Diocèse de Langres* iii 411. éd. 1875). There still exists outside the cloister a chapel 'dédiée à Sainte Ursule, servant de paroisse domestique suivant l'usage adopté par les abbayes Cisterciennes' (A. Roserot, *Dict. Topogr. du Dép. de la Haute-Marne* 115. éd. 1903).

It was influenced by his pious wife Adeline, daughter of Regnier de Choiseul and Ermengarde de Vergy, that early in the twelfth century Ulric d'Aigremont built a little oratory in a marshy forest between Damblain (Vosges) and Fresnoy (Haute-Marne), where he settled an anchorite by name John. It was hoped that others would join him, but for some ten, or perhaps twelve, years he remained solitary. At last John sought St Stephen Harding at Cîteaux, who dispatched two monks of mature age and sound judgement to take stock of the possibilities of the locality as a monastic site. After some opposition on the part of Ulric's son and heir, St Stephen obtained a concession of certain lands about two miles distant from the anchorite's cell, to which Ulric

¹ In I 119 *sanguine Christi* is the right reading; *sanguine fuso* is a weak conjecture shared by X with Pölmann and others.

added neighbouring property which went by the name of Waldenvillers. While the abbey was always known as Morimond (*mori mundo*), the site of the cell is still spoken of as Vieux-Morimond. A charter of Guillelencus, fifty-seventh Bishop of Langres, under date 1126, confirming the grant, giving details of the circumstances as here described and *praecipiens monachis, ut regulam B. Benedicti, quam adidicerant, fideliter observarent*, may be found in *Gallia Christiana* (IV Instr. Col. 159. *Charta* xxxvi. Cf. Dubois, *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Morimond* 14 sqq. éd. 1852). The present writer would express his gratitude to his learned friend Monsieur L. Morel-Payen, late Librarian of Troyes, for valuable help in constructing briefly the story of these early days.

The first abbot, Arnold or Arnolphus I, brother german of Frederick, Archbishop of Cologne and of Henry, later first Abbot of Riddagshausen (*Rhusium*), a Cistercian house in Brunswick founded in 1145—was sent with a small swarm of eight other monks by St Stephen Harding direct from Cîteaux. During Arnold's abbacy of eleven years, 1115–1126, Morimond founded three daughter houses: Bellevaux (Haute-Saône) in the diocese of Besançon on March 22, 1120; La Creste (*Christa*) in the diocese of Langres near Chaumont (Haute-Marne) on June 30, 1121; and Camp or Vieux-Camp (*Vetus-Campus*) in the neighbourhood of Düsseldorf and in the diocese of Cologne on January 31, 1123 (L. Janaschek, *Orig. Cist.* I 8, 10 and 11; U. Chevalier, *Répert.* s. vv.). When Arnold died in Belgium in 1126 he was succeeded by Walter I, first Prior of Clairvaux, for eleven years St Bernard's faithful helper, who, as we have seen, four years later transferred the abbey to a more convenient site (*Gall. Christ.* iv 815).

In the Benedictine edition of Mabillon Epistle CCCLIX of St Bernard is addressed 'Summo Pontifici C. pusillus grex de Clara-Valle'. It was mistakenly recorded by the distinguished Maurist as 'Scripta anno Christi 1143', and as referring to the case of Raynald, fourth Abbot of Morimond (1139–1154), the initial C being taken to indicate Celestin II (1143–1144), whereas the addressee was really Calixtus II (1119–1124). The writer reports a grave matter which concerns his whole Order, and rightly also him whom he thankfully recognizes *gerere vicem* of one whose daily burden was the care of all the churches (2 Cor. xi 28). Had St Stephen not been absent in Flanders at the time (S. Bern. *Ep.* iv 1), he would himself have approached the Pope either personally or by letter, for, unknown to St Bernard, a brother abbot, deserting without warrant his own charge, had resolved on a journey to Jerusalem with the professed intent of propagating the Order in the Holy Land, where, as is well known, the need is rather for soldiers to fight than for monks to sing or to wail! The report is, St Bernard tells the Pope, that not merely is he proposing to lay down

his allotted burden, but has taken with him some of his best subjects, and amongst others a certain *nobilis puer* whom, as the Pope cannot, surely, fail to know, he had formerly with some scandal brought from Cologne. A proceeding such as this is grave. St Bernard does not presume to dictate, but leaves to the Pope's discretion the handling of this *vagatio*.

What might have been said for Arnold we learn from St Bernard himself. Writing reproachfully in 1138 to Humbert, first Abbot of Igny, on the subject of the latter's contemplated resignation (*Ep.* CXLI), he reminds him that he cannot justly plead such excuses as had Arnold of Morimond. Are his monks disobedient, his *conversi* idle, his neighbours hostile? Is he hampered by the lack of worldly substance? And yet Arnold's presumption was promptly, deservedly and terribly punished.

Evidently Arnold had written a letter to St Stephen intended to reach him at Clairvaux, but when his messenger arrived the Abbot of Cîteaux had not returned from a journey to Flanders, so St Bernard tells Arnold, and still remains in happy ignorance (*Ep.* IV 1). Arnold had forbidden St Bernard to attempt to dissuade him by letter; but *pro ratione* the Saint ought not to obey, and *prae dolore* he cannot obey; if he knew where to find Arnold he would seek him personally, and perhaps do what no letter could do. Of course Arnold will laugh, *utpote propriae pertinaciae conscius*; but St Bernard confidently makes his own the sentiment of the Apostle, *omnia possum in eo qui me confortat* (Phil. iv 13), and in terms of a tender sympathy, which with him is never a mere sentimental pose, he appeals to his friend as it were *vultu et oculis*; and more—he would cling to his feet, embrace his knees and, hanging on his neck, kiss the beloved head which in fellowship with himself had borne so long the sweet yoke of Christ. He would beseech him to spare not only the Cross of the Redeemer who bought (*redemit*) them at its price, but those whom he is destroying (*perimis*: note the paronomasia) whether taken away from Morimond or left behind. Reason fails, the very *Christi timor* fails. But *fraterna pietas*? Arnold simply keeps out of the range of its appeal (*Ep.* IV 1). The passage is one of the few which have come down to us revealing the tumultuous emotionalism of the Saint—another is his lament for the death of his beloved brother Gerard (*In Cant. Cant.* Sermo xxvi)—an emotionalism which with him is never the master, but always the servant, deliberately controlled, disciplined to a purpose, directed to an end as the keenest of instruments in the hand of the kindest of surgeons. And real! There is about it no touch of stage-play or make-believe. Critics who speak of St Bernard as characteristically austere, taking perhaps their clue from such charges as that which he brought against

himself in the case of Robert of Châtillon—*delicato quippe adolescentulo austerus exstiteram, et tenerum durus nimis inhumane tractavi* (*Ep.* I 2), may well modify their opinion by reflecting that it was the very intensity of his affection which accounted for his self-reproach. He could safely and profitably be severe because he loved so tenderly; and the more tenderly, the more robustly.

Twice he apostrophizes Arnold as *magna nostri Ordinis columna*. Does he not fear that to destroy this pillar means ruin to the house? Arnold protests, perhaps. He knows what he is doing; *non ruo*; his conscience is quite clear. Yes; but has Arnold thought of the effect upon the rest of the Order? And is it not reasonable that ruining others he is ruining himself? You who are just where you are in order to seek not what is profitable to yourself but to others! And what is to be said about those new plantations of Christ *diversis in locis, locis*—be it remembered—*horroris et vastae solitudinis*? How often do we find the language of the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii 10) used descriptively of Cistercian sites, as for example, by William of St Thierry (*Vita Prima* I v 25), by Caesarius of Heisterbach (*De Mirac.* i 1), and by William of Newburgh (*Historia* i 50)! Its use must be more than merely formal (*Ep.* IV 2).

What advantage is Arnold going to reap, or with so great evils can he reap? Must not the fruits of any proposed repentance be choked with such thorns? And here we find, as in the *De Conversione* x 21 and in Epistle LXXXVII 3, the words of Gen. iv. 7 translated from the Septuagint Version, and explained on this occasion in the sense that *recte dividere* demands that he should consult not only the interest of his own soul, but the needs of his sons orphaned of a father still alive. Indeed, is it to his own interest to disregard the counsel of his brethren and fellow abbots? But more terrible than the plight of those who are thus left orphaned is that of those whom he is taking with him—and that when he has simply discarded his pastoral charge and proclaimed himself to be henceforth care-free! Finally the Saint faithfully pledges himself to do his best to guide Arnold's feet *licite et ob hoc secure* in this grave matter, if he will only give him an opportunity of speaking with him face to face (*Ep.* IV 3). He never did.

And so St Bernard turns to other means of mitigating the disaster. Among Arnold's monks was a certain Adam, who had taken St Bernard into his confidence and from whom probably the Saint had first heard of Arnold's dereliction. Adam was at least wavering, and St Bernard does not mince his words. *O insensate!* On no less than three occasions since his *conversationalis initia* at Marmoutier he had confirmed his *stabilitas*; at Foigny, at Morimond, and finally on St Bernard's advice he had declined fellowship with Arnold (*Ep.* V 1). This *Esse*

et Non esse will not do. Let him learn of Solomon that a man has many friends, but one counsellor in a thousand (Ecclus vi 6). The *simplicitas columbae* is of no use without the *serpentis prudentia* (Matt. vii 24). And there are many other Scriptural testimonies which should warn him. By the bowels of Christ he begs Adam not to take this disastrous step before at least they have met, and a remedy perchance be found (*Ep.* V 2.).

But there were others, we know, who had followed Arnold in his desertion of his post. One, Henry by name, had—perhaps already—repented (*Ep.* VII 14). They seem, certainly some of them, to have assembled in or near Cologne, a neighbourhood where St Bernard had a dependable friend in Bruno, subsequently Archbishop of Cologne, the second of that name (*Épp.* VIII sq.), son of Engelbert, Count of Altona. To him he writes confidently and openly as to a familiar friend. He tells the story of Arnold's defection and of his seduction of some of his best subjects. St Bernard is specially grieved for the fate of three of these, Evrard, Adam *nobilemque illum puerum Conradum*, whom he mentions in Epistle CCCLIX. Arnold he has found quite obdurate; but he has heard that Evrard, Adam and others are still in Bruno's neighbourhood. If this is true, it would be right that Bruno should himself interview them, instruct their *columbina simplicitas* in some *prudentia serpentina*, and warn them of the folly of obeying the disobedient, were he an angel from heaven, rather than withdrawing themselves from every brother walking disorderly (*Ep.* VI). The letter ends—as it might seem, a little pointedly—with devout prayer for Bruno's own spiritual state.

All the letters which we have cited belong probably to the year 1125. The moral disaster with which they deal became in a measure past history when Arnold died in Belgium the following year, but its effects remained; and St Bernard at once took steps to neutralize these so far as was possible. The appointment of his own prior Walter to succeed Arnold was a good beginning and ensured a wise welcome for the remaining fugitives, should they be persuaded to return. Of these the leader was doubtless Adam, and to him St Bernard writes again, and at considerable length, treating not merely of the particular point at issue but of the first principles of obedience (*Ep.* VII). The Benedictine editor assigns the Epistle to the year 1126, and confirms us in the belief that it was written after Arnold's death. St Bernard writes supported by the authority of the Chapter General of the Order, confident of Adam's influence over the rest of the fugitives; confident that whatever he does the rest will do also, but making it plain that the sentence of the Chapter is not to be despised; *qui renuerint morientur* (*Ep.* VII 20). This is his last word.

Space prohibits a full analysis of the Epistle which, in a manuscript to which Mabillon refers as *Codex Regius* (so far unidentified, but possibly, as Père Paul Grosjean suggests, from the Collège de Navarre. Cf. Mabill. *Gener. Dispos.*), is entitled *De Discretionem Obedientiae*. It suffices to say here that it is a treatise of moral theology well worthy of study, the more incisive for the very narrowness of its scope. Among the considerations *ad hoc* which St Bernard urges we may note the fact that the bond between an abbot and his subjects is no stronger than that of marriage, and Arnold is no longer living (*Ep.* VII 2); that the Rule of St Benedict (*Cap.* lxxi) prescribes that *maiorum institutis minorum non esse praeponenda, aut communibus privata non praeiudicare imperia* (*Ep.* VII 6), which is precisely what Adam and his fellow monks had done; and that what they had done was *purum malum*, which no *licentia* could make in any sense *bonum*, a *licentia* which they had sought in order that *quanto licentius, tanto securius; et quo securius, eo periculosius* they might sin; a *licentia* moreover which, if it was granted by the Pope, was obtained by lying or the like discreditable means. It is a pity that they had not asked *consilium* rather than *licentia*, asked *non ut liceret, sed an liceret*. No one knew better than did St Bernard the extent to which men were tempted to smear their remorseful consciences with Apostolic licence, and the moral obliquity to which they would resort in order to obtain the necessary anointing, which was in fact, like the *perizomata* of our first parents, applied *ad velamentum, non ad medicamentum*!

The episode of Robert of Châtillon, much of the true import of which is revealed in Epistle I, was now perhaps some six years old; but St Bernard would not have forgotten its lesson, especially as it was not until two years later that Robert was restored to his Cistercian allegiance (*Petr. Ven. Epist. Lib.* i 35). As we read these stories of Robert and of Arnold, stories of tragedies, the latter it might seem fatal—befalling valued brethren of the Order well within a period of ten years, we are reminded of the vision vouchsafed to St Bernard's mother Aleth of the tawny-backed dog-pup which barked furiously in her womb; a vision interpreted by the monk to whom she told it as prophetic of the faithful watch-dog of the Church which it should be her glory to bring forth; one which would not merely bark and show its teeth, but lick its master's wounds (*Gaufr. Fragm. Cod. Aureaevall.* 6 sq.; *Vita Prima* I i 2; *Gaufr. Ab. Claraevall. Sermo de S. Bern.* 17).

WATKIN WILLIAMS.