

Neque enim coniunctionem suscepisset illam nisi prius immaculatus factus fuisset, ut sic condeceat illius unitatem. . . . Christum iustificatum et immaculatum factum uirtute sancti Spiritus (sicut beatus Paulus modo quidem dicit quod *iustificatus est in Spiritu* [1 Tim. iii 16], modo uero *qui per Spiritum aeternum immaculatum se obtulit Deo* [Heb. ix 14]) mori quidem fecit secundum legem hominum, utpote autem impeccabilem uirtute sancti Spiritus factum resuscitauit a mortuis: *c. Apoll.* iii 7 Dicant igitur nobis [*sc.* the Apollinarians] . . . si pro sensu [*in 2 Th.* ii 2 sensus = *voós*] Domino Christo, qui est secundum carnem, deitas facta esset, sicut dicunt, quid sancti Spiritus cooperatione ad haec Christus indigebat? Nec enim Unigeniti deitas Spiritu indigebat ad iustificationem sed nunc unctum esse dicit ipsum Spiritu et habitasse in eo Spiritum . . . et doctrinam inde ipsum accepisse et uirtutem, et inde impetrasse iustificationem et inde immaculatum factum esse.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

## A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CLUNIAN AND A CISTERCIAN

BEFORE the historic controversy between the Cluniacs and the Cistercians finally lost its immediately practical interest, as it began to do not very long after the great protagonists had passed, St Bernard in 1153 and Peter the Venerable in 1158, it appears to have taken for a while a somewhat academic shape, as of a question gravely and dispassionately debated in the schools. It lost, in a measure, the *verve* of aggressive partizanship and became rather restrained, detached, almost Platonically detached. How far the Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian monk, given by Martène and Durand in their *Thesaurus*,<sup>1</sup> is typical or otherwise it may be, as it often is in such cases, difficult to say, but it certainly is of the character suggested. Lists are opened and the disputants meet one another, courteously enough, with dialectic thrust and parry, and here and there a sally of grave humour or a homely witticism, as of friends who will presently meet outside and go home to a quiet meal together. The editors transcribed it from a MS at Morimond to which the abbot of that house had given them access, and which they assigned to the late twelfth or the early

<sup>1</sup> *Dialogus inter Cluniacensem Monachum et Cisterciensem de Diversis Utriusque Ordinis Observantiis* (Martène and Durand *Thesaurus Nov. Anecd.* v 1569 sqq.).

thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> In their *Admonitio Praevia*<sup>2</sup> they discuss the authorship of the Dialogue, the personality and the purpose of the writer, and the date of writing. The author himself tells us in the text that he had been professed a Cluniac *ad succurrendum*, that is to say, when in peril of death, but that he had afterwards recovered, ratified his profession, and remained a Cluniac for ten years.<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, kindled by the desire for greater perfection, he had migrated to the Cistercians. The language of the Dialogue suggests that, in each case, the *Caput Ordinis* is contemplated, and not a daughter-house; thereby the contrast is heightened and the references to Cluniac customs are the more pointed. He is anxious to vindicate himself, and by implication others who had taken a similar course, from the charge of levity or inconstancy; in other words he would justify, as we shall see later, the Cistercian interpretation of Benedictine stability (*stabilitas*) in the technical sense of this term. For the Cluniac opens the Dialogue by protesting that, 'of the vices that dominate vicious men, none is more detestable than is instability'.<sup>4</sup> These words throw down the glove; stability is the point at issue. As a matter of fact the Cluniac *amour propre* is mortally wounded by cases of migration from Cluny to Cîteaux; what has the Cistercian to allege which can justify such a state of things? The Dialogue is the answer to this question. The Cistercian writer, who is anonymous, maintains that it was a divine message which reached him by the mouth of a certain monk of Reichersberg, urging him to turn his back upon the Cluniac customs, which he does not hesitate to stigmatize as for the most part superstitious, contravening Decretals and Synodals and even the Rule itself.<sup>5</sup> He further explains that he had discussed both with his own Cluniac abbot and with the Abbot of Admont the conditions under which he had been professed; that the former had bluntly replied that he would rather have lacked his discipleship than accepted it *secundum Regulam*, while the latter, a man learned, holy, and honourable, had somewhat de-

<sup>1</sup> Writing at about the beginning of the eighteenth century they speak of it as 'codex antiquus ante annos quingentos exaratus'. I owe to M. Ph. Lauer, Conservateur-adjoint aux Manuscrits at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the information that this MS is now in the Bibliothèque de Chaumont (Haute-Marne), where it is numbered 78 (121). It is ascribed by M. Jules Gauthier (*Catalogue Général des Bibliothèques de France*, tom. xxi) to the end of the twelfth century.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* 1569-1572.

<sup>3</sup> 'In Cloniacensi Ordine, immo consuetudine, jam decem annos conversatus sum' (*Dialog.* i 2). In *Dialog.* ii 17 he tells the story of how he was professed *ad succurrendum*, after the usual three promises of conversion, obedience, and stability.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i 1.

<sup>5</sup> 'Ex magna parte superstitiosas, et tam decretalibus quam synodalibus sanctionibus ipsique Regulæ oppositas.' *Ibid.* i 2.

tachedly confessed that, for his part, he did not turn his ear away from the hearing of the law, meaning, of course, the Rule, but that it was turned away for him!—a manner of putting the prevailing state of affairs which the Cistercian felt to be both very sage and very concise.<sup>1</sup> Reichersberg was a house of Canons Regular of St Augustine in the diocese of Salzburg<sup>2</sup>; Admont (*Ad Montes*) is the great *Abbatia Admontensis*, founded by Gebhardt, Archbishop of Salzburg, in 1074, about ten miles ENE. of Selzthal in Styria. The references to German monasteries, coupled with the spelling of certain words, such as *Cloniacensis* and *Roudpertus* (Rupertus),<sup>3</sup> according to German pronunciation, and with the remark that the Latins as well as the Germans use the word *tunica* for a garment, not of fur, but of woven wool,<sup>4</sup> all suggest that the writer is a German monk. One may not be entirely astray in connecting him with Runa, also in Styria, founded in 1130 of the filiation of Ebrach, the fourth daughter of Morimond, which might perhaps account for the finding of the MS of the Dialogue in this last-named house. Further, if the writer had been professed at Cluny itself, his migration to Runa would have been to a sufficiently distant monastery to satisfy the requirements of the Rule on this score.<sup>5</sup>

As regards the date of the Dialogue, the fact that the words of the writer throughout breathe the spirit of early Cistercian fervour and of the uncompromising discipline of the founders of the Order leads us to conclude for the twelfth century. And we can, also on internal evidence, get yet nearer to the truth. The direct quotations from, and the references to, St Bernard's writings are considerable in number; reminiscences of them can frequently be detected. This is only what we should have expected. To some of these quotations, references, and reminiscences we shall recur. The point here to be noted is that, while in no instance is St Bernard honoured by the title *Beatus* or *Sanctus*, he is definitely spoken of as 'of blessed memory' (*felicis*

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog.* ii 19.

<sup>2</sup> Martène & Durand, *op. cit.* v 1457 sqq. Two extant treatises, both by Gerochus Praepositus Reicherspergensis, namely, *Tract. adv. Simoniac. ad Bernardum Abbatem* (*loc. cit.*) and *Liber de Corrupto Eccles. Statu ad Eugen. III Papam* (Baluze *Miscell.* v 63), point to the interest taken at Reichersberg in the Cistercian reform. 'Reicherspergense (Reichersberg) sur l'Inn, en Bavière' (De Maslatrie *Trésor de Chronologie* 1962).

<sup>3</sup> *Dialog.* i 34 and *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* iii 25: 'Secundum communem usum tam Latinorum quam Teutonicorum.'

<sup>5</sup> *Reg. S. P. Bened.* lxi. For the manner in which the *Instituta* of Raynald, fifth Abbot of Cîteaux, dealt with this question some quarter of a century earlier, see *Instituta Generalis Capituli apud Cistercium*, xi and xvi (Migne *P. L.* clxxxi 1725 sqq., Guignard, *Monuments Primitifs de la règle Cistercienne*, and *Nomasticon Cisterciense*, 1664). The original MS is Dijon 82 (114); it was inventoried by Abbot Jean de Cirey at Cîteaux in 1480; Guignard dated it at 1173-1191.

*memoriae*).<sup>1</sup> Thus the period of the Dialogue was that between his death in 1153 and his canonization in 1173, a period during which, as we have ventured to suggest, the nature of the controversy was changing, losing alike its acrimony and its practical *portée*, but during which, as Martène and Durand remark, there still remained mutual complaints of Cluniacs and Cistercians which the Epistle of Peter the Venerable (*Liber I xxviii*) and the *Apologia* of St Bernard had not succeeded in allaying.<sup>2</sup> It is further to be observed that Rupert of Deutz (*Dominus Roudpertus Tuiciensis Abbas*) is quoted in the Dialogue as a contemporary writer (*nostrī temporis scriptor*).<sup>3</sup> His authority is invoked by the Cistercian against the custom of taking gifts from the ungodly, a custom which, so far from profiting the giver, corrupts the recipient. The passage quoted is taken from the *De Divinis Officiis*<sup>4</sup> which Rupert wrote in 1111; he died in 1135. Clearly we cannot regard the expression *nostrī temporis* as meaning more than that he was a writer of the period of the controversy between Cluny and Cîteaux; a period upon which, in part, the Cistercian looks back, for Rupert had been dead for some eighteen years at least.

Taking the Dialogue as a whole the Cistercian would appear to be upon the defensive; what attacks he does make are made rather on the principle that attack is upon occasion the best method of defence. He is polite, but quite plain-spoken. Most of the quotation from the Bible and from the Fathers is on his part. Of the two disputants one might conclude him to be the more learned; his manner at times approaches that of a catechist. The quotations and the references cover a wide range, within which lie, for example, Bede's History of Abbot Fursey,<sup>5</sup> the Rule of St Macarius,<sup>6</sup> and the Rule of St Columbanus.<sup>7</sup> Occasionally he quotes at considerable length, as from St Bernard's Epistle to the monks of Flay, in the diocese of Beauvais (*Ep. lxxviii ad Monachos Flaviacenses*),<sup>8</sup> from the *Institutions* of Cassian,<sup>9</sup> and from the *Collations* of the same writer.<sup>10</sup> From time to time he appeals to St Augustine, to St Benedict, to St Gregory and, above all, to St Bernard. His quotation from the distich found in the so-called *Catonis Disticha de Moribus*, i 30, is noteworthy and to the point.<sup>11</sup> The editors hold him to be occasionally unfair to the Cluniacs,

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog.* i 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* *Admon. Praevia* 1571 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Dialog.* i 34.

<sup>4</sup> Rupert. Tuit. *De Div. Offic.* viii 4: 'Munus quod ab impio accipitur non solum non prodest offerenti, sed et eum qui accipit praevaricatorem constituit: quia et ille pertinaciter peccat, et ipse peccata ejus comedit.'

<sup>5</sup> *Dialog.* i 34.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* i 55.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* iii 20.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* i 11.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* ii 8.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* iii 38.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* ii 1. The Cistercian quotes the second line of:

Quae culpae soles, ea tu ne feceris ipse:

Turpe est doctori, cum culpa redarguit ipsum.

censuring them too severely; but they do not illustrate such unfairness, and certainly it is not obvious.<sup>1</sup>

The Cluniac is, on the whole, interrogative. Sometimes there is a touch of self-conscious simplicity, perhaps of Socratic irony, about his remarks. On one occasion he makes the quaint suggestion that the word *Papa* is derived from *papae* (Gk. *παπαί*), an exclamation of admiring wonder, and therefore means *admirabilis*.<sup>2</sup> The Cistercian has just quoted St Basil (*Reg. S. Basil. Interrog. xiii*) in support of his contention that obedience is primarily due, not to prelates, but to God. The Cluniac has often read this chapter, but never before, he declares, has he understood it so well. When St Basil forbids us to obey, contrary to a divine prohibition, even one who is *in admiratione positus* his meaning is—well, perhaps it sounds a childish explanation to offer—the Pope. The Cistercian does not fall into the trap. ‘If he did’, he replies, ‘he would not be wrong, for St Benedict’s precept is that nothing is to be preferred to Christ.’<sup>3</sup> ‘You mean, in fact’, says the Cluniac, ‘that in religion our Order is inferior to yours.’

Usually, the Cluniac is not what we should call contentious in argument. Almost his harshest words are to be found in his opening attack upon what he considers to be Cistercian neglect of Benedictine *stabilitas*. Only now and then is he mildly indignant, as when, after the Cistercian has at some length charged the Cluniac abbots with disloyalty to the Rule<sup>4</sup> in not honouring their guests by washing their feet and by sitting with them at table in the guest-house, quoting against them such authorities as the *Collationes Patrum* of Cassian<sup>5</sup>—the guest for whom the table is spread is really Christ—he cries: ‘Spare me so violent an attack upon our abbots; for I will not listen to your biting reproofs of them.’<sup>6</sup>

He manifests a sensitiveness as to any suspicion of the inerrancy of the Pope, upon which the Cistercian ruthlessly rallies him. ‘Sometimes our good Homer is off his guard.’ The Cluniac is horrified. ‘I am surprised’, he exclaims, ‘to hear you reprimanding the very successors

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog. Admon. Praevia* 1569 sq. They suggest that, in quoting the Rule of St Macarius, he suppresses a passage unfavourable to himself; but a reference to the context scarcely bears this out. Martène and Durand were Maurists, and Mabillon (*Traité des Études Monastiques*) had his controversy with the Trappists, the strict Cistercians of his day. Cf. *Dialog.* i 55, note (a).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i 58 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Reg. S. P. Bened.* lxxii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* liii and lvi.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Irrationabile et nimis absurdum est, ut hospiti immo Christo mensam pares, et te alienum ab ejus refectone facias’ (Cassian. *Collat.* ii 26). This is precisely St Benedict’s point of view: ‘Christus in eis adoretur, qui et suscipitur’ (*Reg. S. P. Bened.* liii).

<sup>6</sup> *Dialog.* ii 21 and 22.

of the Apostles', adding with a touch of sarcasm, 'but I suppose that that is your way of mitigating your reprimand of yourselves!' The Cistercian repudiates the charge of disrespect. He, a mere mannikin (*homuncio*), is not so presumptuous, so insane as to suggest that Popes have ever erred from the faith (*a fide exorbitasse*); but, being men, they may be deceived by men (*quia homines sunt ab hominibus falli possunt*). As the Abbot of Clairvaux points out, in his *Libellus De Consideratione*,<sup>1</sup> surrounded by familiars who are, let us say, corrupted by gifts, they issue commands too rashly and they bestow favours too thoughtlessly. And what does the same abbot say in his *De Moribus et Officiis Episcoporum*, addressed to Henry, Archbishop of Sens? 'The Romans dearly love gifts; they follow after rewards. I speak the naked truth. I am not revealing what is shameful, but confuting what is shameless. . . . When all the world knows the story are we alone to be silent?'<sup>2</sup> Again, in the case of Robert de Châtillon, stolen from Clairvaux by Bernard de Brancion, Grand Prior of Cluny,<sup>3</sup> Bernard's cry is: 'I appeal, Lord Jesu, to thy tribunal; I reserve myself for thy judgement; with thee a good conscience counts for more than a full purse.'<sup>4</sup> To all which the Cluniac evasively replies: 'These are hard and bitter things to say against the Apostolic See, and difficult of belief'—evasively, because they are not really said against the Pope at all, but against his enemies.<sup>5</sup> It will be evident that, on the point of the inerrancy of the Pope, the Cluniac is a *maximizer*; his Homer never dozes. How far, as a matter of historical fact, this was a mere pose, it may be difficult to say; probably the Cistercian writer would represent it as such. In any case it was characteristic of the Cluniacs in the days of Peter the Venerable to make much of their unique relation to the Pope as their only diocesan,<sup>6</sup> a privilege which would inevitably tend to their denying, as against the Cistercians, that the Pope was ever wrong.

The Dialogue is divided into three *Particulae*, representing three conferences held on different, probably successive, days. The disputants part and meet again with becoming courtesy. Thus, at the end of the first *Particula*, the Cistercian says: 'I will not answer your last question to-day; let to-day's replies suffice you. To-morrow, how-

<sup>1</sup> The description of the *Libri Quinque* as one *Libellus* is perhaps a rhetorical meiosis; 'a little book he once wrote'. The Cistercian would have in mind such passages as occur in S. Bern. *De Consideratione*, IV ii 2 sqq., e. g. 'Fideles se spondent, ut opportunius fidentibus noceant'.

<sup>2</sup> S. Bern. *De Mor. et Offic. Episc.* vii 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep. i ad Robertum*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Dialog.* ii 46 sqq.

<sup>6</sup> Petr. Ven. *Epist.* I xxviii (Migne *P. L.* clxxxix 138).

ever, after thinking the matter over, I will perhaps give you a somewhat considered opinion upon the point', the point in question being whether, supposing that the Pope were to bid the Cistercian to return to Cluny, he would obey or not.<sup>1</sup> The Cluniac opens *Particula* ii by saying: 'Here I am, ready to receive your promised answer', which is to the effect that the question put by the Cluniac is a crafty one, intended, as was that of the Pharisees to our Lord concerning the tribute-money, to entangle the Cistercian in his talk. He declines to fall into the snare. An affirmative answer would convict him, on his own showing, of infidelity to the Rule,<sup>2</sup> which prescribes 'Christ first', for he would be putting obedience to Christ's Vicar before obedience to Christ; a negative answer would convict him of disrespect to the Holy See. This, he shrewdly anticipates, is how the Cluniac would ensnare him.

*Particula* iii has the appearance of opening with a chance meeting, which furnishes an occasion for the Cluniac to remark sententiously that the opportunity of exercising their minds, of increasing their knowledge and of improving their manners must not be lost; so will they avoid gossip and those idle words which the Rule condemns and excludes (*verba otiosa quae Regula nostra aeterna damnat clausura*).<sup>3</sup>

It may be well to notice how one or two of the principal points at issue in the controversy between Cluniacs and Cistercians are treated in this Dialogue, which takes its place naturally in the story of Benedictine reform. To begin with, we have already remarked that the Cluniac reveals a certain resentful obsession as to what he considers to be the Cistercian violation of one of the three Benedictine promises, and that not the least important, namely, the promise of stability (*stabilitas*).<sup>4</sup> It is on this score that he opens his attack, and it is on this score that he the more frequently renews it. Almost at the end of the Dialogue he casts it in the teeth of his opponent that it is a common proverb that the Grey Monks are always on the move (*griseos monachos semper esse in motu*).<sup>5</sup> The Cistercian can give a good explanation of this, and instances the Annual General Chapters, the Annual Visitations of daughter-houses, and the necessity of buying food. There is little doubt but that the Cluniac has constantly in mind the First Chapter of the Rule which condemns wandering monks (*gyrovagi*), who are always paying visits, first to one monastery and then to another, and are never stable (*nunquam stabiles*), a habit which he quite rightly regards as

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog.* i 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Reg. S. P. Bened.* lxxii. The Cistercian foretells that the Cluniac would in this case counter him with a *Turpe est doctori cum culpa redarguit ipsum*.

<sup>3</sup> 'Verba otiosa . . . aeterna clausura in omnibus locis damnamus' (*ibid.* vi).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. p. 165, *supra*.

<sup>5</sup> *Dialog.* iii 51.

inconsistent with the spirit of stability. He does not hesitate to invoke the greatest of the Cistercians, Bernard of Clairvaux, to his support. This he does early in the Dialogue, as it were by way of entrenching himself strongly. He magnifies the eminence of his authority. 'That abbot, to whom you referred, who in holiness, in learning, and in eloquent wisdom by the exceptional gift of God surpassed bishops and abbots, was the great glory and the most solid pillar of strength of your Order; he it was upon whose support, in virtue of such rich endowments, the Apostolic See was wont to lean. He to no extent derogated from our Order, but rather raised his voice in its praise, even writing a special treatise in commendation of it,<sup>1</sup> and thus leaving to all you Cistercians an example, that you should do the same. Now he dissuaded all those who wished to pass from our Order to yours, on the ground that it was an idle and unnecessary change of life and habit. Every one who, wishing to be his subject, came from our Order to his monastery without letters of commendation he laid hold of and sent back again.' The Cistercian will not allow this. He appeals to Bernard's letters in order to prove that he dealt with each case on its own merits.<sup>2</sup> 'Some, namely those who perseveringly knocked for admission, he received: others, namely those in whom, perchance, he detected by the foresight of his great genius signs of future instability, he sent back to their own abbots.' At the end of his long quotation from the Epistle to the Monks of Flay he sums up: 'There you have it on his own word that he did not refuse and send back again every one who came to him from your Order desiring to be his subject.'<sup>3</sup> At a little later stage the Cistercian reopens the question. His mind seems ill at ease. The Cluniac has just elicited from him the story of the foundation of Cîteaux, which he has briefly told, with the pointed reminder that Molesme was a Cluniac house.<sup>4</sup> He thinks, doubtless, of brethren of his own day fired with the same enthusiasm, and yet stifled by their atmosphere. Them he would set free. They are so far weak that, were it not for the fear of incurring the charge of breaking their vow of stability, they would gladly migrate to better conditions, more profitable to their salvation. Here, at least, it must be allowed, the Dialogue loses its more academic tone. The Cistercian is for the moment full of *verve*.

<sup>1</sup> Note the claim, well founded up to a certain point, that the *Apologia* was written in praise of Cluny.

<sup>2</sup> S. Bern. *Epp.* lxxv *ad Alvisum Ab. Aquiscincti* 3; lxxviii *ad Monachos Flaviacenses* 1 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Dialog.* i 10 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i 52. The details are in the main derived from the two *Exordia*; they are fairly descriptive of the familiar Cistercian life; the *aculeus in fine* is the account given of the use of Tithe. The Cluniac is terrified. 'Why, in our Order we have nothing else that we can call our own!'



He presses the point. He supports himself by reference to a strong statement of St Augustine, quoted by Anselm of Laon<sup>1</sup> in his *Sententiae*; he relies upon the Rule of the holy fathers Serapion, Paphnutius, and the two Macharii. The Cluniac will not accept this latter authority (*Quid ad nos de illa regula?*) 'Well', replies the Cistercian, 'it means much to us: for St Benedict told us that, upon any point as to which he was silent in the Rule, we were to enquire in other books, and especially in the Institutes of these holy fathers', having in mind, of course, the seventy-third, the last, Chapter, 'than which', he adds, 'none can be more rightly and more profitably observed by monasteries, seeing that it tends to promote between them firmly founded peace'.<sup>2</sup> The reference to peace would, naturally enough, be explained by the contentions which, since that day in the year 1119 when Robert de Châtillon left Cîteaux for Cluny,<sup>3</sup> had arisen out of cases of fugitive monks, cases which the *Instituta* of Raynald plainly indicate to have been far from infrequent.<sup>4</sup> It is at this stage that the Cistercian urges, as we have already observed,<sup>5</sup> that both St Basil and St Benedict teach the principle that it is to God, and not to prelates, that obedience is primarily due, with the result that the Cluniac insinuates that the Cistercian view really amounts to the claim on the part of Bernard of superiority in religion for his Order over that of Cluny. 'Yes', replies the Cistercian, 'that is precisely what the Abbot of Clairvaux, whom you adduce as an admirer of your Order, means. Allowing that he praises it, he certainly maintains that it is permissible (*licere*) to pass from it to ours, but not to return to it again, which were to apostatize.'<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt that the Cistercian has in mind here a passage in the *De Praecepto et Dispensatione*, xvi 46 sqq., in which St Bernard writes: 'Perchance some Cluniac wishes to bind himself to Cistercian poverty, preferring the purity (i. e. the strict letter) of the Rule to the Cluniac customs. If he asks my advice, I do not counsel him to do so, unless with the consent of his abbot. Why? In the first place, because of the scandal given to those whom he leaves. Next, because it is unsafe to leave what is certain for what is doubtful; perhaps while he can observe the one, he will fail to observe the other. In the third place, because I am suspicious of levity, whereby often what we readily

<sup>1</sup> Born in or near Laon, he studied under St Anselm at Bec. From 1076 until 1117, the year of his death, he taught at, amongst other places, Paris, where he had William of Champeaux as his pupil. A writer of *Enarrationes* upon most of the Sacred Scriptures, several of which may be found in Migne *P. L.* clxii, he was surnamed *Scholasticus*.

<sup>2</sup> *Dialog.* i 53 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies in St Bernard of Clairvaux* iv 135 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> *Instituta* xi, xvi.

<sup>5</sup> *P.* 167 sq. *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> *Dialog.* i 60.

desire before we have tried it, we will have none of when we have tried it.' However (*ibid.* 49), he would allow that, if a monk's conscience urges him to leave the monastery of his profession for another in order to observe the Rule,<sup>1</sup> then, although St Bernard does not praise him for so doing, he does not advise him to return to his own monastery,<sup>2</sup> provided that his new home is *remotum ignotumque*; and he founds the opinion thus expressed upon the Rule of St Benedict (lxi). It must be allowed that the Cistercian represents St Bernard's view as decidedly laxer than the passage in question warrants him in doing. The Abbot of Clairvaux was keenly alive to the dangers of what in the context he describes as *rupta stabilitas*; the Benedictine editor in a footnote to this phrase gives a list of some twelve of his Epistles which deal with contentions which arose out of it, in addition to the classical instance of Epistle i (addressed to Robert de Châtillon).

We have already noticed that the Cluniac represents a certain exaggerated estimate of the inerrancy of the Pope, which was less on any reasoned dogmatic grounds, than as a matter of policy, characteristic of Cluny. The Dialogue reveals that, equally characteristically, the Cistercians, as may be learnt, not only from St Bernard's treatise *De Consideratione* and from many of his Epistles, but from the long story of his intimate relations with the Holy See, were moderates; they had found that, at any rate from their point of view as plaintiffs at the Papal bar, the Pope, being a man, could be deceived by men, although he could not err from the orbit of the Christian faith. It suited the Cluniacs, as a controversial move, to charge them with denial of his official inerrancy in matters of faith and of morals.<sup>3</sup>

The same problem concerning the interpretation of the Rule, chiefly as the latter bears upon various Cluniac indulgences and relaxations, which we know to have been in debate between Peter the Venerable and St Bernard, may be recognized in the Dialogue. The Cluniac would appeal to the Abbot of Clairvaux<sup>4</sup> in support of the freedom with which his Order is wont to treat mere bodily observances. 'Your Order', he remarks, 'holds fast what the holy father Benedict instituted, namely certain bodily observances (*corporales illas observantias*); our Order does not hold fast what he instituted, but rather what are in accord with what he instituted, that is to say, good customs which accord with the Rule because they accord with the principle upon which

<sup>1</sup> 'Qui inquietus est, et ita credere non potest, sed magis credens et cedens stimulantī conscientiae, exit, et quaerit ubi solvat quod suo in loco suo utique iudicio voverat quidem, sed non solverat.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Sicut non laudo quod egreditur, ita ut regrediatur non consulo.'

<sup>3</sup> P. 168 *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> S. Bern. *De Praecepto et Disp.* ii 5.

St Benedict legislated (*bonos usus qui secundum ipsum, et secundum rei veritatem, non discordant a Regula . . .*). Thus Bernard himself says: *Whatsoever has been devised on grounds of charity may also, when on grounds of charity such a course seems to be profitable, be either entirely set aside or temporarily suspended or changed in favour of something else perhaps more suitable.* To which the Cistercian replies: 'He said that rhetorically, by way of ingratiating concession (*per insinuationem*), or perhaps it is the Abbot of Clairvaux who in this instance is the excellent Homer taken off his guard.'<sup>1</sup> The Cluniac evidently thinks to find, as it were, his charter in this passage from the *De Praecepto et Dispensatione*, for he again quotes it almost at the end of the Dialogue,<sup>2</sup> urging that when Bernard wrote it he intended to support and to strengthen the authority of Cluny, whereas the Cistercian is using it as a means of destroying it. Upon which the Cistercian asks whether, understanding charity to be the end to be considered, as is agreed, an indiscreet and extravagant authority (*magisterium*) ever promotes charity. The Cluniac cannot but say, 'Never; it is opposed to charity for it breaks its bond'. The Cistercian at once takes his advantage, pointing out that St Gregory describes discretion as the primary characteristic of the Rule of St Benedict.<sup>3</sup> The Cluniac feels himself ensnared: 'Now I see the drift of your argument; you would prove that, in the opinion of the Abbot of Clairvaux, these observances of the Rule are immoveably fixed, and cannot be changed at all without sin. But, perchance, the founders of our Order were simple folk who could not reason much; they had nothing but their holy rusticity; it was this which accounted for the changes that they made.'<sup>4</sup> It is a clumsy attempt to get free; for the notion of, say, St Odo as a mere *rusticus* is too delightful. At the very end of the Dialogue the late morning hours of the Cluniacs fall under reproof. They profess to imitate Mary of Bethany by their leisurely abstinence from manual labour; it is a pity that they do not imitate her by early watching. There is here a reminiscence of the passage in *Epistle i ad Robertum* 13, in which St Bernard reproaches Robert with taking his morning sleep at the very hour at which Christ arose from the dead.<sup>5</sup> And with this the Cistercian decides to close the conference. It is a Parthian shaft, as we shall allow. Plainly, throughout the Dialogue the arbitral authority of St Bernard has stood supreme; but it has been characteristic of the Cluniac to appeal to abstract

<sup>1</sup> *Dialog.* iii 6 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* iii 55 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> 'Scripsit monachorum regulam, discretione praecipuam' (S. Greg. *Vita S. Bened.* xxxvi).

<sup>4</sup> 'Sanctam rusticitatem habentes mutaverunt eas pia simplicitate et simplici pietate' (*Dialog.* iii 57).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* iii 59.

statements, whereas the Cistercian has founded himself rather upon concrete instances. In addition to the taunt with which the Dialogue ends, we may notice the quotation again from S. Bernard *Epist.* i 11,<sup>1</sup> with its keen personal edge: 'If salvation (i. e. the state of *salus*) consists in fine clothing and rich banquets, rather than in plain food and modest attire, why do I delay here (at Clairvaux) and not follow you (to Cluny)?' To the Cistercian St Bernard is a revered intimate; to the Cluniac he is but a distinguished stranger.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

### THE CONCLUSION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MARK

THE last twelve verses of the received text of the Gospel according to St Mark are missing in  $\aleph B$ , the old Syriac, codex *a*. Codex *k* gives an alternative ending, which is also included in four later Greek uncial MSS. It is universally agreed, on grounds of attestation, style, and content, that neither the last twelve verses of the received text, nor the alternative ending, have any claim to be part of the original Gospel according to Mark. Mark's book ends for us at v. 8: 'and [the women] came out and fled from the tomb; for trembling and amazement held them; and they said nothing to any man, for they were afraid.' This is a very abrupt conclusion to the Gospel, and many scholars are inclined to conjecture that a further paragraph recounting at the least the appearance of the risen Jesus to the disciples in Galilee, which the angel predicts in v. 7, has disappeared. The primary purpose of this note is to argue that the present text renders it very improbable that the genuine Gospel was ever longer than it now is. The argument is not entirely novel, and the conclusion is in the main that of Wellhausen and E. Meyer. But the argument has not, to my knowledge, been stated quite in the form which it has taken in my own mind.

Before submitting my main point, I will briefly notice the hypotheses which have been framed to account for the supposed incompleteness of the Gospel.

It has been suggested that the author died before completing his work. That, of course, is possible. But that the writer of a comparatively short book like this should have been cut off before writing the last few lines would be a strange coincidence. The chances against it are overwhelming.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* iii 33.