

A R N O L D C F B R E S C I A .

A Thesis in
Church History
for the Degree of
BAHELOR OF DIVINITY

By

Frederick Lewis Weis

United States Naval Academy, Class of
1917.
Meadville Theological School, Class of
1922.

Meadville Theological School
Meadville
Pennsylvania

September 1, 1922.

PREFACE.

A reading of the following thesis will indicate:

- (1). that the author has attempted to portray critically the life, teachings and character of Arnold of Brescia.
- (2). that the author's work frankly represents the organization of the material of the primary and secondary sources upon the life of Arnold - rather than a literary production whose chief merit is originality of expression.

The author has tried to get at the facts - which for the most part come from sources hostile to Arnold. For example,- among the original sources:

- (a). Bernard of Clairvaux is a bitter opponent of Arnold. This is plainly shown by his letter relating to Arnold.
- (b). Otto of Freisingen and Gunther are in their sympathies imperialists - while Arnold is democratic both in religion and politics. Though they are fairer to Arnold than Bernard, they are strongly biased.
- (c). The Historia Pontificalis was written by a personal acquaintance of Arnold - John of Salisbury - and on the whole is a reliable document though not wholly sympathetic with Arnold.
- (d). Gerhoh of Reichersberg cherishes views similar to those of Arnold in regard to the corruption of the Church. His treatment of Arnold, though brief and incidental, is, one feels, much fairer to the real Arnold.

It is necessary, therefore, in sketching the portrait of Arnold, to read between the lines of these sources - if we are to get the facts of the matter.

To the author's knowledge -- this is the first article of any considerable length written in English specifically on the subject of Arnold of Brescia.

F.L.W.

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA : HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

- I. Survey of the one hundred years between 1050 and 1150A.D.
- II. Birth, Childhood, and Education of Arnold of Brescia.
- III. Arnold, A Priest in Brescia.
- IV. Arnold in France.
- V. Arnold in Switzerland.
- VI. Arnold in Viterbo.
- VII. Arnold in Rome.
- VIII. Arnold in the Campagna.
- IX. His Death.
- X. His Character.
- XI. His Writings and Teachings.
- XII. His Disciples.
 - (A). The Arnoldists.
 - (B). Others.
- XIII. Arnold's Place in History.

Sources.

Bibliography.

CHRONOLOGY: 1100-1150.

1098. First Crusade. Council of Clermont.
1099. Paschal II, Pope. Cistercian Order founded by Robert of Molismes.
1100. Godfrey of Bouillon, Christian King of Jerusalem.
Henry I, (Beauclerc), King of England.
William of Champeau teaches at Paris.
Peter Abelard (Nominalist) a rival teacher.
1106. Henry IV, Emperor of Germany, died.
Henry V. succeeds as H.R.E.
Peter de Bruys, reforming preacher. (died 1126).
1108. Louis VI of France.
Tanchelm of Antwerp. (died 1115).
1111. Order of the Praemonstratensians founded.
1115. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux.
1116. Alexius Comnenus persecutes the Bogomiles.
Henry of Lausanne. (died 1145).
1118. Military Order of the Templars founded.
1119. Cathari condemned at Synod at Toulouse.
Calixtus II, Pope.
1122. Concordat at Worms regarding Investitures.
1123. First Lateran Council (Ninth Oecumenical).
1125. Lothar II, H.R.E.
Cathari at Orrieto.
1130. Innocent II, Pope. He invokes secular aid against heresy.
1134. Abelard teaches in Paris. He writes: Sic et Non.
Henry of Lausanne condemned.
1135. Stephen of Blois, King of England.
1137. Louis VII, King of France.
1138. Conrad III, of Hohenstaufen, King of the Romans.
Second Lateran Council (Tenth Oecumenical).
1139. Arnold of Brescia banished from Italy.
1140. Guelph and Ghibelline become watchwords.
1141. Hugh of St. Victor died.
1144. Cathari in Liege.
1145. Eugenius III, Pope. Cathari in Cologne. Eudo de Stella (Brittany).
1147. Second Crusade: preached by Bernard of Clairvaux.
Bernard of Clugny.

Chronology, continued.

- 1151. Peter Lombard, Master of Sentences. (died 1156).
- 1152. Frederick I, Barbarossa, Holy Roman Emperor.
Bernard of Clairvaux: Doctor Mellifluus: dies.
- 1153. Cathari in Artois.
- 1154. Henry II, (Plantagenet), King of England.
Madfian IV, Pope. (Nicholas Breakspear, the only English Pope).
Arnold of Brescia put to death.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

- 1105. Arnold of Brescia, born. (Some say 1095). At best either is uncertain.
- 1115. Arnold went to study in France.
- 1139. Arnold banished from Italy.
- 1140. Arnold and Abelard at the Council of Sens.
- 1141. Under the influence of St. Bernard the Synod of Sens expel/s Arnold from Paris.
- 1143. The Romans reject the temporal power of the Pope.
- 1145. Arnold returns to Rome under the patronage of a papal legate, Cardinal Guido (or Guy).
- 1148. July 15. Pope Eugenius III anathematizes Arnold of Brescia.
- 1155. Arnold of Brescia, put to death, his body burned, and his ashes thrown into the Tiber.

POPES AND EMPERORS, 1100-1150 A.D.

- 1099-1118. Paschal II. (1) Excommunicated Henry IV, who died unabsolved; (2) quarrelled with Henry V; (3) came to agreement on Investitures with Henry I of England. Henry IV (d.1106) Henry V
- 1118-1119. Gelasius II.
- 1118-1121. Gregory VIII (Anti-pope).
- 1119-1124. Calixtus II. (1) Concordat of Worms with Emperor, settling investiture dispute; (2) First Council of the Lateran.
- 1124-1130. Monorious II.
- 1130-1143. Innocent II. (1) Disputed election between him and Anacletus II (Pierleone). In France Innocent II was strongly supported by St. Bernard; (2) the Tenth General Council, Second of the Lateran. Lothar II Conrad III King of the Romans
- 1130-1138. Anacletus II. (Antipope).
- 1138-1143. Victor IV. (Antipope).
1143. Celestine II.
- 1144-1145. Lucius II.
- 1145-1153. B. Eugenius III. A Cistercian monk and a friend of St. Bernard. Dealt wisely with popular seditions in Rome.
1153. Anastasius IV.
- 1154-1159. Hadrian IV. An Englishman; (1) crowned Frederick I; (2) laid Rome under an interdict; (3) Arnold of Brescia executed. Frederick I (Barbarossa)

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

I.

A Survey of the One Hundred Years Between 1050 A.D. and 1150 A.D.

The period of one hundred years between 1050 and 1150 A.D. marks the time when Europe was just beginning to recover from the devastating effects of the barbaric invasions of the Dark Ages. The great kingdoms of Europe which had been in the making were now more stably founded. Especially was this true of England where William the Conqueror (1066-1087) having secured an entrance by means of the battle of Hastings (1066) had succeeded in reducing the population to order by imposing upon the defeated Saxons the feudal system of the continent. As a consequence of the new stock and its accompanying civilization which came over from France in the Conqueror's train a new school of literature was built up in England. Here were, also, two prelates of fame;- the archbishops Lanfranc (1070-1089) and Anselm (1093-1109).

History, too, was being written. William of Malmesbury (1095-1142), Geoffrey of Monmouth (1110-1155), and Henry of Huntindon (fl.1135-1155) while in no sense critical historians, were busy, nevertheless, recording the events of their own and past times, and from their writings we are able to separate from the chaff of their extravagant fancy, much good grain.

2.

From the England of this time, too, came the writer of that invaluable book, the Historia Pontificalis. In John of Salisbury (1110-1180) we have a man who had benefited from an acquaintance with Arnold of Brescia, who had learned to criticize history, perhaps from the fact that he, too, had studied at the feet of Abelard (1079-1142). No scholar of the Middle Ages can compare in brilliance, in ability, in keen understanding of life, and in teaching capacity with this intellectual colossus - Abelard - the friend and perhaps the teacher of Arnold of Brescia.

In regard to the progress of the architecture of the time we find that the majority of the Anglo-Saxon churches of England had been built. Westminster Abbey, indeed, had at the opening of this period just been completed by Edward the Confessor. Then a new school of architects commenced Durham Cathedral in the Anglo-Norman style. Moreover, during this period the celebrated London Bridge was built.

Universities were being founded. Cambridge (1109) is reputed to have originated during this period. In Italy the University of Bologna (1116) started its honorable career. And as for the University of Paris, tho it was only chartered in the year 1200, the teaching of Abelard nearly one hundred years before that time (e.g. (1) 1108 to 1113; (2) 1115-1119; (3) 1135-1140) had given this university such a good name that it was now easily first among all the schools of Europe. Here canon law, civil law, mathematics, and rhetoric with a bit of philosophy in the form largely of dialectics, were the most popular studies. We are studying the period of Scholasticism.

All the literature of this period is of a heroic cast, and, as time softens the fierceness of the Norman temperament, the heroic gives way to the religious. So it is to be expected that a period which starts with the Chanson de Roland and the Troubadour Songs of William of Guienne and the beginnings of the Arthurian Legends will end with the devout productions of the mystic Hugo of St. Victor (1097-1141) and the stirring sermons and poems of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Even secular battle has been transformed into the religious frenzy of the crusades (1095-1099) (1147-1149), after Peter the Hermit (1071-1115) had preached his Children's Crusade. Thru his indomitable valor the siege of Jerusalem had ended in the brilliant capture of the Holy City by the renowned Godfrey of Bouillon. The Knights of St. John, the Knights Templar (1118) and the Teutonic Knights originated at this time. Even the feuds between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines which for more than three centuries were to disrupt Europe had their birth before the end of this century.

But more important than most of the foregoing events both in its devastating results at the time and its consequences for the future, was the struggle between the Bishops of Rome and the Emperors of Germany over the question of the Investitures. In the course of this struggle the monk Hildebrand who had become Bishop of Rome forced the mighty and proud Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, to come bare-footed across the ice and snow of the Alps to Canossa (1076) to crave his spiritual father's pardon and forgiveness. And this was but the opening of a long, bloody and heart-rending strife for the first place in man's kingdom. But in his dealings with Pascalis II.,

4.

Henry V., exchanged the roles of Henry IV. and Gregory VII.; the son of the monarch who had cast himself faint-hearted in the dust before a priest, grasped the Pope with his mailed hand, forced him to bend to his royal majesty, and in a moment attained what Henry IV. in sixty battles had not been able to achieve. (1).

The renunciation of the right of investiture involved the loss of all royal influence in the Church, the greatest power of the world at that time. (2). This is why the State was so loath to part with it.

The feudal inter-course of secular and spiritual powers weighed for centuries upon society, and not until the time of the Reformation did the idea of Pascalis (which in him was due probably only to a naive simplicity) attain a mature and powerful consciousness. (3). But in dealing with Calixtus II., Henry V. found that he was working with a very different kind of man. The half-century old wars over the Investitures came to an end at the Concordat of Worms in 1122. "The victory by the Church was more decisive than the advantage gained by the State, from which a great principle had been wrested, namely the free election of the clergy. The Church, however, no longer enjoyed the secular standing of the bishops as subjects; she installed them in the spiritual office, and the Emperor placed the Church in possession of her feudal principality or lordship." (4).

(1). See Gregorovius, p. 353. (2). Gregorovius, p. 337.
(3). Gregorovius, p. 334.
(4). Gregorovius, p. 397-8. Hallam's Middle Ages. i. c. 7.

5.

The quarrel for investitures had lasted half a century, and, no less destructive than the Thirty Years' War, had ravaged Germany and also Italy, and wasted the flower of the contemporary generation. (5). Thus Henry IV and Gregory VII, as its tragic heroes, and Henry V and Calixtus II, as its happier founders of peace in the ever-memorable war of principles, have attained their conspicuous places in the annals of history. (6).

But while the quarrel over Investitures was in principle settled by the Concordat of Worms the mad race between the Church and the State for the foremost place in the temporal power of the world was by no means ended. With each new Emperor and with each new Pope the case was entirely reopened and they struggled until one or the other gave in. We shall see later that the Emperors definitely rejected the proffered alliance of the Roman Republic, and thus they helped to confirm the temporal power of the Popes. "The essence of the idea of the Mediaeval Empire was the parity and alliance of the civil and ecclesiastical heads of the Christian world, while the essential fact in the constitution of the German monarchy was the temporal power enjoyed by the prelates. No mediaeval emperor could espouse the cause of apostolic poverty without loosening the foundations of his power, and running counter to the orthodox ecclesiastical sentiment of his times. To enter into a quarrel with the Papacy upon the lines suggested by the Roman Senate would have been to open an endless chapter of discord, and to seal up forever the mystic page of the Mediaeval Empire." (7).

(5). Gregorovius, p. 398. (6). Gregorovius, p. 399.
(7). Herbert Fisher: The Mediaeval Empire, 217-220.

6.

Thus it will be seen that as the Empire's greatest vassals were Churchmen, and as the rule of the Church was the best and surest way local good order could be kept for the Empire, and furthermore, as the Church's corporate life practically depended upon her temporal power over her possessions, the puzzles of the Middle Ages was not as simple as it at first might appear to be. How could the Church and the Empire remain on a par with an ambitious Emperor and a worldly Pope each at the other's throat? Arnold of Brescia was one of the first to attempt to solve this riddle. His solution was that the clerics should return to apostolic poverty and should cleave only to their spiritual duties. In all these struggles during his lifetime, Arnold of Brescia was one of the most ardent adversaries of the temporal power of the Popes.

II.

Birth, Childhood, and Education of Arnold of Brescia.

Between two and three decades after the death of the celebrated Hildebrand at Salerno, and, indeed, during the last days of the Emperor Henry IV. of Germany, there was born in the little town of Brescia in northern Italy a young man of good, if not noble, family, by the name of Arnold. What the names of his parents were we do not know. We simply know that sometime between the year 1095 and 1105, and perhaps nearer the latter date than the former, there was born in Brescia this fiery young orator who was marked out to do great things in the history of mankind,- to be, in fact, one of the most ardent adversaries of the temporal power of the Popes.

As is the case even with those we love most dearly - our mothers and fathers - our wives and our children - how many of us could say off hand accurately the town, the year, the day or even the month in which these loved ones were born, - unless perchance we have been favored by the laws of a nation like our own which requires that such things shall be recorded as a part of the doctor's routine work at the birth of each child which comes under his care.

Even then, how seldom parents check up such dates to see that the proper entries have been made! Yet the living personalities of these loved ones are ever with us, whether they are still in the flesh or whether they have fallen asleep.

This is exactly what happened in the case of Jesus. We know enough of his personality to set him apart from all other men. Many of the world's most prized men and women have given their lives - have died on a cross - have been burned to a stake - for this man of whose life they possess but the barest and haziest biographical details.

So in Italy, too, at the beginning of the twelfth century, the many of the world's great knew Arnold personally and loved him - and tho a whole nation revered him, - and tho Rome idolized him and listened to his eloquence with breathless interest - no one saw fit to record the time of his birth.

Hence, as in the case of Jesus and Paul, and many, many others down to our own day, the biographical details of the life of Arnold are not to be had. We cannot turn to the Vital Records of Brescia and indicate by volume, page and column the exact date of Arnold's birth, or for the most part of any other data connected with his life.

But, as we estimate Paul's character and place in history by his few and scattered letters rather than by teams of biographical material about him - and as we judge Lincoln the man by the few words of his immortal Gettysburg speech rather than by the full and minutely detailed histories of his life - so we must weigh the influence and judge the place in history of Arnold - not by a full biographical account of his life but by a few, rare, caustic remarks and slurs upon his character made, not by his friends, but by his most bitter enemies. That after some nine centuries have passed he can

9.

still fascinate us with his daring schemes, his aspiring dreams for the future welfare of his adopted city of Rome, and with his noble character, when all that we know of him is reported to us by his enemies, is, surely, a tribute of the highest kind to his wonderful personality.

To return to the question of his birth - we cannot know even approximately when he was born. We are, however, certain that he was martyred in the year 1155 and we judge him by all that we know of him to have been at that time about fifty years of age. In a general way, therefore, we may say that Arnold was born sometime in the first decade of the twelfth century.

But writers of his time have left us no doubt concerning his birth-place. In a letter to Hermann, the bishop of Constance, after having compared his adversary to a thief, Bernard of Clairvaux adds: "I speak of Arnold of Brescia." (1). (Epist. 195). No less explicit is Otto of Freisingen (de Gest. Frid. II Imp. xxi.) who declares that "this Arnold originally came from Brescia." And again he says: "He was born at Brescia, a city of Italy."

(1). That Brescia was in Lombardy, I quote the following, (after Clavel):

Chronique des Suisses IV.:47:

"L'an du Seigneur 1141, veut Arnould de Bressa en Lombardie." and again, Tschudi (Chron., ann. 1141): "In the year of our Lord 1141, at the time of Pope Innocent, there appeared prematurely in Italy a new doctor, Arnold, who was born in the village of Brescia in Lombardy."

These authorities are cited for no other reason than to indicate that the Brescia from which Arnold came was in Lombardy and not in the Tyrol as some have said.

The poet, Gunther, further confirms this statement, for he said:

.....Arnoldus, quem Brixia protulit ortu
Pestifero.

(Gunther: Ligerinus, III, 345).

Faino (2), a historian of Brescia said of Arnold that he came "of a noble race" while Walter Mapes, an English contemporary of Arnold, says that he came of prominent stock, but we suspect that these statements are made up of nine parts oratory and one part fact. We know absolutely nothing concerning the parentage of Arnold. But we may surmise that Arnold came of good family because of his excellent education and his extensive travels in France and other countries. His easy association with the great personages of many nations would indicate that his parents were people of means and position.

Arnold's early education was undoubtedly acquired at the feet of some good churchman of Brescia where doubtless he distinguished himself in his monastic studies. According to the old abbot Guadagnini at an early age this brilliant lad went with

Il fiore della nobiltà italiana (3)

across the Alps to study in France. Sooner or later he became a student at Paris and we can imagine that he actually listened there to the eloquent words of the greatest scholar of the age, Abelard, whose friend and ally he later became and whose very chair at Ste. Genevieve he later held. (4).

(2). Faino: Brescia illustre nelle principali dignità ecclesiastiche, ms. nella libreria de' Padri dell' Oratorio di S. Filippo Neri de Brescia.

(3). "The flower of the Italian Nobility." Abbe Guadagnini: VITA D'ARNALDO; PARVIA; 1790.

11.

While we know that he studied theology at Paris (5) there is no proof that he was a pupil of Abelard, tho to be sure Otto of Freisingen, a very reliable historian and contemporary of Arnold says that Arnold completed his studies under the direction of Abelard. Arnold was, according to this witness, "a clerk of the church of Brescia where he was ordained a reader, having had for his master Peter Abelard."(6).

It is the opinion of many scholars, however, that Arnold did go to France to study in Paris about the year 1115. (7). If we review the life of Abelard we will recall that he taught there at three different times. As a young man he taught from about the year 1108 to 1113. During this period Abelard was so successful in exposing the faults of his rival William of Champeaux that William's friend the Bishop of Chalons found it convenient to make Paris distasteful to Abelard who thus left Paris to be near Anselm of Laon.

(4). Joseph McCabe: Peter Abelard: passim.

(5). DuBoulay: Histoire de l'Universite de Paris. Vol. II, page 10.

(6). Otto de Freisingen: de Gest. Frid. Imp. II. Cap. xxi.

(7). Some critics think that there is not sufficient evidence of this sojourn of Arnold in France. This residence there is vouched for by Otto of Freisingen. I see no reason why Arnold might not have sojourned in France at this time, even tho Castro, perhaps the most careful student of Arnold's life, doubts as to whether Arnold ever studied under Abelard. But as Vacandard says the fact that Arnold had studied under Abelard in Paris would explain the affection which Arnold later showed the French master, and we could, then, easily understand how it came about that Abelard called Arnold to his side after the Lateran Council of 1139 as St. Bernard intimate that he did.

12.

It was during the 2nd period of Abelard's teaching at Paris (from 1115-1119) that his name became so famous throughout Europe and he had reached the height of his unapproachable success. The education of the scholar of that day was not complete unless he had sat for a time at the feet of the great master. And, thus in the case of Arnold of Brescia it would be, indeed, highly improbable if during his wanderings in France as a scholar he should not have studied dialectics and theology under his companion Abelard. And we shall see later that after Abelard was forced to flee from Paris for the third and last time, Arnold held his friend's chair at Ste. Genevieve, and indeed from the time of his first journey to France onward throughout the remainder of his life, Arnold threw himself with all the energy of a young and ardent disciple into the schemes of the great master Abelard. (8).

(8). The following, among many others, believe Arnold to have been a pupil of Abelard: William Barry, F.A.Christie, Ephraim Emerton, Héféle, Foakes-Jackson, H.C.Lea, Dom John Mabillion, Dana C. Munro, Neander, Newman, Schaff, Schmidt and Trout.

For the most part those historians of this time who do not join with the above try to dodge the issue with the exception of Castro who comes out squarely against it.

To quote Neander: (Note, Vol. E., 203-205):

This connection between Abelard and Arnold has been doubted in these modern times. We allow, an authority so important as that of the abbot of Clairvaux, seems to be against the correctness of this account; for this abbot expresses himself as if he had first made his appearance in a way altogether independent of Abelard, and had not till later, when

banished from Italy he came to France, espoused the cause of that persecuted man. See Bernard in his 189th letter to Pope Innocent, s. 3; Sibilavit apis, quae erat in Francis, api de Italia et venerunt in unum adversus Dominum; and Ep. 195: Execratus a Petro apostolo adhaeserat Petro Abaelardo. We must suppose, then, that Otto of Freisingen had been led by what he had heard concerning the latter connection with Abelard, into the mistake of representing the former as a pupil of the latter. Upon this hypothesis we must suppose that Arnold had been led, only at some later period, by the common interest of opposition in the dominant church-system, to take sides with Abelard. The testimony, however, of Otto of Freisingen, who had himself pursued his studies in France, is of importance; and we are by no means warranted to accuse him of an anachronism in his account of a fact not in itself improbable. The less inward relationship there appears at first glance to have been between the teachings of Abelard and those of Arnold, the less reason have we to call in doubt an account which represents Arnold as having been a pupil of Abelard. The narrative of Gunther which enters into particulars, agrees with the above. How easily might it have escaped the notice of Bernard, however, who would have taken but little interest in the early life of Arnold, that, of the great crowd of young men who flocked to hear Abelard, Arnold was one!

III.

Arnold, - A Priest in Brescia.

In the new artisan and trade class that sprang up thru the intermarriage of the sturdy Lombard stock with the more cultured Italian or Roman stock was formed the people of northern Italy. Of such blood were the inhabitants of Brescia.

While Arnold was yet in France this part of Italy entered into the liberal movement which had begun with the extension of the borders of the Lombard cities as early as the time of the Otto's; and some of the later emperors had even ventured to help fortify some of the cities in their struggles with the growing power of the nobles.

Two consuls and three councils made up the administrative bodies in most of these Lombard towns. The consuls, a judge and a general, were elected annually. There were three councils, namely, - first, the council "de Credenza" which had to do with finances, surveillance over the two consuls, and foreign affairs, - second, the Senate - commonly of 100 members, and, third, - the general assembly. This last, the general assembly of the people, was the sovereign body.

The nobles at first resisted the encroachments of these republican city governments. But finding that they received no sympathy for their complaints - they stopped complaining - had themselves installed in the most important governmental positions and then ruled to suit their fancy - sometimes well - and at other times, not so well.

As the years went by, however, the bishops, being first in rank, both by right of lineage and by right of wealth, -ntook an increasing part in these councils. As a temporal prince the bishop headed the nobles -- as a great proprietor of land he had vassals obliged to defend him and do his bidding -- as a bishop he dealt as he pleased with the souls of all men in his bishopric.

When Arnold returned to his native town, Brescia had had for a long time a municipal constitution (if we are able to believe Malvezzi, the writer who deals with the history of Brescia at this time.)(1). According to Guadagnini, after much fruitless effort, in the first years of the 12th century, being unable to check the birth of the republican government of Brescia Ahrimann, the bishop-legate at Brescia put himself at the head of the republican city government on the express condition that the bishop was always to be the chief and lord of Brescia, to take precedence over the council of Credenza and the two consuls.

As to the historicity of the details of this above statement we cannot be certain for our sources are very general, but we may say, in general, that the outline is correct. As might be expected, the people soon became dissatisfied with the bishop's government and yearned for more power for themselves. During the melee which followed several bishops were deposed. Finally in 1132 Innocent II having come to Brescia

(1). Jacobi Malveccii: Chronicon. Muratori Rer. Ital. script., XIV. Milan, 1729.

deposed Villanus and put in his place his aide, Manfred. (2).

The people attacked the temporal power of the bishop, Manfred, who had placed himself at the head of the aristocratic party and in the carrying out of the Pope's orders was thought by some of the citizens to have used high-handed methods not compatible with those that should be used in a republic. We cannot say (from lack of sources upon the point) whether this charge against Manfred was a just one or not, but at any rate, whether for this reason or for some other a struggle between the aristocratic party and the townsmen came to pass in which Arnold was very clearly on the side of the citizens of Brescia, tho in what capacity he served the republic we do not know.

Not only did the people desire to regain their old control of public matters but some of the good people shuddered at the corruption of the high clergy and demanded that an investigation be made. It must have been about this time (1130-1135) (3) that Arnold returned to Brescia from France tho he may perhaps have been preaching reform in the nearby Lombard towns for a few months before he actually reached his native town. He came home full of enthusiasm for humanity and desiring only to serve his people, his country and his Church. He had by this time become a rigid ascetic as Bernard of Clairvaux describes him, "homo neque manducans neque bibens."

Arnold was not a heretic in religion but he was a pious critical student who could not be held down under the thumb of the ecclesiastics. Abelard inspired critical inde-

(2). MCXXXII. Innocentius papa Brixiam venit, et ejecit Villianum de episcopatu. Cronico Bresciano. V. Landulph., Hist. med., cap. xxx.- Vid. Malvezzi.

pendence in his disciples and naturally enough Arnold with some of the spirit of his master turned to attack the problems of the Scriptures. He asked himself, "Were the Apostles like the Bishops of Rome?"

Arnold read his New Testament critically as he had been taught to read everything by Abelard. Had Abelard not taught Peter de Bruys to do the same? Arnold read in Matthew X. the following verses, being the instructions which Jesus was supposed to have given his disciples as they went forth to preach the gospel:

- 7. And as ye go, preach, saying,
The kingdom of heaven is at hand.
- 8. Heal the sick, cleans the
lepers, raise the dead, cast out
devils: freely ye have received,
freely give.
- 9. Provide neither gold, nor silver,
nor brass in your purses,
- 10. Nor script for your journey,
neither two coats, neither shoes,
nor yet staves: for the workman
is worthy of his meat.

And he decided that this was not the way the Popes and the Bishops lived. The Bishops of Brescia and Milan did not live as vicars of Christ should live. "Freely ye have received - freely give," said Jesus. But the Pope and his Cardinals and the Bishops all required enormous taxes. They don't give freely. They live in the midst of every luxury. They are not barefooted wanderers. They are not disinterested. They are worldlings. They care more for their tithes than for the good of other men. Truly these Popes, Cardinals and Bishops do not live the Apostolic life.

(3). John of Salisbury does not seem to have known of Arnold's sojourn in France after 1136.

18.

The poverty of the Apostles does not rhyme with the luxury, splendor and wealth of the papacy at Rome. Two generations later Francis of Assisi was to ponder over this same question as were also Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon three hundred years later.

Aspiring to a perfect life Arnold entered a convent of canons regular in his native city where he was ordained a priest and was appointed prior or provost of the community.

"He was fitted for this high office by the austerity of his life, his detachment from earthly things, his love for religious discipline, the clearness of his intellect, and an originality and charm of expression that he brought to the service of a lofty ideal." (4). The *Historica Pontificalis* of John of Salisbury speaks of Arnold as canonicus regularis and abbas apud Brixiam which latter phrase Deutsch interprets as a sort of Choir-master, for, he says, "he stood at the head of an establishment of choir-men and as presiding officer of this choir he would have the title of abbot." (5). This may or may not have been true, but at any rate, if we think of Arnold as a priest in the lower orders or a cleric or even a lay reader we cannot be far from his true vocation.

In being thus closely connected with things ecclesiastical he was able to observe critically the manner of life of the church-men of Brescia. The incontinent clergy, living in luxury and debauchery, were no longer, he declared, true ecclesiastics - they were unfit to discharge the priestly

(4). E. Vacandard.

(5). Rough translation from the German.

functions. The corrupt bishops and priests were no longer bishops and priests; the secularized church was no longer the house of God. (6). If the church is to be saved it must renounce altogether any worldly possessions. (7).

Therefore Arnold began to preach: Be emancipated from the interest of wealth. Live the true monastic life. Be as disinterested as you can. To all religion turn with criticism and suspicion if it be of this world. The money collected and possessed by the Church should at least be reduced to tithes. Churchmen should not have great possessions but should copy the example of the apostles and live lives of apostolic poverty. (8). To reduce this to a working theory, Arnold ventured to formulate the following proposition: "Clerics who own property, bishops who hold regalia (tenures by royal grant), and monks who have possessions cannot possibly be saved. All these things belong to the (temporal) prince, who cannot dispose of them except in favor of the laity."(9). As Arnold saw the corruption of the church, therefore, he thought that the wealth of the clergy and the temporal power of the bishops were its most direct causes. "Was it not best, therefore, to take drastic measures at once to strip the monasteries and the bishoprics of their wealth, and transfer it to the laymen? Was this not the surest and quickest way of satisfying the civil authorities, and bringing back the clergy, by poverty, to the practice of evangelical perfection?"

(6). Gerhoh of Reichersberg: *Ut domus Dei taliter ordinata domus Dei non sit vel praesules eorum non sint episcopi, quemadmodum quidam nostro tempore Arnoldus dogmitizare ausus est, plebes a talium episcoporum obedientia dehortatus.*

(7). Otto of Freisingen; *Lig.; Gesta di Federico 774 ff.*

(8). Christie - based upon Otto of Freisingen.

(9). Otto of Freisingen.

Such teachings were hailed by the masses and the lower clergy, but, naturally, not very warmly by the higher clergy. Once Arnold started to voice his opinions regarding the corruption of the clergy and especially against the temporal power of the high dignities of the Church his troubles began which were to last until the Church crowned him with a martyr's death. The world was not yet ready for the teachings of Arnold any more than it had been for those of Henry of Lausanne or of Tanchelm.

That his preaching did inflame the laity we learn from Ligurinus:

Veraque multa quidem, nisi tempora nostra fideles
Respuerat monitus, falsis admixta monebat.

Such was the prodigious effect produced in the minds of the Brescians that when the newly appointed Bishop of Brescia, Manfred, made a journey to Rome in 1137-8 to consult with Pope Innocent as to what should be done about conditions in the surrounding portions of Italy, the people of Brescia rose in revolt during his absence from the city, and together with Arnold they attempted to prevent Manfred on his return, from taking possession of his see or temporal power. Manfred hastened back to Rome to condemn the rebellious prior, and it was determined that his case should come before the approaching synod.

During the Lent (10) of 1139 a Lateran Council (11) solemnly announced the end of the schism between Pope Innocent II and Anaclete (Pierleone) the anti-pope. Anaclete's acts were annulled.(12). The doctrines and acts of Peter de Bruys

(10). April 4, 1139. (Hefele).

(11). The 10th Oecumenical Council and the Second Lateran.

(12). Hefele.

21.

and Arnold of Brescia were condemned at this synod. (13). More than a thousand prelates, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, had come to this council from diverse parts of the Christian world to assist at the Council under the direction of the Pope.(14).

We may be certain that Manfred appeared personally at this Lateran Council against Arnold in 1139. (15). Deutsch declares that Arnold personally appeared to defend himself.

This is perhaps doubtful. The Council, in his absence, found Arnold guilty of being a schismatic and charges were brought against him for heresy. These charges were probably dropped. But Arnold was sentenced as a schismatic to lose his benefice at Brescia, to keep silence, to leave Italy and to remain away during the good pleasure of Innocent. He was to go into exile. Arnold, moreover, is said to have bound himself by an oath to obey this injunction to quit Italy and not to return without the express permission of the Pope. If this was the case (which may very well have been the case) the oath was probably expressed in such terms as to leave Arnold free to interpret it as referring exclusively to the person of Pope Innocent. (16).

(13). Otto of Freisingen: Chr.vii,c.23. Mansii,xxi;523.

Gregorovius Book IV., Part II. page 442-443.

(14). Hefele: Histoire des Conciles. pp. 733-734-735-737.Vol.V.

(15). Ann. Brix., M.G.S.S.XVIII:812; Giesbrecht: Arnold von Brescia.

(16). So thinks Neander. Bernard says (ep.195): Accusatus apud Dominum Papam schismate pessimo, natali solo pulsus est, etiam et abjurare compulsus reversionem, nisi as ipsius apostolici permissionem.

22.

It may be concluded, however, that he was accused of agitative activities but not convicted of any real heresies—since in that case he would hardly have gotten off so easily; for had he really been guilty of propagating false doctrines he would have been as dangerous to the Church elsewhere as in Italy proper.

IV.

Arnold in France.

Otto of Freisingen and Gunther tell us that Arnold fled from Brescia as soon as the tidings came concerning his condemnation by Pope Innocent. He went first by way of the Swiss Alps into Germany where at the town of Terregum he was made a doctor and for a time taught there. But he could not have stayed for very long either here or at Zurich for we soon hear of him in France.

Here he must have lived the life of the wandering scholar as Peter Abelard his master had done and for a time we may picture him wandering afoot through the long provinces of France. As he trudged alone, now and then, a "noble or a wealthy merchant would fly past in his silks and furs, with a body-guard of a dozen stout fellows; or a poor clerk would jog along on his ass, looking anxiously towards each wood or rock that bordered the road ahead. Robbers (frequently in the service of the lord of the land) infested every province. It was safest to don the coarse frieze tunic of the pilgrim, without pockets, sling your little wax tablets and style at your girdle, strap a wallet of bread and herbs and salt on your back, and laugh at the nervous folk who peep out from their coaches over a hedge of pikes and daggers. Few monasteries refused a meal or a rough bed to the wandering scholar. Rarely was any fee exacted for the lesson given." (1). To some

(1). Joseph McCabe: Peter Abelard. (If one reads no other book about this period - by all means read this one!)

such life must Arnold have returned after he left Italy until in the due course of time he must have "directed his steps towards far-famed Paris - beautiful, naughty, brilliant, seductive Paris, even in those days."

Once again in Paris Arnold naturally enough found himself again at the feet of his old master. Abelard, who was by this time 57 or 58 years of age had again attracted great numbers of students to Paris. During the second of his earlier periods of teaching in Paris Crevier and other writers say that he attracted five thousand students to Paris. It was the great throng of students attracted by Peter Abelard that assured the growth of the city, for had it not been for Abelard, there might never have been the present magnificent city of Paris. Scholars, students and even learned doctors came over seas, plains and mountains to hear the great teacher.

"At five or six o'clock each morning the great cathedral bell would ring out the summons to work. From the neighboring houses of the canons, from the cottages of the towns-folk from the taverns and the hospices and the boarding-houses, the stream of the industrious would pour into the inclosure beside the cathedral. The master's beadle, who levied a precarious tax on the mob, would strew the floor of the lecture-hall with straw, according to the season, bring the master's text book, with the notes of the lectures between the lines or on the margin, to the solitary desk, and then retire to the silence of the adjoining street. Sitting on their haunches in the hay, the right knee raised to serve as a desk for the waxed tablets, the scholars would take

notes during the long hours of the lecture (about six or seven), then hurry home, if they were industrious - to commit them to parchment while the light lasted." (2).

"The vigour, the freshness, the charming pertinacity of youth have departed. Yet there is no master in Christendom, young or old, that can restrain the flood of young "barbarians" when Li Mestre reappears in Paris. John of Salisbury was among the crowd. It is from his Metalogicus that we first learn of Abelard's return to the arena, and the renewal of his old triumph. St. Bernard fully confirms this story, after his fashion. Indeed, in one sense, Abelard's triumph was greater than ever, for he gathered a notable group of followers about him on Ste. Genevieve. There was Arnold of Brescia, the scourge of the Italian clergy, the "gad-fly" of the hierarchy. There was Gilbert de la Porree, a dreaded dialectician and rationalistic theologian. There was Hyacinth, the young deacon and noble from Rome, afterwards a power in the Sacred College. There was Berenger, the caustic critic, who gave Bernard many an unpleasant quarter of an hour. There were future bishops and theologians in remarkable numbers." (3).

Feeling that he must sooner or later come to sword's points with Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard decided to take the offensive and to challenge him to a disputation. "Very shortly afterwards Bernard was dismayed to receive a letter from

 (2). Joseph McCabe: Peter Abelard. p. 79.

(3). Ibid., p. 291.

the Archbishop of Sens, in which he was invited to meet the redoubtable dialectician at Sens in a few weeks time, and discuss the right and wrong of their quarrel before the whole spiritual and temporal nobility of France." (4).

At first Bernard refused to accept this challenge, but finally at the very last moment he accepted. It is quite clear, however, that from the first he had planned to accept the challenge - for Migne gives us a letter which Bernard sent out to all the French bishops on whom he could rely for sympathy and support. If Bernard could not meet the great dialectician on his grounds - he, at least, knew a better way to beat both the master and his "esquire" as Bernard calls Arnold of Brescia. Bernard's method was to use a loaded ballot-box. (Even the saints do not use such methods today - it would seem that the pious Bernard did not hesitate if in his opinion the occasion demanded them). "Be not surprised," writes Bernard, "that I summon you so suddenly and with so brief a notice; this is another ruse of our cunning adversary, so that he might meet us unprepared and unarmed." Thus with smooth statements and lies Bernard prejudiced the case in the minds of the official judges with his rhetorical denunciations of Abelard's heresies. (5).

"On the 4th of June, 1141, the cathedral at Sens was filled with one of the strangest throngs that ever gathered within its venerable walls. Church and State and

(4). Joseph McCabe: Peter Abelard, p. 309.

(5). Ibid., passim.

the schools had brought their highest representatives and their motley thousands to witness the thrilling conflict of the two first orators of France. On this Monday morning, the great concourse had streamed into the cathedral, an intense eagerness flashing from the eyes of the majority. The red Mass of the Holy Spirit had been chanted by the clerics, and the clouds of incense still hung about the columns and vaulted roof of the church. King Louis sat expectant and stupid on the royal throne: the count de Nevers and a brilliant group of nobles and knights standing beside and behind him. Opposite them, another gaily apparelled group presented Henry, Archbishop of Sens, with five of his suffragans. Mitred abbots added to the splendor with their flash of jewels. Shaven monks, with the white wool of Citeaux or the black tunic of St. Benedict, mingled with the throngs of canons, clerics, scholastics, wandering masters, ragged, cosmopolitan students, and the citizens of Sens and Paris in their gay holiday attire.

"It was, at first sight, just such an assembly as Abelard had dreamed of when he threw down the gauntlet to the Cistercian. But he must have looked far from happy as he stood in the midst of his small band of followers. As he passed into the cathedral he had noticed Gilbert de la Porree in the crowd, the brilliant master who was to be Bernard's next victim, and he whispered smilingly the line of Horace:

It is thy affair when thy neighbor's house was on fire.

With Abelard were the impetuous young master, Bereger of Poitiers; the stern, ascetic, scornful young Italian, Arnold of Brescia, flashing into the eyes of the prelates the defiance that brought him to the stake fourteen years afterwards; and the young noble, Hyacinth, who afterwards became cardinal.

"Besides these, and a host of admiring non-entities, Abelard almost looked in vain for a friendly face amidst the pressing throng." As Remusat says, "If Bernard had not prepared for the debate, he had made every preparation for the verdict."

All the clergy of Sens as well as the majority of the people in the cathedral were in favor of Bernard. The clergy of "the Church of Sens knows no noveties." And McCabe goes on to say that of the judges proper, Geoffrey, Bishop of Chartres, was almost the only one who could be termed neutral; and even he had become greatly amenable to Bernard's influence.

"In such an assembly the nerve of the boldest speaker might well fail. Bernard had preached during the mass on the importance of true faith. Then when the critical moment came he mounted the pulpit with a copy of the writings of Abelard, and the dense crowd, totally ignorant, most probably, of the previous events, which were known only to the intimate friends of each combatant, held its breath for the opening of the struggle. The frail worn, nervous figure in the flowing, white tunic began to read the indictment, but suddenly Abelard stepped before the judges,

and crying out: "I will not be judged thus like a criminal; I appeal to Rome," turned his back on them and strode out of the cathedral."

Although the bishops afterwards made a show of disputing it, the appeal was quite canonical, and was admitted at Rome. But it was a course which had not entered into the thoughts of the most astute of them, and which completely upset their plans. They could not now touch the person of Abelard. Bernard, indeed, did not deprive the great audience of the discourse he had "not prepared", although it was not quite safe from contradiction. We have it some say, in his later letter to the Pope, a most vehement denunciation and often perversion of Abelard's teaching. He gained an easy victory as far as Sens was concerned. The next day the prelates met together, condemned Abelard's teaching as heretical, and forwarded a report, submitting his person and his works to Rome.

"We know now that the worthy bishops of the council which was to try Abelard had drawn up their verdict over their cups on the preceding day." Bernard had Abelard condemned on the subject of the Trinity by a lot of stupid bishops who were simply there to condemn him without listening to him. (6). The assembly was merely a farce covering an unworthy plot. Abelard, himself, had, that very morning, been secretly informed of this intrigue. This has now been based on incontrovertible evidence. (7). At any rate Bernard

(6). F.A.Christie: Lecture Notes.

(7). McCabe: p. 329.

has never essayed to rebut the charge of procuring a verdict against Abelard on the day before the synod (8) and, McCabe adds "This fully harmonizes with our knowledge of Bernard's earlier and subsequent conduct. It is not ours to inquire how Bernard was consistent with himself and his lofty ideals in acting thus." The bishops regaled themselves with wine to listen to the condemnation of Abelard. In condemning him they said we are afloat, swimming, which is the meaning of the word which they used to condemn him, - condemnaus, namus meaning we are afloat. (9). And this was on the night before his trial was supposed to take place.

Bernard, secluded contemplative though he may have been, knew the Roman papal court (or Curia) well. He hastened home after the performance that morning in the cathedral told his secretary to prepare for a journey to Rome and sat down to write a batch of extremely clever epistles. Thus the battle was won before Abelard had covered many leagues in the direction of Italy. (10).

The gist of Bernard's letters to the Pope was: Do not allow Abelard to come to Rome, but condemn him unheard, on my word. They were of an "unworthy temper, torturous, diplomatic, misleading, and vituperative."

And because Arnold of Brescia stood up for Abelard when nearly every other friend he possessed left him, he, too, was condemned. He earned, by supporting Abelard, the life-long hatred of Bernard of Clairvaux - who, if he disliked a man, would hound him from one corner of the earth to the other. For this reason we have gone with such great detail into the above

31.

denouement. Both Arnold of Brescia and Abelard were condemned unheard. In the case of Arnold, however, the procedure was even more unjust than in the case of Abelard - for charges had been made against Abelard, while Arnold did not even have the opportunity to have a hearing before a bench of prejudiced judges. He was merely condemned because he had had the temerity to stand back of Abelard when nearly every other man had deserted him.

"It was on the 4th of June that Abelard had appealed to Rome. There were no Alpine tunnels in those days, and the journey from Paris to Rome was a most formidable one. Yet Bernard's nervous energy had infused such spirit into the work, and he had chosen so able a messenger that the whole case was ended in less than seven weeks. There cannot have been a moment's hesitation at Rome. On the 16th of July the faithful at Rome gathered at the door of St. Peter's for the solemn reading of the decree of excommunication." The Pope was there, surrounded by his cardinals, and it was announced, with the usual impressive flourishes that Abelard's and Arnold's works were condemned to the flames and their persons to be imprisoned by the ecclesiastical authorities.

(8). McCabe, p. 333.

(9). F.A.Christie: Lecture Notes.

(10). McCabe, p. 334.

From among the letters of Pope Innocent II we glean the following letter: against Arnold and Abelard:

.....Universos quoque erroris sui sectatores et defensores, a fidelium consortio sequestrandos, et excommunicationis vinculo innodandos esse censemus.....(....We think all followers and defenders of errors should be surrendered by the society of the faithful and bound by fetters of excommunication.....).

In a second much shorter letter, the Pope orders that Abelard and Arnold of Brescia be imprisoned in a monastery and that their books be burned.

Ad Samsonem Remensem, Henricum Senonensem, episcopos, et Bernardum a abbatem Claraevallensem. - De Abaelardi et Arnaldi damnatione.

(Anno 1140, Jul. 16.)

INNOCENTIUS episcopus, servus servorum Dei, venerabilibus fratribus SAMSONI Remensi, HENRICO Senonensi archiepiscopis, et charissimo in Christo filio BERNARDO Claraevallis abbati, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Per praesentia scripta fraternitati vestrae manamus quatenus Petrum Abaelardum et Arnaldum de Brixia, perversi dogmatis fabricatores, et Catholicae fidei impugnatores, in religiosis locis, ubi vobis melius visum fuerit, separatim faciatis includi, et libros erroris eorum, ubicunque reperti fuerint, igne comburi.

Data Laterani XVII Kalendas Augusti.

Transcripta ista nolite ostendere cuicumque, donec ipsae litterae in Parisiacensi colloquio, quod prope est, praesentatae fuerint ipsis archiepiscopis. (11-A).

"Rome has not been a model of the humane use of power but she has rarely condemned a man unheard." However, in this instance she did condemn two men unheard. (On the sole authority of Bernard the decree recognized in the teachings of Abelard and Arnold the "pernicious doctrines" which were the already condemned errors of the early heretics of the Church. It was Bernard's skillful use of Arnold's association with Abelard which chiefly impelled the Pope to condemn him even tho he had not even been officially indicted. (11-B).

Thus Innocent replied to Bernard's appeal by sending him back the decree of the condemnation of his antagonist with a private note to the effect that it must not be published until after the approaching synod. (12). It was well for Bernard's cause that he had succeeded in obtaining the decree without delay for he had represented to the Pope that the whole of France supported him in his demand. Indeed in a letter of Bernard's to a certain cardinal we find him defending himself against the charge of "having obtained the decree by improper means (subripere) from the Pope." (13).

While Abelard took refuge with Peter the Venerable, abbot of Clugny, Arnold of Brescia professed moral theology at Paris. As might be expected he was bitter in his denunciation of the whole hierarchical system. He had taken Abelard's late chair, in the chapel of St. Hilary on the slope of Ste. Genevieve, and was sustaining the school until the master should return in triumph from Rome.

Even tho Arnold had little hope of any good being done at Rome and tho personally he rebelled at the whole system of bejewelled prelates he still hoped that his master would overcome Bernard's objections in some manner. His courses were therefore open to the public though John of Sallsbury says that he had few disciples and they were all so needy that they had to beg their daily bread. Sternly ascetic in his life and ideals - St. Bernard scoffingly applies to him the evangelical description of the Baptist: "He ate not, neither did he drink" - he was ever contrasting the luxurious life of the pastors of the Church with the simple ideal of early Christianity.

It would be incorrect to lay too much stress on the condemnation of Abelard and Arnold by Pope Innocent. "All the world knew that Bernard had prudently kept the unexecuted Bull in his pocket, and that Abelard was teaching theology at Clugny, with the Pope's approval a few months after the condemnation." (14).

It has been sarcastically said that the poverty of Arnold's students accorded very well with his teachings. He censured the luxury of bishops and the worldly possessions of monks, and he stigmatized wealth as the real virus that was infecting the Church. (15).

About this time we are told that Arnold described the Abbot of ^{Clairvaux} ~~Clugny~~ as a man "puffed up with glory, and jealous of all those who have won fame in religion or letters, if they were not of his school." Whether Arnold actually did say this or did not say it history would seem to confirm the truth of the statement.

We may perhaps grant that Arnold did say something of this sort about Bernard for the latter denounced Arnold to King Louis VII of France as "the incorrigible schismatic, the sower of discord, the disturber of the peace, the destroyer of Unity." We will recall that about this time there was a conflict between the Papal court and King Louis VII. (16). At first Bernard had taken sides with the Papacy and against the King. Later, however, he came in as mediator and a happy settlement was effected. This quite naturally gave Bernard favor with the King. Being thus under obligation to Bernard, Louis VII was desirous of doing some favor for him, and thus it came about at the instigation of "Saint" Bernard that the "most Christian King drove from the Kingdom of France" him whom Italy had already exiled. (17).

Arnold, compelled to flee, took refuge in Switzerland and fixed his abode at Zurich in the diocese of Constance.

(14). McCabe, p. 388.

(15). Vacandard.

(16). Regarding the conflict between the Papal Court and King Louis VII see Vacandard: *St. Bernard et la royauté française: Romische Quartalschrift*: 1891, p. 353 ff.

(17). The latter part of this statement is correct only if one thinks of Italy in terms of the Pope.

V.

Arnold in Switzerland and Bohemia.

Expelled from France, little Zurich received Arnold, and, four hundred years before the time of Zwingli, acquired a right to the gratitude of all adherents of liberty of thought. Here Arnold found many followers and friends even among the higher nobility.(1), Especially was he popular among the lay nobility - one of whom, the Count de Linzbourg,(2) became his special protector. Thus all went well with the teacher during the years 1142-3 (3), until here, too, the Abbot of Clairvaux - who had continued active in pursuit - found him and required the Metropolitan of Constance (4) to secure the heretic, although in his unctuous letter he was obliged to admit that Arnold was a man of irreproachable life.(5).

The persecuted Arnold found a still more influential protector in Guido, the highly educated cardinal who had formerly been his fellow-student in Paris. This Guido was the Cardinal-Deacon whose stay in the East-Mark of Bohemia and Moravia was so rich in results.(6). As Papal Legate in these parts from 1142 to 1145, Guido extended his protection to the fugitive "in whatsoever part of Germany he might be", until the indefatigable "Saint" who from the rock of Peter kept a watch over heretics, wrote (sometime previous to September

(1). Otto of Freisingen, ii.c.21.: in oppido Alemanniae Turrego officium doctoris assumens, perniciosum dogma aliquot dieb. seminavit. Gregorovius, p.485.

(2). Lecture Notes of F.A.Christie.

(3). Otto., Lig. 312ff., cf. Hausrath 64ff.

(4). Epistle 195. Quoted in our sources.

(5). Epistle 195. Gregorovius, p, 485.

(6). Giesebrecht, p. 16ff.

1143) indignantly to Guido: "Arnold of Brescia, whose speech is honey, but whose teaching is poison, who bears the head of a dove but the sting of a scorpion, whom Brescia drove forth, who is abhorred by Rome, banished by France, denounced by Germany, and whom Italy refuses to receive, is, it is said, with you; take care that he does not injure the respect due to your office; to favor him means opposition to the commands of the Pope and of God." (7). It remains uncertain how long Arnold continued with Guido, but we do know that on the death of Pope Innocent II in 1143 Arnold returned to Italy (having learned of the death of Innocent as Otto of Freisingen says "comperta morte Innocentes" but John of Salisbury in his *Historica Pontificalis* says "post mortem Innocentes" Arnold returned to Italy.). With Guido, however, Arnold had been more secure and if we can judge rightly from the unheaded letter of Bernard to Guido, we may conclude that at least until the time Arnold returned to Italy, he was in the retinue of Guido and was granted intimacy with him:- indeed was made a member of the legate's household and a companion at his table.

(7). Epistle 196. The remark which Otto of Freisingen makes at this point concerning Bernard is that he is credulous and zelotyphus. (*De Gestis.l.c.47*).

VI.

Arnold at Viterbo.

Meanwhile, another Cardinal Guido, a friend of the above mentioned Cardinal Guido and a pupil of Abelard, by birth a Tuscan from Castello, who had no common degree of culture as may be vouched for by the fact that in France he had been given the honorable title of Magister (1), "ascended the sacred chair as Celestine II. on September 26, 1143, only two days after the death of his predecessor; his hurried election being due to the revolution then raging in Rome. His pontificate, however, lasted only three months, and the statement that he died at the Palladium renders it probable that he had been unable to come to any settlement with the Romans, but during a fierce conflict had been obliged to place himself under the protection of the" family of the Frangipani. (2). Celestine died on March 8, 1144.

The successor of Celestine was Lucius II who ascended the Papal throne on March 12, 1144. His short pontificate was most unfortunate and he himself - it is said - fell a victim to the revolution. A blow from a stone, it is supposed, struck the Vicar of Christ to the earth. This was in February 1145.

The successor of the unfortunate Lucius was Bernard, the Abbot of St. Anastasius ad Aquas Salvias. Thus it was that thru his pupil the ideas of the Abbot of Clairvaux obtained possession of the papal chair. As Gregorovius says "Bernard of Pisa had no genius; his own master felt dismayed that, at a time so critical, a simple monk should have been placed on the throne of Christendom."

"The new pope was able to take possession of the Lateran unhindered, but the Senators barred his way to St. Peter's, where his consecration ought to have taken place. They demanded his renunciation of civil power, and the recognition of the republic. Rome stood in arms. The Pope fled on February 17, the third day after his election, to the Sabine fortress of Monticelli, and was followed by the dismayed cardinals. They proceeded to Farfa, where Eugenius III. was consecrated, on February 18, 1145. He took up his abode at Viterbo at Easter and remained there eight months."(3).

It was about this time that Arnold returned to Italy. Apparently Arnold only regarded his obligation of 1139 as meaning that he must keep out of Italy while Pope Innocent II lived. He must have concluded, therefore, that after the death of Innocent there was no reason why he should not return to his native land. Once again in Italy Pope Eugenius granted Arnold permission to remain.

Having been granted permission to remain in Italy it was not long before Arnold was at the feet of good Pope Eugenius asking his pardon for all the charges which were made against him. It was at Viterbo, sometime during this first eight month's stay, that Eugenius III forgave Arnold of Brescia for all his errors of the past and received him into the arms of the Church once more - on the condition that he take the oath of obedience to the church and that he

(1). Gregorovius, p. 486.
 (2). Gregorovius, p. 486.
 (3). Gregorovius, p. 492-3.

accept and carry out the penances imposed upon him - fasting, night-watches, and prayer at all the principal shrines and churches of Rome.

Thus it was that all unknowingly Pope Eugenius III sent Arnold to Rome to start him on a career which should end with constant trouble for the one, and, at a later date, a martyr's death for the other.

We cannot doubt but that the influence of Arnold's friend and protector, Cardinal Guido, upon Pope Eugenius III was the principal cause of Arnold's restoration. As a result of Arnold's pardon the report soon spread that his earlier condemnation was cancelled.

We may well wonder how Arnold could accept the conditions which were laid upon him, especially his promise to be an obedient son of the Church. Did the longing for reconciliation overmaster him for the time? or did he hope for better things from the hierarchy itself? Who shall say! However, that Arnold did assume these obligations we have ~~an~~ reliable testimony - for the Historia Pontificalis informs us that Arnold went to Rome and performed his penances. What is more, he must have kept quiet in Rome, for we hear nothing of him until 1147. Just because Arnold went to Rome and kept quiet there we have no reason to believe that he had renounced his ideals - for the fact that they reasserted themselves at a later date indicates that he had not renounced them.

For the present, then, and, indeed, during the next two years we must leave Arnold quiet in the midst of the great political upheaval which was taking place in Rome. But we may assume that Arnold was watching the results of this revolution and was turning over in his mind just what should be his attitude to it when the proper time should come.

VII.

Arnold at Rome.

When Arnold went to Rome to perform his penances in 1145 it was two years after the Romans had rejected the temporal power of the Pope. The rejection of the temporal power of the Pope had taken place as a result of the quarrel of the Roman nobility with Pope Innocent II just before his death. The burgher class of Rome together with the nobility of the city had quarreled with the Pope respecting Tivoli.

"Little Tivoli, fired by the spirit of liberty and resistance, roused the ire of the Romans;" its bishop had enjoyed privileges which Rome did not possess. To this must be added the fact that the people of Tivoli possessed a tolerably free constitution; they even made war on their neighbors, if such a procedure pleased them. (1). As early as 1139 Tivoli found herself at strife with the Pope and soon afterwards in open revolt against him, and in 1140 she was at war with Rome. (2). We do not know how this war started. Perhaps it was because the Pope desired to place a Roman garrison in Tivoli to curb the aspirations of its people towards civic freedom, as he desired and intended to do in Rome and in all the cities of the ecclesiastical State. (3).

(1). Gregorovius, p. 447.

(2). Gregorovius, p. 449. This is shown by the pacitum concerning (ddo de Poli (Mansi, xxi. 542), the close of which says: Sed quia inter dom. Papam ac Tiburtinos controversia emergerit.

(3). Gregorovius, p. 449.

For a long time the proud Romans were held in check so that even Innocent encouraged the efforts of the Roman soldiers. (4). Enclosed and attacked on every side the Tivolese at length surrendered, not to the Romans, but to the Pope, as they has formerly surrendered to Pope Sylvester II. (5).

(4). See Gregorovius, p. 450. The above statement is borne out by a Bull of Innocent II., dated May 19, in Monte Tiburtino (Jaffe, n. 5853): probably during the second siege. The Chronicle of Sicard (Muratori, vii. 598) says rightly: A. dom. 1142 Innocentius -- Tiburtum obsedit.

(5). "We still possess the instrument of peace, in which the citizens of Tivoli swore to keep faith to St. Peter and to the canonical popes: neither by counsel or deed to aid in depriving the Pope of life, limbs, or freedom; to reveal any evil designs against him; to keep secret the contents of his embassies; to help him in upholding the papacy in Rome, in the town of Tivoli and its domains, the fortress at the Pons Lucanus, the fortress of Vicovaro, St. Polus, Boveranum, Cantalapus, Burdellum, Cicilianum, and other royalties of St. Peter's; lastly to give the country and rectorate of Tivoli into the power of the Pope." Gregorovius, p. 450.

((---Note regarding Pope Lucius II --- see ante page 38 --- Encyclopedia Britannica ::: A single unreliable writer (Godfrey of Viterbo (in J.M.Watterich : Pontif. Roman. Vitae.)) is authority for the statement that Lucius II perished in an attempt to storm the Capitol. He was Pope from the 12th of March 1144 to the 15th of February 1145.))).

Hearing of this treaty by which the Pope had deprived them of a town which they themselves had conquered - naturally enough the Romans were seized with furious indignation. (6). The people of Rome then demanded that Innocent utterly destroy Tivoli. But this the Pope would not do.

As a result of this last refusal on the part of the Pope, Rome was plunged into a fierce civil war. The urban nobles set up a republic, which, under forms ostensibly modelled on antiquity (e.g. patriciate, senatus populusque romanus, &c.), concealed but clumsily a purely oligarchical government. Helpless to quell the tumult by means of threats, entreaties or gold, the Pope died. But in the meantime the indignant Romans hastened to the Capitol, restored the long extinct Senate, appointed a Patrician in place of the City-Prefect dependant upon the Pope, and renewed the war against Tivoli. (7).

"Innocent II., who had spent half of his pontificate in exile, or, like a general, in military expeditions, saw the temporal government of St. Peter shattered; the sceptre of Rome fell from his dying hand; and he passed away on September 24, 1143, the victim of sorrow and excitement, while the hoary Capitol re-echoed to the rejoicings of the republicans." (8).

(6). Gregorovius, p. 451.

(7). Gregorovius, p. 451.

(8). Gregorovius, p. 452.

The unfortunate Popes Celestine and Lucius had both gone down to death in their struggle with this revolutionary party which had proclaimed itself a republic, and at length Eugenius III tried his feeble hand with them only to find himself forced to flee from Rome to Viterbo there to remain in exile for eight months. This was in 1145.

The head of the republic, or the Patricius, selected was none other than Jordan Pierleone, a brother of the anti-pope Anaclete, and the sole member of that famous mediaeval Jewish family who, from ambition or other motives, had selected the popular side. Perhaps the Patricius had counted himself a representative of the Roman King but of that we cannot be certain. But we can be certain that the civic constitution was formed under this same Jordan Pierleone in 1144, and from his installation in that office the senatorial era was reckoned. It was this same civic order that had rendered the peace of Eugenius III so hazardous that he had fled from the city and this same Senate had declared the temporal power of the Popes to be a thing of the past.

Not until Eugenius III with the help of little Tivoli and the Counts of Campagna together with the papal party in the city opened an offensive war against the Romans was he able to reenter the city. Possibly, too, the excommunication with which Eugenius III had threatened the Patricius Jordan had some effect for finally the wearied populace demanded the return of the Pope - whom they determined to recognize. (9).

The Romans then concluded a treaty with the Pope who agreed to recognize their constitution - if they should remove the Patricius and appoint a Prefect who should recognize the supremacy of the Pope. As a result of this treaty shortly before 1145 Eugenius III was able to leave Sutri, and make his entry into the Lateran. (10). Thus for the time both citizens and the papal party were content. Rome was divided into 14 sections. From each section 4 senators were elected annually. This made 56 senators in all. Instead of the Patricius as the head of the government they now had - besides the City-Prefect - a committee of Senators who made up what is called the committee of Consiliatores or Procuratores of the republic. Thus in a true sense it may be said that the Romans governed themselves.

It does honor to the civic energy of the Romans, that, although recognising in principle the supremacy of the Pope, they retained their political autonomy, and Rome henceforward became a self-governing republic, which made war and peace independently of the Pope. (11).

But tho the Pope could make a treaty with the Romans he could not bring them to subjugation. Once again the Senate became aggressive and wished to exert control over the entire Campagna. For one thing they wished to punish Tivoli for its past actions. The Pope allowed the Romans to tear down the walls of Tivoli but he forbade further damage to the city. Even this failed

to satisfy the Romans and at the end of January 1146 Eugenius III once more fled from Rome to ST. Angelo. Later he retired to Sutri and in May 1146 to Viterbo where he stayed until the end of the year; and in March 1147 we find him fleeing to France to seek the protection of King Louis who at that time was preparing for the second crusade. But Rome had not driven Eugenius forth by force of arms. He had left Rome on his own initiative.

In the Papal State - clergy, Senate and petty nobility were all fighting for as large a slice of the territory as they could seize. Meanwhile Jordon Pierleone had returned to his former position as the leader in civic affairs. But the city of Rome was for the time again torn by constant internal civil wars and revolutions.

It must have been sometime in 1147 that Arnold appeared once again in public activity. We may here agree with the author of the *Historia Pontificalis*. He indicates that Arnold had lived in the city in concealment, having returned from Viterbo at about the same time Eugenius III returned from Sutri, having performed his penances and and having thereupon settled down to a quiet life -- perhaps to meditation or the like for a time -- until in 1147 Eugenius had gone to France and left an open field for Arnold to work in. This more accurate account appeals more to the thoughtful reader of the time than does the account of Otto of Freisingen which must be considered unsound when it says that Arnold was active in Rome at the time of the death of Celestine II.

After the Pope's flight, if we may believe the *Historia Pontificalis*, therefore, "he came forward publicly, and, heedless of the oath which he had taken to the Curia, loudly preached his old doctrines to the Romans." The revolution had effected him greatly. "Friends, whom he had either found in the city, or recently made, encouraged him to dedicate his talents to the cause of the people. He acquiesced, filled with the enthusiastic hope of thus accomplishing his ecclesiastical and social ideal in the overthrow of the Dominium Temporale. Nothing could have been more gratifying to Arnold than the establishment of the Roman commune. Should the attempt to deprive the Pope of his civil power succeed, it would entail the fall of all the remaining ecclesiastical States, and Christian society would then approach the democratic conditions of the early unpolitical Church. Arnold's chief work must consequently be to aid in the formation in Rome of a republic founded on civic liberty." (12).

Again, we may conclude that Arnold was exercising no influence in Rome in 1146 from the fact that he was not mentioned in the letter sent by Bernard in the interest of the Pope to Conrad, King of the Romans, (13), and in a similar one to the Romans (14). In 1147, however, he was active in Rome, as we have just said, and where his views in familiar circles are colored by contemporary conditions. He did not hesitate now to attack both Pope and Cardinals.

(12). Gregorovius, p. 503.

(13). Epistle of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Number 244.

(14). Epistle of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Number 243.

He attacked first the Cardinals whose spiritual lives he had for the first time had an opportunity to observe in recent years. He said of the Pope himself that he was "no shepherd of souls, no apostolic man, but a man of blood, who is seeking to maintain his rule by slaughter and fire." He was an incendiary and a murderer, a tyrant over churches and a corrupter of innocence, who fed his body and his treasure-chests on the property of others. Neither obedience nor reverence was due to him. Nor was any toleration to be shown to such as desired to reduce Rome, the Seat of the Empire, the Source of Freedom, the Mistress of the World, to subjection. (15).

We can imagine the tumult such words would be likely to raise in the city of Rome where Popes both good and bad were known to every inhabitant. To add to the popularity of such statements must be reckoned the fact that Arnold spoke to his listeners in the corrupt latin of the vulgar tongue out of which over a century later Dante was destined to create a new literature.

And not only did Arnold speak in public meetings on secular affairs but he also spoke early and late to his religious followers who by this time had a name. They were known as Arnoldists or Lombards. But of them we shall speak later. Suffice it to say here that his doctrine of apostolic poverty and purity of morals won him many friends and followers.

As we have seen Arnold proclaimed that Rome was the Mistress of the World and at the same time he entered into relations of close intimacy with the Roman community. They promised to protect him from any harm that might befall him. With him came many members of the lower clergy, so many in fact that when word came to Pope Eugenius III who at that time was on his return from France he decided that something must at once be done about this matter. Meanwhile Arnold of Brescia took the oath of allegiance to the republic.

In June 1148 Eugenius returned to Italy from France and in July of 1148 Arnold was excommunicated by him at a Synod held at Cremona. On July 15th 1148 Eugenius III wrote to the Roman clergy from Brescia. He said that Arnold was a schismatic and that anyone who followed him would lose his ecclesiastical offices and benefices. (16).

Both Eugenius III and the Senate summoned King Conrad to Rome. Both made use of the same phrase -that Caesar should take that which belonged to Caesar - but by this statement each meant something different. (17). Conrad returned to Italy after his disastrous Crusade by way of Aquileja early in the year 1149 and from there he determined to journey to Rome. During all this time Eugenius was trembling with fear lest Conrad III should agree to a treaty with the Romans which they had repeatedly offered him.

 (16). *Historia Pontificalis*: eunamque excommunicaverat eccl. Rom. et tanquam haeticam praeceperat evitari.

(17). Ep. 244, ad Conradum. Martene vol. ii. 299. Ep. 212.

At the end of the year 1148 Eugenius went to Viterbo, a town with which the Romans were already at war. In the spring of 1149 he ventured into the neighborhood of Rome. At Tusculum he was greeted by Count Ptolemy and King Louis of France who had just returned from the Crusade. Louis saw with astonishment the utter helplessness of the Pope shut up as he was in the gloomy old fortress but rather than succor him he went on to Rome and there performed his pilgrimages to the holy places of the city. During this time he was shown all honor due him by the republic. (18).

Some time later Eugenius with all his mercenaries strove to enter the city - but to no avail - for the republic defended it bravely. But the republic was hard pressed and three times the Senate wrote to Conrad III begging for him to come and help them. The citizens Sixtus, Nicholas, and Guido, now Councillors of the republic, announced that they had banished the Frangipani and Pierleone, and further urged Conrad to take the Roman commune under his protection. (19).

It has been thought that Arnold was the writer of this letter - but such can hardly be the case - for a man of Arnold's scholarship would by all means write a better type of letter than the one following. Of this much we may be certain, however, : the letter does reflect the political views of Arnold of Brescia. The letter follows:

(18). Gregorovius, p. 509. *Historia Pontificalis*, c. 29.

(19). Gregorovius, p. 510. *Wibaldi: Epistle 212*.

(Letter of the Romans to King Conrad. A.D. 1149.).

(THE LETTER IS TOO POOR TO BE ASCRIBED TO ARNOLD.)

(Excell. atque praecl. Urbis et Orbis totius Domino, Conrado Dei grat. Romanor. Regi, semp. Augusto, S.P.Q.R. salutem et Rom. Imp. felicem et inclytam gubernationem.) (From: Otto of Freisingen: De gestis.:i.c.28).

To the illustrious ruler of the city and of the world, Conrad, by the Grace of God, King of the Romans, always Augustus, from the Senate and people of Rome; health and a prosperous and glorious rule over the Roman empire! We have already informed your royal nobility by frequent letters of that which has happened through our means, have told you that we remain faithful to you, and that your crown may increase in splendor is our daily wish. We are, however, surprised that you have not vouchsafed us any answer. Our unanimous endeavor is that we may again restore the empire of the Romans, which God has entrusted to your guidance, to the might that it possessed under Constantine and Justinian, who, empowered by the Roman Senate and people, governed the world. We have, therefore, by the help of God, restored the Senate, and defeated many enemies of your imperial rule, in order that what belonged to Caesar should be yours. We have laid a solid foundation. We are security for justice and peace to all such as shall desire them. We have conquered the fortressess of the civic nobility, who, supported by Sicily and Pope Eugenius, hoped to defy you, and have either held these towns for you or have destroyed them. We are,

therefore, harried on every side by the Pope, the Frangipani, the sons of Pierleone (with the exception of Jordan our standard-bearer), by Ptolemy, and by many others. They desire to prevent our crowning you Emperor. Meanwhile we suffer much hardship out of love to you, since there is nothing too hard for those who love, and you will give us the recompense due from a father, and merited punishment to the enemies of the Empire. Shut your ears to the slanderers of the Senate; they will rejoice at our discord, in order to ruin you and us. Remember how much harm the papal court and these our former fellow-citizens have caused your predecessors, and how, with Sicilian aid, they have sought to do still further harm to the city. Nevertheless, with Christ's help we hold out manfully for you, and we have already driven several of the empire's worst enemies out of the city. Hasten to our aid with imperial power; the city is at your command. You can dwell in Rome, the Capitol of the world, and, more absolute than any of your predecessors, after every obstacle is removed, can rule over the whole of Italy and the German empire. We entreat you do not delay. Deign to assure your willing servants of your well-being by letters and messengers. We are now actively occupied in restoring the Milvian Bridge, which to the misfortune of the emperors has long been destroyed, and we soon hope to complete it with strong masonry. Your army will, therefore, be able to cross it, and to surround S. Angelo, where the Pierleoni, according to arrangement with Sicily and the Pope,

54.

meditate your ruin.

Rex valeat, quidquid cupit obtineat super hostes,
Imperium teneat, Romae sedeat, regat orbem,
Princeps terrarum, ceu fecit Justinianus.
Caesaris accipiat Caesar quae sunt, sua Praesul,
Ut Christus jussit, Petro solvente tributum.

(Strong be the King, let him get whatever he desires
over his foes.

Let him keep his sovereignty, let him sit at Rome, let him
rule the world as Prince, as did Justinian. *

What is Caesar's let Caesar receive, let the leader have his own
As Christ commanded when Peter paid the tribute money.)

Finally we entreat you to accord our envoys a
good reception and to put confidence in them, since
we cannot write all that we would. They are nobleman;
the Senator Guido, James, son of Sixtus, the Procurator
and Nicholas, their companion.

((((The envoys mentioned above are called nobilis viri,
which means actual nobles. The barbarous hexameters well
express the programme of the Romans. This letter is too
poorly written to be ascribed to Arnold of Brescia.))))

How true are the words of Gregorovius! "The magic influence exercised by the traditions of the ancient Roman empire is a curious phenomenon in the history of the Middle Ages. A single great recollection became a political power; the Roman emperors on the throne of Germany; the Roman popes on the chair of Peter, the Roman senators on the ruins of the Capitol, all dreamed of their legitimate right to the sovereignty of the world."

Conrad, however, was too busy with his war with Guelf VI. in Germany to care much about conditions in Rome. Conrad's secretary, the Abbot Wibald of Stablo and Corvey, was too clever to allow the many friends of Roman freedom to draw Conrad to their point of view. Thus it was that towards the end of the year 1149 the sorely beset Romans had to allow the Pope to return to Rome. It was not long, however, before the Pope was once again driven into exile and in June, 1150, we find him in Latium. For the next three years the papal court wandered through the Campagna, close to Rome, and yet in exile. (20). During all this time Eugenius III received numerous assurances from Wibald that Conrad would not support the Romans.

After having defeated Guelf VI. in 1150, Conrad decided to go to Rome to straighten matters out in that city, and, at two imperial diets, in 1152, his journey was resolved on.

(20). Gregorovius, p. 516.

Conrad's envoys treated with both Pope and Romans. Eugenius was more foxy than the Romans, however, for he went to meet Conrad at Segni in January 1152 and at that time came to an understanding with him. Fortunately for the Roman popluace, in the midst of his preparations, Conrad died, February 15, 1152. He was succeeded by his nephew Frederick, the immortal hero, Barbarossa, who ascended the German throne on March 5, 1152.

Again, both Pope Eugenius III and the Roman Senate hastened to secure the support of the new King of the Romans. The royal envoys were received by the Pope alone. To them, Eugenius intimated that Arnold and his partisans were conspiring to elect another emperor and to make the empire Roman in fact as well as in name. As the papal favor seemed necessary to him to secure his coveted coronation and recognition, Frederick cast his fortunes with the Pope: swore to subdue for him the rebellious city and regain for him the territory of which he had been deprived; while Eugenius on his side, promised to crown him when he should invade Italy, and to use the artillery of excommunication for the abasement of Frederick's enemies. (21). This was all done at Constance in the spring of 1153 through the instrumentality of the Cardinal-legates Gregory and Bernard.

Let us quote at some length a letter which one of Arnold's followers addressed to Frederick at this time. It follows:

 (21). H.C.Lea: History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages, p.73f.

"I rejoice that you have been elected king by your people, but I regret that you follow the counsel of your priests, through whose teachings things divine and human have become confused, and that you did not consult the sacred city, the Mistress of the World, the Creator of all Emperors."

Following Gregorovius we learn further that the writer deplores that Frederick, like his predecessors, had determined to receive the imperial crown from the hands of false and heretical monks, whom he called Julianists. He proves to him, from the precepts of St. Peter and Jerome, that the clergy had nothing to do with secular rights. He derided the Donation of Constantine as an absurd fable, which old wives laughed to scorn; he showed how the imperium and every magisterial office was an emanation from the majesty of the Roman people, to whom thereafter alone belonged the right of creating him emperor. The writer finally required him to send envoys and lawyers to Rome, in order to place the empire on a legal foundation in accordance with the law of Justinian, and to prevent a revolution. (22).

As we have seen while negotiations were going on between Frederick and the Pope a violent revolution broke out in Rome. Since the Pope had not treated the Senate fairly, Arnold and his party demanded that the treaties with him be annulled and that instead there should be annually elected a Senate of one hundred members and two Consuls. These were the tumults of the people, of which we have spoken, which Eugenius interpreted to Frederick as the plottings of

the populace to elect a new emperor among themselves. This we learn from the following letter which Eugenius sent to the Abbot Wibald.

"We notify of what a rustic gang at the instigation of the heretic Arnold and without the knowledge of the nobles and the better classes recently attempted in the city. For about two thousand were secretly bound by oath and next November First they plan to create one hundred Senators and two Consuls, one moreover whom they wish to call Emperor." (23).

In the autumn Eugenius left Segni and at the end of the year 1152 he again entered Rome. Arnold's party was overthrown. Even the moderates had to come to terms. Once again the Senate was by the deceit of Eugenius rendered impotent and the exiled nobles returned to the city. Two of their number who were in papal favor were made Consuls. We hear of a glowing account of Eugenius' triumph over the Arnoldists and the democrats but at the same time we remember that the Pope has not entirely subjugated the Roman Senate and the republic, since Arnold, the Pope's most hated opponent, remained with many followers, in the city. (24).

Eugenius III died at Tivoli on July 8, 1153.

This "unassuming but astute pupil of St. Bernard had

 (22). Epistle 384 in Martene II.

(23). Wibald. Ep. 383, dat. Signiae XII. Kal. Oct.: notificamus quae faciente Arnaldo haeretico rusticana quaedam turba absque nobilium et majorum scientia nuper est in Urbe molita. Circiter enim duo millia -- sunt secretius conjurati, et in proximis Kalendis Novembris centum senatores -- et duos consules -- unum autem, quem volunt Imperatorem dicere, creare disponunt.

(24). Gregorovius, p. 523.

always continued to wear the coarse habit of Clairvaux beneath the purple; the stoic virtues of monasticism accompanied him through his stormy career, and invested him with that power of passive resistance which has always remained the most effectual weapon of the popes." (25).

Following Eugenius III an aged Roman Cardinal, Conrad by name, became Pope as Anastasius IV on July 12, 1153. He was unanimously elected and to all intents and purposes kept on good terms with the Senate. After an uneventful and peaceful reign he died in Rome on December 3, 1154.

Then a new force came to the papal throne, in the person of an Englishman, Nicholas Breakspeare, - "a peasant born, rude and bluff, who by sheer ability and pluck, fought his way to that supreme eminence, where he sat for five years as Adrian IV." he was a man of high character, of industry and of unusually great energy. As a begger lad he had forsaken his native land and crossed over into France, where, in time, he came to be prior of St. Rufus near Arles. In this capacity he went to Rome where he attracted the attention of Eugenius III who - impressed with the remarkable eloquence, culture, ability and personality of the young man - at once, in 1146, made him Cardinal-Bishop of Albano. Later Eugenius gave him an opportunity to prove his metal by making him papal legate to Norway where he set up the new archbishopric of Trondhjem. So it came about in due time that this very Nicholas Breakspeare came to the papal throne - the only Englishman who has ever achieved that dignity, - as Adrian IV. on December 5, 1154.

That he felt fully the responsibility of his office may be gathered from his declaration that the Pope's tiara was splendid because it burned like fire.

Adrian IV used a firmer hand in his dealing with the Roman commune than his predecessors. He was refused recognition by the Senate - but he was rather pleased that such should be the case - for he was now able to refuse recognition to that body. He at once determined to be master in Rome - the constitution should be abolished - and if necessary Frederick's arms should bring about this result.

Almost the first thing which Adrian did as Pope was to demand the expulsion of Arnold from the city. This "most dangerous of all heretics, protected by the Senate and idolised by the populace, was able to preach his doctrines for years in the very face of the popes. With the overthrow of this one demagogue, Adrian hoped to bury the republic, and the Romans, who had little to expect from Frederick, turned in secret to William I., who had succeeded his celebrated father Roger on the throne of Sicily in February 1154, and had immediately quarrelled with the Pope. It is possible that he may have been invited to invade the State of the Church before the German king came to Rome."(26).

It was amidst a succession of street fights that Adrian began his pontificate. In one of these brawls between the people and the hated priests - a

61.

cardinal, Guy the Titular Cardinal of St. Pudencienne, on his way to visit the Pope was stabbed and slain in the Via Sacra. Adrian IV, to the amazement of all Christendom, quickly seized the opportunity to lay Rome under an interdict, - giving as his reason for so doing that the death of a cardinal under such circumstances was an offense against the majesty of the Church. This interdict he laid upon the city shortly before Palm Sunday, 1155. "Not even when personally maltreated by the Romans had any pope ever before employed this - the most terrible of all weapons - against the city....In order to compel the people to banish Arnold, he laid Rome under a curse." This meant no sacraments, no baptism for children, no penance, no extreme unction, no Christian burial for the dead. Marriages only received the benediction in the churchyard. "Never had human ingenuity devised so bloodless, yet so terrible, an instrument of force; nor in a superstitious age could any have proved more efficacious in reducing great princes to submission, a word pronounced by a priest having power to stir their subjects to revolt."

The Romans at first bore the interdict with defiant contempt; but the pious and the weak, the women and priests, overcame the defiance when it began to look as if mass would not be celebrated on Easter. And we may believe that the decreased gains of the shopkeepers and citizens - who were to a large extent dependent for their livelihood upon the purchases of pilgrims - had a very great influence upon the people - for a pilgrim could not visit a city under the Pope's ban: and here

it was almost Easter-time when thousands of pilgrims from all the four corners of Christendom were expected to attend the Pope's Easter mass, but who would be prevented from witnessing this mass because the Pope had laid Rome under a curse.

Thus it was that on Wednesday of Holy Week the people rose in an uproar, the Senators were compelled to throw themselves at the feet of the Pope and implore for mercy. As a result of their submission the Pope demanded that Arnold of Brescia be driven from the city. "The unfortunate reformer suffered the fate of all prophets; the people whom he had so long held spellbound surrendered him. After having dedicated his talents for nine years to civic freedom, he fled from Rome." Thus forced to flee from Rome he wandered from friend to friend, from fortress to fortress, an outlaw seeking only to reach some republic of Central Italy where he would be beyond the reach of the papal arm. On Wednesday (March 23) Adrian removed the interdict; the moral darkness vanished from Rome and for the first time the Pope was conducted in festal procession to the Lateran.

By losing Arnold, however, the republic had lost its leader, and the fate of both the republic and of Arnold himself was decided by this banishment.

VIII.

Arnold in the Campagna.

Banished from Rome - forced to wander from friend to friend and from fortress to fortress - Arnold had succeeded in getting part way across Tuscany only to fall into the hands of Oddo, Cardinal-Deacon of St. Nicholas in carcere Tulliano at Bricola in the Creia Valley. But the Viscounts of Campagnatico set him free again and he found a refuge with them at their fortress where they honored him "as a prophet." (1).

William I., the new king of Sicily, afflicted the Church with war, devastated the Campagna, laid siege to Benevento, and burnt Ceprano and other fortresses in Latium, and threatened to march on Rome. In his despair, Adrain renewed with Frederick the treaty of Constance, and went out towards Nepi to meet him. But as the German king approached and Rome remained quiet, William retreated from Frosione to Aquino, after having committed fearful devastation. (2).

Tuscans, Pisans, the Apulian exiles, and the Emperor Emmanuel were now ready to join Frederick against the Normans. As Frederick approached by the Via Toscana the Pope did not know whether to rejoice over his deliverance from William of Sicily or to tremble in uncertainty before the terrible and war-like Frederick. In order to find out how Frederick was disposed toward him

(1). Odorici 4:281. Giesebrechte p.28.

(2). Gregorovius p. 529.

Adrian sent three Cardinals ahead to meet the King at San Quirico in Tuscany to demand that the heretic Arnold of Brescia be secured and surrendered to the Pope.

Wishing to remove any obstacle that stood in the way of his coronation Frederick did not hesitate to send his troops to the fortress of one of the Counts of Campagnatico to arrest him and compell him to surrender Arnold, who had remained under his protection. Thus it was that Arnold was delivered into the hands of the papal legates to be once more thrown upon the mercy of the Church.

All this happened in June 1155 when Adrian, the Prefect Peter, and Oddo Frangipane, and other nobles of the papal court were at Viterbo. Soon after this, Adrian, still suspicious, moved from Viterbo to Civita Castellana at which place he finally was convinced of the Emperor's friendliness by his swearing again to fulfil the treaty of Constance.

Encamped at Campo Grasso near Sutri the German King awaited the arrival of the Pope from Nepi. When the Pope rode up to the royal tent on June 9th. within sight of the army the good understanding was almost destroyed when Frederick refused to hold the bridle of the Pope's horse to assist him to dismount and the alliance was only renewed by Frederick's submission on the following day, which was rendered necessary by the sudden enmity of the Romans to Frederick and Adrian alike.

The Romans, moreover, insisted on being heard. From Otto of Freisingen we learn the gist of the speeches made by the Roman envoys. "We ambassadors of the city," they said, "not insignificant men of Rome, are sent by the Roman people and the Senate to thy Excellency. Benevolently hear what the illustrious mistress of the world, whose sovereign thou, with God's help, wilt soon be, offers thee. Dost thou come in peace, I rejoice. Thou desirest the empire of the world, and I gladly rise to hasten forward with the crown. Why should's't thou not approach thy people in peace and mercy, thy people, who, striving to throw off the unworthy yoke of the priests, have awaited thy coming so long and so anxiously. May the splendor of ancient times, the freedom of the illustrious city, return. May Rome under such an Emperor again seize the reigns of supremacy over the rebellious world, and may her ruler with the name also unite the glory of Augustus. Thou knowest that, through the wisdom of her Senate and the bravery of her **knighthood**, Rome has stretched forth her arm with might from sea to sea, to the ends of the world -- yea, even to the **isles** beyond the confines of the earth. Neither the waves of the ocean nor the **inaccessible** Alps could protect nations; Roman valor has overcome all. But unfortunately (thus her own guilt has avenged itself) that glorious princely nobility of our olden times (I speak of the Senate), has vanished from us, has degenerated into unwarlike indolence, and like the decline of wisdom, power has also decayed. Then I arose; to restore thy glory and that of the divine republic, I revived Senate and knightly **order**, that by the

counsels of the former and the weapons of the latter the ancient majesty might return to the Roman empire and to thee. Shall this not rejoice thy Highness? Does not a work so glorious and so advantageous to thy dignity seem deserving of recompense? Then listen, O Prince, with kindly patience to what I have to say concerning thy duty and mine, but chiefly thine rather than mine. For "from Zeus is the beginning!" Thou wast my guest; I have now made thee a citizen. What was mine by right I have given thee. Thou art, therefore, pledged first of all to uphold my good customs and swear to the laws, ratified by thy predecessors, so that they may not be injured by the fury of the barbarian. Thou shalt pay 5000 pounds to my officials, whose duty it is to proclaim thee on the Capitol; thou shalt avert every injury from the republic at the cost of thy blood, and thou shalt confirm this by oath and documents."

At this point Frederick interrupted this pompous oratory. Only his sense of the dignity of the ancient city of Rome prompted him to answer these men. But he did answer them.

"I have heard much," he said, "of the valor, still more of the sagacity of the Romans. I am therefore surprised that your speech should be inflated by such foolish arrogance and be so destitute of all reason. Thou holdest up before me the nobility of thy ancient city, thou exaltest the past of thy republic to the stars. I grant it and with thy historian I say "virtue once dwelt in this republic."

.... It is known thruout the world how the flower of thy nobility has been transplanted from this our city to Byzantium, and how for a long time the degenerate Greek has drained thy precious life-blood. Then came the Frank, whose noble deeds belied not his name, and deprived thee of even the last remains of nobility and independence. Wilt thou know where the ancient glory of thy Rome, the dignified severity of the Senate, the valient chastity of knighthood, the tactics of the camp and invincible military courage have gone? All are now found among us Germans; all have been transmitted to us with the empire. With us are thy Consuls, with us thy Senate; thy legions are here. Thou owest thy preservation to the wisdom of the Franks and the sword of their chivalry. History can tell whether our illustrious forefathers Charles and Otto, received the city by the grace of anyone, or whether they wrested it by the sword, with the remainder of Italy, from the Greeks and the Lombards and then incorporated it with the Frankish kingdom. This is witnessed by thy tyrants, Desiderius and Berengar; they died old and grey in Frankish chains, and our country still preserves their ashes. But thou sayest the new emperors are summoned by thee. It is true. But why? Thou wast oppressed by enemies, and by thy own strength thou could not deliver thyself from the effeminate Greek. Thou didst then entreat the aid of the Frank; misery summoned fortune, impotence power, anguish self-conscious strength. Thus summoned, I came.

Thy ruler was my vassal, thou thyself art still my subject, I am the rightful owner. Who dares to snatch his club from Hercules? Perhaps the Sicilian on whom thou placest thy hopes? Let the past teach him, for the arm of the German is not yet disabled. Thou demandest from me a threefold oath. Listen. Either thy demand is just, or otherwise. Is it unjust? Thou oughtest not to make it, nor I to consent. Is it just? I acknowledge an obligation assumed of my own free will. It is therefore unnecessary to confirm it by an oath. How should I violate the law with thee, when I have to preserve it for the most insignificant? Wherefore should I not defend the seat of my empire whose boundaries I am determined to restore?,.... Finally thou demandest a sworn promise to pay money. Is Rome not ashamed to traffic with her Emperor as with a usurer? Are we to be compelled to give whatever is asked of us instead of being a dispenser of favor? The fulfilment of due services is expected from lesser men, but the great repay as a favor only what has been merited. Why should I withhold from thy citizens the customs inherited from my illustrious forefathers? No. My entrance shall be a festival for the city; but to those who unjustly demand what is unjust, I will justly refuse all."

Both of these speeches are reported to us by the pen of Otto of Freisingen. Doubtless the phraseology is that of Otto but without doubt the substance of these speeches is in keeping with what was actually said on that eventful day.

"The folly of the Romans in addressing so powerful a ruler in this pompous manner corresponded to their lofty ideas concerning the majesty of the Eternal City, which, by the institution of a Senate, they hoped to invest with a new life. But had any man of enlightenment superior to the level of his age been found within the imperial tent, he would have laughed at Frederick, who shared with the Senators the fantastic ideas of the legitimate authority of the Roman emperors over the world." (3).

The Roman envoys rode back in anger. The only reception which the Emperor could now expect from the citizens of Rome was a barred gateway to the city. The Pope, who understood the situation in the city, advised Frederick to occupy the Leonine city with picked men who would be admitted by the papal adherents. A thousand horsemen were, therefore, sent and occupied the Leonina without opposition on the dawn of June 18th. 1155.

On the same day Adrian and almost secretly, for fear of the Romans, crowned Frederick Emperor in St. Peter's. On hearing the shouts of acclaim which went up from the German army when the coronation was finished the Romans rushed to arms and tried to cross the bridges of the city which the German troops held. Frederick could only hold his ground by hard fighting, and soon lack of provisions forced him to flee from Rome, taking the Pope with him.

70.

The fierce heat of the Italian summer had already decimated Frederick's **little** army, and he now resolved to recross the Alps, leaving Adraⁿ to his fate. (4).

(3). Gregorovius p. 538.

(4). Gregorovius p. 538-539. Tout: Empire and Papacy, p. 249.
Fisher: The Mediaeval Empire. Vol. II. p. 220.
Frid. imp., Ep. 3. "De ponte Tyberino prosiluerunt et in monasterio Scti. Petri duobus servis nostris occisis et cardinalibus spoliatis papam capere intendebant."

IX.

The Death of Arnold of Brescia.

We do not know with certainty all the details of the obscure death of Arnold of Brescia. It is probable, however, that his execution took place somewhere in the neighborhood of Soracte, near Rome, at about the time the Pope and his Cardinals retreated in the train of the newly crowned Emperor who sought to escape from the wrath of the citizens of Rome.

We will remember that upon his surrender by the Viscounts of Campagnatico to the Emperor Frederick he was handed over to the legates of the Pope. They brought him before a spiritual tribunal, the papal Curia, where he was condemned and handed over to the City Prefect to be executed as a heretic and a rebel.

Undoubtedly his death had the Emperor's sanction as well as that of the Pope. Of what importance to them was the life of a single heretic? We may surmise, therefore, that the City Prefect, who with his powerful family, owned large estates in the country round about Viterbo which had suffered severe injuries at the hands of the Roman commune, was not adverse to use this opportunity to relieve himself of the feeling of bitter indignation which he cherished against Arnold. According to the story recorded by Gerhoh of Reichersberg, Arnold was secretly removed from the ecclesiastical prison and put to death by the servants of the Prefect of Rome. But Gerhoh is dubious about this

story himself and is inclined to think that the papal Curia had a larger share in Arnold's condemnation than reflected to the credit of the Church. One annalsit goes so far as to say that the Pope personally ordered him to be hanged,

According to the author of a poem lately discovered (and he seems to be well informed), Arnold when brought in sight of the gallows faced death courageously. When urged to recant his teachings, he answered that he had nothing to withdraw; he asserted that his teaching was just and salutary, and that he was ready to suffer death for his principles. He only asked for a brief respite to pray and beg Christ's pardon for his sins. He knelt with uplifted hands, prayed to heaven and commended his soul to God. Even the executioner himself was moved to pity. After his short mental prayer he gave himself up to the executioner and offered his head to the noose. After hanging from the gallows for a short time, his body was burned, and the ashes thrown into the Tiber, "for fear," says one chronicler, "lest the people might collect them and honor them as the ashes of a martyr."

Thus ignominiously perished the reformer and patriot, Arnold of Brescia: his chief offense being that he was born a thousand years ahead of his time!

X.

The Character of Arnold of Brescia.

The character of few men in the annals of the human race has been so disfigured by the partiality of historians - for we must remember that it is from his most bitter enemies that we receive all our knowledge of this inspired leader and martyr. To see Arnold in his true light we must read between the lines of these prejudiced narratives. Yet even Bernard of Clairvaux, while comparing Arnold to anti-christ, admits his charm of manner and his engaging personality. Bernard affirms that Arnold's life is pure and austere and that he is gifted with a rare persuasive eloquence.

Arnold was a bold, ardent, forceful man. He was a man of restless activity, combining a zealous enthusiasm for humanity with a clearness of insight given to but very few of his contemporaries. He was a true leader and inspirer of men: albeit too democratic to be a dictator and too much of a critic and scholar to be a mere agitator. He was not - as Otto of Freisingen said he was - to be classed among those ingenia ad fabricandas haereses scismatumque perturbationes prona (natures - i.e. talents - inclines to the framing of heresies and disorders of church divisions) (1) for it was the teaching of Arnold rather than his inner nature that caused him to break with many of the customary standards of his time. Yet we cannot deny entirely that Arnold was a

(1). Mon. Ger. hist. Scriptorum. Vol. xx. pp. 403, 537, 538.

schismatic - for his progressive and constructive teachings left no other way open to his followers than to break with the old. But if he was a revolutionary - he was the same sort of a revolutionary that Jesus was.

His conquest over souls was so rapid that the envious Bernard tells us that "his teeth are arms and arrows, and his tongue a sharp sword."

Perhaps no better way of depicting the character of Arnold could be selected than to compare him with his great master - Peter Abelard. "Abelard was a philosopher, Arnold a politician; Abelard, a speculative thinker, Arnold, a practical preacher; Abelard a rationalist, Arnold, an enthusiast. The former undermined the traditional orthodoxy, the latter attacked the morals of the clergy and the temporal power of the Church. Arnold was far below Abelard in intellectual endowment, but far more dangerous in the practical drift of his teaching, which tended to pauperize the Church and to revolutionize society." (2).

Noble by birth - Arnold was also noble by nature. His very virtues brought him trial and suffering. He was too scrupulous to come to a natural end. His fine, keen, critical, far-sighted intellect led him to see clearly into the history of the Church and the meaning of the scriptures and made him far too critical to accept unreservedly the authority of the Pope. He was too courageous, fearless and persistent to be cowed by the persecution of Bernard of the Church. He was too straightforward and too honest to be a good diplomat like his more shrewd contemporary, Bernard; - while his pious asceticism and his simple mystical

regard for religion made him too unpractical and idealistic in his onslaught against ecclesiasticism.

His very eloquence marked him as a demagogue and the enthusiasm which he engendered thru his preaching found its natural outlet in the excesses of the Roman revolution. He was too unselfish to be able to count the cost to himself which his ideals inevitably would bring in their train, while his sublime faith in human nature caused him to forget the shortcomings of his less virtuous brethren. His very sincerity brought him to his death for he would not retract his teachings and beliefs - as he was urged to do - and hence he was martyred.

Thus principally because he lived ahead of his time, and because he was true to the testimony he was given to bear, and because he pleaded for a spiritual church in a free state - this daring champion of the free spirit was strangled and burned at the stake - a martyr to the Church whose corruption he had spent his whole life endeavoring to purge and purify.

And there is one thing more which reveals the sterling character of Arnold. He was a true friend. When Abelard was in the clutches of his enemies at Sens and had been deserted by his students, disciples and followers - opposed to that vast throng who had conveniently

76.

forgotten that Abelard had been their friend - there was one man who remained at the side of the master - and shared - though he was innocent - in the master's condemnation. When a man of his own free will faces the disfavor of such an august assembly as that council at Sens - just to be at the side of a friend in need - such a one is indeed a true friend. The man who alone stood by Abelard at this time of need was Arnold of Brescia.

XI.

The Teachings Of Arnold Of Brescia.

The philosophical basis of Arnold's doctrines - both of an ecclesiastical and of a political nature - was the spirit of free inquiry and criticism and in general the application of the human reason to the great problems of human thought which he had learned from his master, Peter Abelard. Such a spirit of inquiry could not rest content in its conquest of the worlds of theology and philosophy - but must inevitably attempt to deal with the more practical problems of religious and political organization. With characteristic force and clearness of insight Arnold applied his energy in the search for the source of the foulness of the Church and the existing evils of society. Arnold's teacher Abelard was a philosopher; "he had not the stuff in him of which reformers are made; but his ideas, falling upon the fertile soil of an eager and passionate nature like Arnold's, brought forth a crop of reformatory energy such as the Church had never yet seen." (1).

Thus it was that Arnold of Brescia came preaching reform, denouncing the corrupt life of the clergy and pleading for a return to the apostolic poverty of the early Church. In the endeavor to purify and make holy the Church Arnold regarded himself as charged to combat the incontinence and the worldliness of the clergy. His gospel was therefore fervid and hot in the denunciation of priestly vice.

(1). Ephraim Emerton: Mediaeval Empire, p. 293.

How could those who eagerly grasped at all the wealth of this world, and corrupted the true riches of the Church by their false doctrines and their luxurious living receive the world of our Lord -- Blessed are the poor in spirit -- when they were themselves poor neither in fact nor in disposition?

"How can our Lord say to such, 'Ye are the light of the world,' 'the salt of the earth?' Much rather is it to be applied to them what our Lord says of the salt that had lost its savor."

His life corresponded to his doctrine. He set the example of evangelical poverty and chastity himself by his dress, his entire mode of living, and the ascetical severity with which he treated his own person.

The incontinent clergy, living in luxury and debauchery, were no longer, he declared, true ecclesiastics. Otto of Freisingen reports him as saying that, "clergymen having property, bishops having regalia, and monks having possessions, could in no wise be saved." (2). According to Arnold, the Church, corrupted in the person of its priests, bishops and cardinals, nearly all of whom were guilty of simony and greed for riches, was not the true church and its pope was not the true pope. (3). *Ipsum papam non esse quod profitetur apostolicum virum et animarum pastorem... Dicebat quod sic apostolicus est ut non apostolorum doctrinam imitetur ad vitam, et ideo ei obedientiam et reverentiam non*

(2). Otto of Freisingen. lib. ii.c.20.

(3). Hefele: Histoire des Conciles. Vol. 5. p. 734.

deberi (That the Pope himself was not as he professes to be, an apostolic man and a shepherd of souls. He said, "He is so apostolic that he doesn't imitate the teaching of the Apostles with respect to life", and therefore obedience and reverence are not due him.)

Hence men need not obey the Pope and the false prelates. The faithful ought not to receive the sacraments from unworthy priests - nor confess to them. It was better to confess to one another.

Nec debere illis populum delicta fateri.

Sed magis alterutrum nec eorum sumere sacra. (4).

(Nor should the people confess their faults to them, But rather on the other hand also not take their sacraments.)

Faithful to his principles, Arnold refused, at the moment of his death, to receive a priest and he declared that he would confess to none but Christ. (5).

The Cardinals are the scribes and pharisees of Christendom - their college is not the church of God - but rather a house of trade and a meeting-place of brigands - because of their pride - their cupidity - their hypocrisies and their depravity. The Pope is not an apostolic pastor of souls - as he is called - but a drinker of blood: because he holds his power thru murder and arson - he governs the churches according to his good pleasure - he oppresses innocence - he fills with gold his coffers - and lives as other men. But in spite of his style of life - he imitates the teachings of the apostles. The people only obey him

thru fear. It is a state of things intolerable to those who do not wish to see the city of Rome - the seat of the powerful - the empress and mistress of the world - reduced to servitude. (6).

As a monk vowed to poverty Arnold was justified in denouncing the wealth and luxury of the clergy of his age.

Arnold taught, then, that the church ought to live from its tithes and free will offerings of the faithful and it should confine itself to spiritual functions.

Otto of Freisingen attributes to Arnold on hear-say evidence - blamable opinions regarding the eucharist and the baptism of infants. (7). Breyer claims that Durandus von Mende confirms this report of Otto. But if one examines the passage in question it will be seen that Durandus is speaking of the Arnoldists and not of Arnold. The passage is as follows:
 Arnoldistae....asserunt, quod nunquam per baptismum aquae homines Spiritum sanctum accipiunt, nec Samaritani baptizati illum receperunt, donec manus impositionem acceperunt.

Whatever may have been his theological heresies, and undoubtedly he was a heretic, " his real offense was the energetic way in which he lashed the vices of the clergy

(3). Hefele, Vol. 5. 734. Mon. Germ. hist. Script. Vol 20. col.538.

(4). Archivio della Societa romana di storia patria, 1878, Vol. 1. p. 471.

(5). Ibid. p. 473.

(6). Hefele, Vol. 5. p. 839.

(7). Otto of Freisingen: "He is said to have been astray with reference to the sacrament of the altar and the baptism of infants."

and stimulated the laity to reposses the ample wealth and extended privilege which the Church had acquired." (8).

Just as Arnold's teaching regarding the worldly life of the clergy proceeded from his habit of free inquiry, so too he arrived at his political conceptions. Arnold had clear democratic ideals. After he took the oath of allegiance to the republic (probably in 1147) he took pains to voice his political ideals. But he cannot be thought of as the author of the Roman republic. He was in fact absent from Rome - perhaps he had never been there - when the first Roman revolution took place.

The real causes of the Roman revolution are several in number. The haughty behavior of the Roman Emperors towards their subjects; the jealousy of the Roman people of sacerdotal authority; the revived study of Roman law; the first fruits of the antiquarians's searches into the history of the city; the natural desire of the Romans - like the Lombards - to have a free city; the ambitions of the great noble families (the Colonna, the Corsi, the Pierleoni, the Frangipani) for more power: all these and many more causes brought about the Roman revolution. And the revolution in turn brought about the Roman republic.

But Arnold of Brescia did espouse the cause openly - became its hero, dictator, and demagogue and he endeavored to reform the entire fabric of Roman society on a democratic basis. Thru his researches and thru his arguments in the

name of the ancient constitution of Rome he added to the political revolution the element of theoretical defense which it needed.

"The Romans certainly felt no great sympathy for the religious element in that serious spirit of reform which animated Arnold; but the political movements, which had sprung out of his reforming tendency, found a point of attachment in their love for liberty, and their dreams of the ancient dominion of Rome over the world. The idea of emancipating themselves from the yoke of the Pope, and of re-establishing the old republic, flattered their Roman pride. Espousing the principles of Arnold, they required that the Pope as spiritual head of the Church, should confine himself to the administration of Church affairs; and they committed to the Senate, whom they established on the Capitol, the supreme direction of civil affairs." (9).

Arnold's love for civic liberty is commendable - but his theory that because Rome had lived under a constitution in the dim ages of the past - she should be free always - was not logical and was eventually bound to come to grief. But Arnold was on the right track:- for it is the spirit of free investigation which proved, in the last analysis, Kings, Emperors and Popes do not rule by divine right but by the common consent of God's children - the people ruled.

(9). Neander: A History of the Christian Religion and Church. Vol. VII. page 208.

XII.

His Disciples.(a). The Arnoldists.

Arnold of Brescia not only influenced contemporary opinion while he lived but he also, beyond a doubt, founded a sect which carried forward some of the principles which he stood for during his life and for which he finally was martyred. We have this on no less an authority than his fellow-student, John of Salisbury (Johannes Saesberiensis) in his Historia Pontificalis. During his stay in Rome he said that Arnold "founded a sect of men which is still (he wrote in 1164) called the heresy of the Lombards," and that its adherents, on account of the uprightness, rigor, and piety of their lives, had found the most enthusiastic support among the people and especially among pious women. As our informant lived in Rome during Arnold's stay there, and as he knew Arnold personally, we must admit that he knew whereof he spoke.

When we come to ask whether the sect which Arnold founded was the one known during the following century as the Arnoldists we are in deeper waters. Most students of the life of Arnold incline toward the view that Arnold did found the sect which bears his name.(1).

(1). Those students, among others, who held that Arnold did found the sect of Arnoldists are : Leger, Fusslin, Muratori, Diekhoff, Tocco, Keller, Newman, Schmidt, Schaff, Christie, Hefele, Moeller, and many others. Those who disagree with this view are Gottfried Arnold, Guadagnini, Alphandery, and Giesebrecht. Still others refuse to take sides, and still others are vague about what they really do believe.

Moreover we know that the Arnoldists flourished in Lombardy (where the influence of Arnold is known to have been greatest) and this fact is strongly favorable to the identification of the Arnoldists with the followers of Arnold of Brescia.

What were the views of these people called Arnoldists? With the Cathari, Petrobrusians, and other sects, they agreed in an uncompromising hostility to the Roman Catholic Church. This hostility was especially directed against the secularization and the corrupt lives of the clergy, whose ministrations of the sacrament they considered invalid. (2). They denied the efficacy of water-baptism to secure the remission of sins, and laid considerable stress upon the imposition of hands as complementary to baptism.

We have no credible evidence that, like the Cathari, they rejected water-baptism and substituted therefor the Censelamentum. "Our information about the Arnoldists is extremely meager; but they are mentioned with sufficient frequency in Roman Catholic literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to prove that they persisted as a distinct party until long after the rise of the Waldensians. It is certain, that, like Arnold and Peter de Bruys, they made the apostolic church their model, and aimed to restore Christianity to its primitive purity and simplicity." (3). Tocco affirms "that the Poor Men of Lombardy descended in a direct line from the Arnoldists."

(2). pro malitia clericorum sacramenta ecclesiae esse vitanda.

(3). Newman: Manual of Church History.

(b). The Humiliati.

We know little or nothing regarding the date and circumstances under which this party originated. It seems, in the opinion of Newman, to have arisen some time between 1017 and 1184, and most probably during the reign of Frederick I. Tradition tells us, with some semblance of truth, that this party owes its birth and organization to a party of Italian noblemen who were taken captive to Germany, and who while there had been forced to support themselves, so that on returning to Italy they had determined to abandon their titles, to devote themselves to a semi-monastic life, and to continue to support themselves by the labor of their own hands. Wool-weaving seems to have been their chief means of support and for a time they are said to have almost had a monopoly of this industry in certain parts of Italy.

"Little is known of their views except that they rejected oaths. The party seems at first to have been composed chiefly of laymen, and celibacy was not required. Before the close of the twelfth century there were two parties, one of which was in harmony with the Church, and the other classed by the Church among the heretics. It is highly probable that the heretical Humiliati became so thru Arnoldistic influence."(4).

In the presence of a great assembly of clerics and lay nobility in the cathedral at Verona on the 4th of November, 1184, in accordance with the Emperor, Pope

(4). Newman: Manual of Church History.

Lucius III promulgated a long and celebrated Bull against all the heretics of his time. In particular he named the Cathari, the Patarens, the Humiliati or the Poor Men of Lyons (5), the passagiens, the Josephines and the Arnoldists. As it will be noticed Lucius speaks of the Humiliati and the Poor Men of Lyons as if they were one and the same party. (6). We are led to infer, therefore, that there was some vital connection between these two parties, for an official document emanating from the Roman Curia would hardly make such a statement, unless there were some connection between the anti-churchly Humiliati and the followers of Peter Waldo. (7).

To hold novel or heretical views on any matter during the 12th century - as Arnold and his followers did - required more than courage in the face of danger. It required a willingness on the part of those who professed these views to take the consequences. As Hefele says: After the promulgation of an imperial law against the heretics, the Pope proclaimed a papal Bull which placed an eternal anathema upon all who under the mask of piety and without Church authorization, preached publicly or in secret, errors on the sacrament of the altar, baptism, the remission of sins, marriage, etc.. And the same penalty was imposed upon their protectors and defenders. All clerics or monks culpable of these errors were to lose the privileges of their ecclesiastical state, their charges and their benefices and were to be delivered to the secular arm for punishment. As for the laity, if

they could not give immediate satisfaction, they were to be delivered to the civil tribunal for punishment, and if they were only suspects, it was necessary that they prove their innocence before the bishop. A relapse could be punished without the due process of the law. The property of condemned clerics was to be returned to the church which they had formerly served. All bishops who did not announce this present sentence at every fete day were to be suspended for three years from all ecclesiastical functions. Each year the bishop must visit one or two times each parish in which was found, after a public announcement, heretics,.....Counts, barons, and in general, all civil authorities must, at the demand of their bishops, come to the defense of the Church against the heretics and to observe the present statutes, emanating from the Emperor and the Church, under the pain of loss of their dignities, excommunication and the interdict. (8). Few but the very boldest dared to be heretics in those days. Yet there are still people who sigh for "ye goode olde days."

(5). These are the Waldensians who appear here for the first time.

(6). Qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur: (Who feign themselves by a false name to be the "Humbled" or the "Poor Men of Lyons.")

(7). Newman: A Manual of Church History. C. Schmidt: Histoire et doctrine de la secte des cathares ou albigeois, 2 vols. Paris, 1849, cf. pp. 307-308.

(8). Translating freely from Hefele: Histoire des Conciles: Vol. V. Part II. pages 1119-1127.
De haereticis: Book V, tit. vii, c. 9.

XIII.

Arnold of Brescia's Place in History.

Arnold's work, the Roman Commune, lived after him, and Adrian, after the Emperor Frederick's departure, was forced to make terms with it. Nor was it long before Frederick himself had ample cause to regret that he had not made an ally of the only man who could have saved him from the bitter humiliation of his surrender to Pope Alexander III.

Arnold's career was a manifestation of the temper with which the more spiritually minded rebelled against the encroachments and corruption of the Church. There were many others like him. It was not so much that they quarrelled with institutionalized Christianity as with the blight of corruption with which the Church was encrusted. Arnold's preaching left a deep impression on the minds of the populace, and his followers in secret cherished his memory and his principles for centuries. (1).

This patriarch of political heretics is the first of a series of celebrated martyrs for freedom who died at the stake. And because his insight led him to attempt to reform the political constitution of Italy 700 years before Italy was ready for freedom we may call him a true prophet. "Arnold surpasses all his successors in the struggle for Roman liberty, not only in the greatness of his time, but also in the loftiness of his aims," and

(1). Lea: History of the Inquisition, etc. p. 76.

of such enduring vitality was his teaching, that it is still in harmony with the spirit of our time. (2).

Arnold was a Protestant 400 years before Luther; for like Luther, Arnold protested against the worldly life of the clergy, against the temporal rather than the spiritual policy of the Church and against the blank acceptance rather than a critical inquiry into the teachings of the scriptures.

The idea of apostolic poverty did not die with Arnold. Half a century later St. Francis of Assisi founded the Franciscan order whose basis was the very idea for which Arnold had striven so energetically. Like Arnold, Francis was convinced that the source of evil was wealth, and that only a return to the primitive poverty of the Apostles could the evangelical spirit be infused again into the world.

Much of the austerity, the spiritual purity, the mystic religion and the free spirit of the pious asceticism of the Waldensians may be traced thru the Arnoldists back to the influence of Arnold of Brescia. Such mystics as may be connected with the Waldensians such as Tauler, Thomas à Kempis and the author of the *Theologia Germanica* owe much to Arnold.

It is interesting to note that this statement, "He who professes the true articles of the Christian faith, and only sins against the power of the Pope, is by no means to be counted a heretic," was signed by John Tauler and two other monks who at the time were threatened with excommunication because they insisted that

it was their duty to administer the sacraments in Strassbourg when that city was for 26 years under an interdict for which the people who suffered were in no way to blame.

Furthermore we know that the life task of John Wycliffe was to teach the old doctrine of Arnold of Brescia - that the clergy were to live wholly in their spiritual vocation and to follow the pattern of Christ in poverty, self-surrender and renunciation of the world.

Arnold of Brescia has, moreover, a lesson for our own time - namely that the spirit of free and critical inquiry (of which great numbers of men are still afraid) is the only spirit that can make for progress and truth.

- - - - -

Truly Arnold of Brescia - deserted by his followers and his friends - and burned at the stake as a heretic - did not die in vain --- but rather left a rich and fruitful heritage, which we of the twentieth century may share -- if our souls are large enough to partake of it.

- - - - -
 (2). Gregorovius, p. 548.
 - - - - -

Finis.

SOURCES.

Adriani, Vita: See Vita Adriani., also see Boso.

Anonymous: Commentaire des causes heretiques: inserted in Huguccio's: Summa Decreti, 1211-1215, xxix of Cause 23, quest 4, cf. Tanon: Histoire des tribunaux de l'Inquisition (Paris 1893), 456, note 2.

Anonymous: Letter ascribed to Arnold but not by Arnold. Otto de Freising: De gestis: 1., c. 28.

Annales: Augustani Minores: in Mon. Germ. hist., x. 8.

Annales of Baronius: see Baronius.

Annales of Einsiedl.: Mon. Germ. hist.: v.: for year 1155.

Annales of Würzburg: for the year 1155.

Aragon., Cardinal.: p. 442, and passim.

Archivio della societa romana di storia patria: 1878, t. 1. pp. 471-473.

Baronius: Annales: ad ann. 1139, n. 9; 1140, n. 10; 1148, n. 38., etc., to 1155. Letters of Eugenius III: in Baronius: Annales ecclesiastici: (ad. ann. 1148, No. 38.).

Bernard of Clairvaux: Letters in Latin: Migne: Patrologia (P.L.). CLXXXII (182): Epist.: 189, 195, 196, 243: (clxxxix, cxcii, cxcv, cxovi, cexliii): Cols. 354-359, 361-364. Works (in English translation): 4 Vols.: Edited by S. J. Eales, D.C.L.: London: Burnes and Oates: Vol. 1., pp. 68-69. Vols. 1 & 2., Letters, Nos. 189, 192, 195, 196, 243.

Boso: Vita Hadriani IV.: in J. M. Watterich: Ponticum Romanorum vitae: II: 324-326: Leipzig: 1862. Vita Hadriani IV: in Duchesne: Liber pontificalis: 11390. Paris, 1889.

Buonacorso de Milano: Vita haereticorum: (end of 12th century): P.L.: cciv: cols. 791-792. Spicil., Vol. iii, p. 85.

Card. Aragon.: See Aragon.

Chronicon (of Otto de Freising): vii., c. 31.

Coleti: Concilia: vii. xii, col. 1510; col. 1578.

Eugenius III: Letters: in Baronius: Annales ecclesiastici (ad. ann. 1148, No. 38.).

Sources, (con't.).

Federigo: Gesta de: See Gesta di Federigo.

Otto of Freisingen: (Bishop of Freisingen; uncle of Frederick I
Barbarossa; died 1158).
De gestis Friderici: lib. I, c. 27-28, lib. II,
c. 20-21, in Monum. Germ. hist., Script., xx,
(1868), 338-491.
and ed. G. Waitz in Script. rer. Germ., Hanover,
1884.
Chronicles: lib. vii: c. xx, xxxi.
Gesta Friderici imperatoris: lib. II, 20-23, in
Monum. Germ. hist., xx: 366-367, 403-404.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg: See Reichersberg, Gerhoh of.

Gesta di Federico: (or Gesta di Federigo).
Gesta di Federico: in Fonti per la storia d'Italia.
Vol. I., verses 802 sq., 809 sq., 828 sq., 850 sq.
or Edition of Monaci: lines 618-641.

Gesta di Federigo I. in Italia.: (Publications of the Istituto storico
Italiano), Rome, 1887.

Gesta per imperatorem Fridericum Barbam Rubeam in partibus Lombardie
et Italy: fragment of an anonymous poem, published by E. Monaci in
Archivio della societa roman di storia patria. (Rome, 1878)
Vol. I., 466-474.

Gunther (Gontier de Paris): Ligurinus: De Gestis Friderici I., a poem
written 1187., lib. III, verses 262-348,
in Migne: P.L.: cxxii (212): cols. 369-371.

Hardouin: Conc. coll.,: Vol. VI., Part 2, col. 1215, col. 1243.

Historia Pontificalis: See Salisbury, John of.

Innocent II: Letters: Migne: P.L.: 179: Ep. cdxlvii, col. 515-517;
Ep. cdxlviii, col. 517.

Jaffe: Regesta: n. 10073, and passim.

Ligurinus: - see Gunther.

Lucensis: Ptolemy Lucensis: XX.c.20.

sources,(con't).

- Mansi: Conc. ampliss. coll.: Vol. xxi. col. 536 sq., col. 625, col. 628.
- Walter Map: (or Walter Mapes): (Archdeacon of Oxford, 1196): De Nugis Curialium: Edition of Wright: pp. 41 and 43.
- Martene et Durand: Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima collectio: Paris, 1724.
A letter of Wetzel: Vol. II., cols. 554-557.
A letter - perhaps by Arnold: Vol. II., cols. 399-400.
- Migne: Patrologia: (P.L.): Letters of Innocent II: Vol. 179, col. 517.
Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux: Vol. 183., cols. 354-359; 361-364.
Buonacorso: Vol. 204., cols. 791-792.
Gunther: Ligurinus: 212. cols. 369-371.
- Monaci: Gesta per imperatorem Federicum Barbam Rubeam in partibus Lombardiae et Italiae: (edited by E. Monaci): in Archivio della societa romana di storia patria, 1878, Vol. 1., pp. 466-474.
- Muratori: Rerum italicarum scriptores: Vol. II., pp. 28. (de Gestis Frid. I.).
- Otto of Freisingen: see Freisingen, Otto of.
- Palidenses: Arnold mentioned under year 1155.
- Gerhoh of Reichersberg: (Provost of Reichersberg: he died 1169.).
De Investigatione Antichristi: I: xlii:
Margarin de la Signe: Bibliotheca Patrum:
Paris, 1624. Vol. IV.b., col. 727-728.
or Edition of Scheibelberger, (Lincii, 1875).
or Edition of Scheibelberger, Innsbruech, 1875:
I: 87-89.
- John of Salisbury: Historia Pontificalis: (written ca. 1162, recently discovered): Monum. Germ. hist. Script., xx.c.31, pp. 403, 537-538. Edition of 1868: xx: 515-545. (((Monumenta Germaniae historica, ed. by G.H.Pertz, (died 1870), and his co-editors and successors: Wattenbach, Boehmer, etc.. More than 50 volumes. Hanover, 1826, sqq. They cover the whole history of the Empire and the Papacy.))).
- Vita Adriani: in Muratori: Vol. III., p. 441., Rerum italicarum scriptores.
- Vitae rom. pont.: - see Watterich.

Sources, (con't.)

Watterich: Vitae rom. pont., p. 3324.

Wetzel: (German follower and disciple of Arnold.). Letter of Wetzel, beginning, "Carissimo Dei gr. F. Wetzel ad summa animae et corporis laeta undique proficere." (Beloved by the Grace of God F. Wetzel to advance everywhere to the highest joys of soul and body....) Epistle 384 in Martene II. This letter of Wetzel, together with an anonymous letter said to have been written by Arnold (probably not tho') are to be found in Martene and Durand: Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum... amplissima collectio (Paris 1724), lib.II., 354-557, 399,400.

Wiebald: Letters of: Ep. 383., etc., etc..

Wurzburg: Annals of: - in the year 1155.

#####

Wetzel: The letter mentioned above by Wetzel to Frederick I. can also be found in Jaffe: Bibl. rer. germ., I., No. 404.

These above sources are cross indexed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Allen, Joseph H.: Christian History in its Three Great Periods:
Volume II: The Middle Ages. Boston, 1883.
Pages 175-176, 261.
- Alphandery, Paul D.: Encyclopedia Britannica: Article on Arnold of
Brescia.
- D'Achery: Spicilegium: Vol. xiii. page, 85.
- Barry, William: The Papal Monarchy: London, 1903, pp. 258-259, 206.
- Beck, K.: Arnold von Brescia: Basel, 1824.
- Benvicenni, J.: Arnaldo da Brescia, condannato a morte per ordine di
papa Adriano IV, 16mo., Firenze (Florence), 1873.
- Bernhardi, W.: Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs unter Konrad III.,
Leipsic, 1883.
- Bert, or Bent, A.: Essai sur Arnaud de Brescia, 8vo., Geneve, 1856.
- Bertolini, F.: Archiv. stor. Italiano: 1875. Series III, Vol. xxii,
pp. 282-291.
- Bonghi, R.: Arnaldo da Brescia: in Nuova antologia, 1882. Series III.
Vol. xxxiv, pp. 601-639.
- Breyer, R.: Arnold von Brescia: Aurenbecker: Historische Taschenbuch:
Leipsic, 1889. Series VI. Vol. viii, pp. 123-178.
- Breyer, R.: Die Arnoldisten: Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte.
Vol. XII, P. 412 sq.
- Bryce, James: The Holy Roman Empire: Philadelphia, 1886, pp. 151,
230-232, and 212.
- Bower, Archibald: History of the Popes: Vol. II, pp. 471, 488-489.
Philadelphia, 1845.
- Cacciapuoti: Arnaud de Brescia, 8vo., Venezia, 1910.
- A. di Giovanni de Castro: Arnaldo da Brescia e la rivoluzione romana
del xii secolo: studio: 16mo.,
Livorna, Leghorn, 1875.
- Chevalier: Bibliography and sources a propos de Arnold of Brescia:
Repertoire des sources hist. du moyen age (2nd ed. pp. 320-1).
- Civiltà cattolica: An account of the Apoteosi di Arnaldo da Brescia.
1882. Series L. Vol. XI. pp. 257-268.

Bibliography, (Con't).

- Clavel, V.: Arnaud de Brescia et les Romains du xii^e siecle, 8vo., Paris, 1868, cf. Revue critique, vol. viii, pp. 219-222. (Said to be of little value.)
- Comba, E.: I nostri protestanti, Avanti la Riforma. Firenze (Florence), 1895. I: pp. 173f.
- Deutsch, S.M.: Arnold von Brescia: in Hertzog: Realencyclopadie fur protestant. Theologie und Kirche. (3rd Edition, Leipsic, 1897) Volume II, pages 117-122.
- Deutsch, S.M.: Arnold of Brescia: abridged translation from the article mentioned above in Schaff-Hertzog: see article on Arnold of Brescia.
- Emerton, E.: Mediaeval Empire, Boston, 1896. pp. 293-297, pp. 454-456.
- Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses: Article by Charles Schmidt of the Theological faculty of Strasbourg on "Arnaud de Brescia."
- Fechtrup: Arnold von Brescia in Kirchenlex., Vol. I., pp. 1419-1420.
- Fisher, Herbert: Mediaeval Empire: Macmillan, 1898. Vol. II., p. 103, pp. 217-220.
- Francke, H.: Arnold von Brescia und seine Zeit, Nebst einem Anhang uber d. Stiftung d. Peraklet, 8vo, Zurich, 1825. (Eulogistic, uncritical, unreliable).
- Etude sur la vie et les doctrines d'Arnaud de Brescia, 8vo., Montauban, 1861.
- Gaggia, G.: Arnaldo da Brescia, Brescia, 1882.
- von Giesebrecht, W.: Uber Arnold von Brescia: in Sitzungsberichte phil.-histor. Akademie d. Wissenschaften, Munchen, (In the Reports of the Bavarian Academy of Science), Munich, 1873. Vol. III. pp. 122-154. The same translated into the Italian by F. Oderici, 16mo., Brescia, 1877. The same, Munich, 1895. The same in Kaisergesch., Vol.V., p. 64. The same in Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit, Vol. IV., 314 sqq., Vol. V. passim., Brunswick, 1880-1888.

Bibliography, (Con't).

- Gregorovius, F.: History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages.
Volume IV., Part II., Pages 442, 478, 482, 485, 502,
506, 528, 530, 545, 546-548.
- Guadagnini, G.B.: Difesa (Apologia) di Arnaldo da Brescia, 2 Vols.
8vo., Pavia, 1790.
- Guerzoni, G.: Arnaldo da Brescia, secondo gli ultimi studi; in Nuova
antologia, 1871, Vol. xvii, pp. 723-754.
Same, Milan, 1882.
- Guibal, Georges: Arnaud de Brescia et les Hohenstaufen, ou la question
du pouvoir temporel de la Papauté au moyen age, 8vo.,
Paris, 1868., cf. Revue critique, 1869, Vol. VII.
pp. 8-12.
- Hausrath, Adolph: Arnold von Brescia: in Neue Heidelberg Jahrbucher,
1891. Vol. I., pp. 72-144.
- Hausrath, Adolph: Arnold von Brescia: Leipsic, 1891.
The same in his Weltverbesserer, Vol. II., Leipsic,
1895.
- Hefele, C.J.: Histoire des Conciles, Paris, 1912. Volume V. Part I.
pp. 721-722, 734-737, 798, 839.
Volume V. Part II. (Paris, 1913). pp. 870-873, 1119-1127.
- Henderson: History of Germany in the Middle Ages: London and N.Y., 1894,
pages 243-244, 251.
- Hertzog: See Deutsch.
- Jackson (F.J.Foakes Jackson): An Introduction to the History of
Christianity: A.D. 590-1314.,
N.Y., Macmillan, 1921.
Pages 181-182, 191, 250.
- Keeler, J.D.: Dissertatio historica de Arnaldo Brixienti, 4to.,
Goettingen, 1742, 1842.
- Lagarde, André: The Latin Church in the Middle Ages, N.Y., 1915.
Pages 202, 439, 450.
- Lea, Henry C.: History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages: N.Y.,
1887. Vol. I. pp. 72-76.
- n. Liebenau, Th.: Arnold von Brescia und die Schweizer: 8vo., Lucerna,
1885.

Bibliography, (Continued).

- McCabe, Joseph: Peter Abelard, N.Y., Putnam's, 1901. *passim*.
- Maffre, C.: Histoire populaire des reformateurs, Vol. V.,
Arnaud de Brescia. 32mo., Paris, 1862.
- Medley, D.J.: Church and Empire: 1003-1304. Pages, 103-105.
- Mercantini, L.: Rivista Sicula, Palermo, 1871, Volume VI, pages 178-185.
- Moeller: History of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages, pp. 267 ff
322.
- Mulas, E.: Arnaldo da Brescia, in Rivista europea, 1882, Series II,
Volume xxix, pp. 473-508.
- Munro, Dana C.: Middle Ages: 395-1272. N.Y., Century Co., 1921,
pages 287-8, 357.
- Muratori: Cenni storici di Arnaldo da Brescia tratti dalle opere, 12mo.
Brescia, 1877.
- Neander, Augustus: General History of the Christian Religion and Church.
London, 1852, Volume 7: pp. 203-210, 222, 223.
Volume 8: pp. 61. Volume 9: p. 198.
- Newman, A.H.: A Manual of Church History, Philadelphia, 1900,
Volume I., pp. 562-566.
- Newman, A.H.: A History of Anti-Pedobaptism, Philadelphia, 1902.
Pages 35-39.
- Niccolini, G.B.: Arnaldo da Brescia, 1843.
- Nouvelle Biographie Universelle: Volume III., Paris, Article: Arnaud
de Brescia, cols. 276-278.
- Oderici, Federico: Storie Bresciane, iv., Brescia, 1858.
- Oderici, Federico: Arnaldo da Brescia, ricerche istoriche, 16mo.
Brescia, 1861-1862.
- Oderici, Federico: Italian translation of Giesbrecht (see Giesebrecht)
Brescia, 1877.
- Paolucci, G.: L'idea di Arnaldo da Brescia nella riforma di Roma.
in Rivista stor. Ital., 1887, Vol. IV., pp. 669-684.
- Papencordt: page 266.

Bibliography, (Continued).

- Pianciani, G.B.: *Annali di se. relig.*, Modena, 1844. Volume xix, pp. 374-416.
- Pianciani, G.B.: *Civiltà cattolica*, 1851, Volume IV., pp. 35-49, 129-152.
1856-1875: Volume V. pp. 654-665., Volume VI., pp. 43-59.
- Polo, Michele di.: *Due novateri del XII secolo* (Florence, 1894) pp. 79sq.
- Quirin, F.A.: *Essai historique sur Arnaud de Brescia*, 8vo., Strasbourg, 1848.
- de Raumer: *Hohenstaufen*, Volume II, page 37.
- Realencyclopädie*, etc.,.: See Deutsch.
- Reuss, R.: *Revue critique*, 1876. 2nd Series. Volume I. pp. 33-36.
- Revue critique*: 1869: Volume I., pages 8-12.
Volume II., pages 219-222.
1876: Volume I., pages 33-36.
- Revue des questions historiques*: 1884: Volume xxxv., pp. 52-114.
- Revue historique*: 1876: Volume II., pp. 260-262.
- Schaff, David: *History of the Christian Church*. Volume V. In the *Middle-Ages*. Part I. N.Y. Scribner's, 1917.
pages 97-102, 382, 618.
- Schaff-Hertzog *Ency.*: *Arnold of Brescia*: Article by Deutsch.
- Schalchlin, J.J.: *Arnold von Brescia, ein Vorkämpfer und Verlauffer der Reformation, seine Zeit und sein Leben, Wirken und Tod*, 8vo., Zurich, 1872.
- Schmidt, Charles: *Arnaud de Brescia: Encyclopedie des Sciences Relig.*, Paris, 1877, Vol. I., pp. 606-608.
- Simonsfeld: *Jahrbucher.*, Volume I., pp. 341 sq.

Bibliography, (Continued).

- Thatcher and Schwill: Europe in the Middle Ages: pp. 284-286.
- Tocco, F.: L'eresia nel medio evo. Florence, 1884, pages 231-256.
- Tocco, F.: Quel che non e' e nella Divina Commedia, o Dante e l'eresia. Bologna, 1899.
- Tout, T.F.: Empire and Papacy: 918-1273 A.D., London, 1914.
Pages 208, 213, 234, 239-242, 249-250.
- Trent, Archbishop: History of the Church in the Middle Ages: p. 171.
- Vacandard, E.: Arnaud de Brescia: Revue des questions historiques, Paris, 1884, Volume, xxxv, pp. 52-114.
- Vacandard, E.: Arnaud de Brescia: Résumé in Vie de St. Bernard, 8vo., Paris, 1895, Volume II., pages 235-259, 467-469.
- Vacandard, E.: Arnold of Brescia: Article in the Catholic Encyclopedia. I. pages, 747-749.
- Vernet, F.: Arnaud de Brescia: in the Dictionnaire de theol., cath., Paris, 1903., Volume I., columns, 1973-1975.
- Walker, Williston: History of the Christian Church: N.Y., scribner's, 1920, pages 247-248.

Guntheri Cisterciensis: Ligurinus.-Lib.III.

Cujus origo mali, tantaeque voraginis auctor
Extitit Arnoldus, quem Brixia protulit ortu
Pestifero, tenuit nutrit Gallia sumptu,
Edocuitque diu : tandem natalibus oris 265
Redditus, assumpta sapientis fronte, deserto
Fallebat sermone rudes, clerumque procaci
Insectans odio, monachorum acerrimus hostis,
Plebis adulator, gaudens popularibus auris,
Pontifices, ipsumque gravi corrodere lingua 270
Audebat papam, scelerataque dogmata vulgo
Diffundens, variis (or vanis) implebat vocibus aures.
Nil proprium cleri, fundos, et praedia nullo
Jure sequi monachos, nulli fiscalia ajura
Pontificum, nulli curae (or curiae) popularis honorem 275
Abbatum sacros referens concedere leges.
Omnia principibus terrenis subdita, tantum
Committenda viris popularibus, atque regenda:
Illis primitias, et quae devotio plebis
Offerat, et decimas castos in corporis usus 280
Non ad luxuriam, sive oblectamina carnis
Concedens, mollesque cibos, cultusque nitorem,
Illicitosque jocos, lascivaque gaudia cleri,
Pontificum fastus, abbatum denique laxos
Damnabat penitos mores, monachosque superbos. 285
Veraque multa quidem, nisi tempora nostra fideles
Respuerent monitus, falsis admista (al mista) monebat,
Et fateor, pulchram fallendi neverat artem,
Veris falsa probans; quia tantum falsa loquendo
Fallere nemo potest : veri sub imagine falsum 290
Influit, et furtim deceptas occupat aures.

Articulos etiam fidei, certumque tenorem
Non satis exacta stolidus pietate fovebat,
Impia mellifluis admiscens toxica verbis.

Ille suam vecors in clerum, pontificemque, 295
Atque alias plures adeo commoverat urbes,
Ait jam ludibrio sacer, extremoque pudori
Clerus haberetur; quod adhuc (ni fallor) in illa
Gente nocet, multumque sacro detruncat honori.

Mox in concilio Romae damnatus, ab illo 300
Praesule, qui numeros vetitum contingere nostros
Nomen ab innocua ducit laudabile vita,
Territus, et miserae confusus imagine culpae,
Fugit ab urbe sua, transalpinisque receptus,

Qua sibi vicinas Alemannia suspicit Alpes, 305
Nomen an Alpino ducens, ut fama, Lemanno
Nobile Turregum, doctoris nomine falso,
Insedit, totamque brevi sub tempore terram
Perfidus, impuri foedavit dogmatis aura:

Unde venenato dudum corrupta sapore, 310
Et nimium falsi doctrina (or doctrinae) vatis inhaerens,
Servat adhuc uvae gustum gens illa paternae.

Ast ubi de medio sublato praesule summo,
Eugenius sacrae suscepit jura cathedrae,
Ille Petri solidam cupiens convellere petram, 315
Ut caput infernum per caetera membra dolorem
Diffundat, Romana petit temerarius ausu

Moenis sacrilego, totamque nefarius urbem
Inficit impuri corrupto semine verbi:
Et populi tantas in clerum concitat iras, 320
Ut penitus nullum summo deferret honorem
Pontifici, clerumque odio vexaret iniquo.

Et si quis, cui mens aequi et reverentior esset,
Et meliora pio flagrarent viscera voto,
Forte refragari, seu dissuadere furorem 325
Ausus erat, seseque novis opponere monstris;
Omnibus ereptis, eversa funditus aede,
Corporis afflictu, seu tandem sanguine fuso,
Clericus, aut etiam popularis, facta luebat.
Quin etiam titulos urbis renovare vetustos, 330
Patricios recreare viros, priscosque Quirites,
Nomine plebio secernere nomen equestre,
Jura tribunorum, sanctum reparare senatum,
Et senio fessas, mutasque reponere leges,
Lapsa ruinosis, et saepe pendentia muris 335
Reddere primaevo Capitolia prisca nitenti:
Consiliis, armisque suae moderamina summae
Arbitrio tractare suo, nil juris in hac re
Pontifici summo, modicum concedere regi,
Suadebat populo : sic laesa stultus utraque 340
Majestate, reum geminae se fecerat aulae.
Unde etiam tandem (neque enim reor esse silendum,
Nec de funesto repetetur postea sermo)
Judicio cleri nostro sub principe victus,
Appensusque cruci, flammaque cremante solutus 345
In cineres, Tiberine, tuas est sparsus in undas :
Ne stolidae plebis, quem fecerat improbus, error,
Martyris ossa novo, cineresve foveret honore,.....

(Concerning lines 342-348 above, Prof. Archibald Bower in his History of the Popes Vol II p 489 says that Gunther was with the king at the time of Arnold's death. He would probably know whereof he spoke, therefore, regarding this matter.)

SOURCE MATERIAL about ARNOLD of BRESCIA.

Letters of Saint Bernard:

Letter CLXXXIX. (A.D. 1140.)

To Pope Innocent, against Peter Abaelard.

(St. Bernard expresses his grief at the errors of Abaelard, which he warns the Pope to oppose.)

To his most loving Father and Lord INNOCENT, by the grace of God, Supreme Pontiff, Bernard, called Abbet of Clairvaux, writes as his humble servant.

3. Goliath advances, tall in stature, clad in his armour of war, preceded by his armour-bearer, Arnold of Brescia. Scale overlaps scale, and there is no point left unguarded. Indeed the bee which was in France (An allusion to Isaiah vii.18. The French bee is Abaelard, the Italian, Arnold of Brescia.) has sent his marmuring to the Italian bee, and they have come together against the Lord and against His anointed. They have bent their bow, they have made ready their arrows within the quiver, that they may privily shoot at them which are true at heart. In their life and habits they have the form of godliness, but they deny its power, and they thereby deceive many, for they transform themselves into angels of light, when they are Satan's. Goliath standing with his armour-bearer between the two lines, shouts against the armies of Israel, and curses the ranks of the Saints, and that the more boldly because he knows that no David is present. In short he puts forth philosophies with great praise and so affronts the teachers of the Church, and prefers their imaginations and novelties to the doctrine and faith of the Catholic Fathers; and when all fly from his face he challenges me, the weakest of all, to single combat.....

5. But thou, O successor of Peter, wilt determine whether he, who assails the faith of Peter, ought to have shelter at the See of Peter. Thou, I say, the friend of the bride-groom, wilt provide measures to free His Bride from lying lips and a deceitful tongue. But that I may speak a little more boldly with my Lord, do thou, most loving Father, take heed to thyself, and to the grace of God which is in thee.

.....
It is necessary, S. Paul says, that there be heresies and schisms, that they that are approved may be made manifest (I Cor.xi.29).

And, indeed, in schism, as I have just said, the Lord has proved and known you. But that nothing be wanting to your crown, lo! heresies have sprung up. And so for the perfection of your virtues, and that you may be found to have done nothing less than the great Bishops, your predecessors, take away from us, most loving Father, the foxes which are laying waste the vineyard of the Lord while they are little ones; lest if they increase and multiply, our children despair of destroying what was not exterminated by you. Although they are not even now small or few, but imposing and numerous, and will not be exterminated save by you, and by a strong hand. Myacinetus (? perhaps Cardinal Bobe of S. Mary in Cosmedin ?) has threatened me with many evils; but he has not done, nor could he do, what he wished. But I thought that I ought to bear patiently concerning myself what he has spared neither to your person nor to the Curia; but this my friend Nicholas, as he is also yours, will better tell in person.

Letter CXCIV. (A.D. 1140).

To the Bishop of Constance (on the Rhine) about Arnold of Brescia.
Bernard advises him to expel Arnold of Brescia from his Diocese.

1. If the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. (S. Matt. xxiv. 43). Do you know that a thief has broken into your house by night, yet not your house, but the Lord's entrusted to your care? But there can be no doubt that you know what is taking place at your door, when news of it has penetrated even to us who are so far distant. It is no wonder that you could not foresee the hour, or perceive the night attack of the thief, but it will be a wonder if you do not recognize that he has been caught, if you do not hold him fast and prevent him from carrying off your goods, nay, rather the most precious spoils won by Christ, souls which He has stamped with His own image and redeemed with His own blood. Perhaps you are yet in the dark and wonder who it is I mean. I speak of Arnold of Brescia, and I wish he were of as sound doctrine as he is strict of life. And if you wish to know more, he is a man who is neither eating nor drinking, but with the devil alone he is hungering and thirsting for the blood of souls. He is one of the number of those whom the watchfulness of the Apostle takes note of when he says, Having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. (2 Tim. iii. 5). And the Lord Himself says: They shall come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves (S. Matt. vii 15). Up to the present time, in whatever place he has lived, he has left such foul and destructive tracks that he dares not return to any place wherever he has imprinted his foot-mark. For example, he grievously stirred up and troubled the land in which he was born, and he was, therefore, accused before the Pope of grievous schism, and was banished from his native soil, and also compelled to swear that he would not return except by the Pope's permission. For a like reason this notable schismatic has been driven out of the kingdom of France. When anathematized by Peter the Apostle he joined himself to Peter Abaelard, and with him, and for him, he endeavoured to defend vigorously and stubbornly all his errors, which had been already exposed and condemned by the Church.

2. And in all these incidents his phrensy was not abated, but his hand was stretched out still. For though he is a fugitive and wanderer on the earth, he does not cease to do among men of other countries what he is not allowed to do amongst his own countrymen, and goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. And I hear that he is now working mischief amongst you, and is eating up your people as it were bread. His mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, his feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and unhappiness are in his ways, and the way of peace has he not known. He is an enemy of the cross of Christ, a sower of discord, a manufacturer of schisms, a disturber of the peace, a divider of unity; his teeth are spears and arrows, and his tongue a sharp sword, his words are smoother than oil, and yet they are very darts. Thence it is that he is wont to entice to himself by flattering words and the pretences of virtues the rich and the powerful, according to the verse: He sitteth lurking in thievish corners with the rich that he may slay the innocent (Ps. x. 8). Depend upon it, when he feels that he has securely gained their goodwill and affection, you will see the man openly rise against the clergy; and, relying on military tyranny, he will rise against the Bishops themselves, and run a tilt against all ecclesiastical order.

Letter CXCV (Continued).

Knowing this, I do not know what better or more wholesome thing you can do at such a crisis than, according to the admonition of the Apostle, to remove the evil man from among you (ICor.v.13), though the friend of the bridegroom will see that he is bound rather than put to flight, lest he be able to travel about again, and so do more harm. Our Lord the Pope, when he was here, gave in writing the same directions, because of the evils which he heard were being done; but there was no one to do the good action. To end, if the Scripture soundly warns us, to take the little foxes which spoil the vine (Cant.ii.15), should not a fierce and powerful wolf much rather be bound fast, lest he break into the sheep-folds of Christ, and slay or destroy His sheep?

Letter CXCVI. (A.D. 1140).

To Guido, the Legate, on the Same Subject.

Bernard warns him against familiarity with Arnold of Brescia.

1. Arnold of Brescia is said to be with you, a man whose discourse is as sweet as honey, whose doctrine is poison; whose head is that of a dove, his tail a scorpion's; whom Brescia cast forth, Rome was horrified at, France rejected, Germany abominates, Italy is unwilling to take in. See, I beseech you, that your authority lend no protection to his further mischief; for he has both the art and the wish to do injury, and if he gain your favor he will be likely, like a three-fold cord which is not easily broken, to be, I am afraid, above measure mischievous. And if it is true that you have the man with you, I suppose one of two things -- either that you do not know him, or, which is more likely, that you are hoping for his repentance. Would it were not a vain hope! Who can from this stone raise up a child to Abraham? How welcome a gift would it be to our mother the Church to receive him as a vessel for honor, whom she has so long borne with as a vessel of dishonor! It is lawful to make the attempt, but a wise man will be careful not to go beyond the number laid down by the Apostle, when he says, A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself (Tit. iiii. 10,11). Otherwise, to be on intimate terms with him, and to admit him frequently to private conversation, not to say in your house, is suspiciously like showing him favor, and is a powerful weapon in the hands of the enemy. A member of the household, and a private friend of the Legate of the Apostolic See, will preach with impunity and persuade whom he will. For who can suspect any wrong to come from the side of our Lord the Pope? But although he manifestly speak perverse things, who will dare lightly oppose himself against one who is at your side?
2. And do you know what kind of foot-prints he has left in every place he has dwelt in? It is not without cause that Apostolic energy has forced him to cross the Alps from Italy which gave him birth, and does not suffer him to return to his native country. What man is there amongst the foreigners to whom he was driven who does not heartily wish that they had sent him back home? And certainly the fact that his bearing towards all is such that he incurs the hatred of all is an approbation of the condemnation of his labors, so that no one can say that it was obtained from our Lord the Pope by surprise.

Letter CXCVI (Continued).

With what excuse, then, can he flout the Sentence of the Supreme Pontiff when, though his tongue disclaims it, his life loudly proclaims its justice? And so to show him favor is to go against our Lord the Pope, to oppose our Lord God. For by whomsoever a righteous sentence may have been given, it is certain that it proceeds from Him who says by the mouth of the Prophet, I who speak righteousness (Is. lxiii. 1). But I have confidence in your wisdom and honesty, and that when you have read this letter, and know the truth, you will not be led away to give your consent in this matter to anything, save what is becoming to you and expedient to the Church of God, on behalf of which you are discharging the office of legate. You have my heart, and may reckon on my obedience.

Letter CCXLIII. (A.D. 1146.)

To the Romans when they Revolted Against Pope Eugenius.

At the instigation of Arneld of Brescia, the Romans tried to establish the ancient Roman liberty in place of the Pope's authority, leaving him only tithes and free-will offerings. Bernard reproves them sharply for ingratitude.

To the nobles and chief men, and to all the people of Rome, Brother BERNARD, called Abbot of Clairvaux, writes, desiring that they may eschew evil and do good.

1. My speech is to you, O great and famous people, though I am mean and of no reputation, of small stature, and smaller influence. And, indeed, when I consider who I am that write, to whom I am writing, and, at the same time, how differently another may judge my action, I am held back by very shame. But it is a smaller thing to endure shame before men than to be condemned before God for ~~forbearance~~, withholding the truth, and concealment of righteousness.....

5. Do you now recognize that all are not peaceably disposed who are of your own house, nor all friendly who seem to be so? And even if we had known it before, we are now taught more plainly by your example the full truth of that saying of the Lord which He spake -- that a man's enemies shall be those of his own household (S.Matt.x.36). Woe to brother from brother in the midst, and to the children from their parents. Woe to them; not from the sword, but from lying lips and a deceitful tongue. How long will you evilly encourage each other in your evil-doing? How long will you lay one-another low with the swords of your lips, ruin one another, be consumed by one another? Assemble yourselves, ye scattered sheep, return to your pastures, and to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls. Return, ye wanderers to your first love. I say this not as an enemy to revile you, but as a friend to rebuke you. True friendship brings sometimes rebuke, never flattery.

6. But I add to it entreaty. For Christ's sake, I beseech you, be reconciled to God, be reconciled to your princes (I mean Peter and Paul), and to him their vicar and successor, Eugenius, whom you have driven from his house and home. Be reconciled to the princes of the world, lest haply the world begin to take up arms on their behalf against your folly. Know you not that when they are offended you can do nothing, that when they are favorable you have nothing to fear? Under their protection you need not fear, O renowned city, home of the brave, for thousands of the people that set themselves round about you.....

Note on Letter CXCV of Saint Bernard about Arnold of Brescia, by Dom John Mabillon.

Otto of Freisingen (de Gestis Friderici lib.ii.c.20) thus describes/Arnold - He was born at Brescia, a city of Italy, and being ordained reader he became a clerk in the Church there. He had formerly had Abelard as his teacher. He was a man of quick intelligence, more distinguished for a flow of words than for the weight of his matter, " a man who affected singularity and sought after novelty, one of those dispositions ever ready to manufacture heresies and to stir up divisions. On returning from Gaul to Italy he assumed the religious habit in order to impose on people the more easily. He mangled and gnawed at everything as a dog might, he spared no one, he spoke contemptuously of bishops and clergy, he persecuted the monks, and reserved his flatteries for the laity. For he was in the habit of saying that no clergy with private property, no Bishops with estates, no monks with possessions of their own, could in any way be saved; that all these things belonged to the King, and that they ought to give up possession of them and hand them over to the laity. Besides this he seems to have held erroneous ideas on the Sacrament of the Altar and on Baptism of children." The same author adds: "In the year 1138 he was condemned to silence by a Council held at Rome, was banished from Italy, retired to the town of Turgau, and scattered his false doctrines broadcast. When at last he heard of the death of Innocent he returned to Rome in the days of Eugenius, and urged on the people to further sedition, putting before them the examples of the Romans of old, who in the later days of the Senate had brought the world under their sway. And, therefore he exhorted them to rebuild the Capital, to restore the Senatorial dignity, and to recreate the equestrian Order. He said that no part of the government of the city belonged to the Pontiff, that he ought to be content with ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Note on letter CXCIV cont.

The evils springing from this pernicious teaching grow to such a head at last that not only were the houses and splendid palaces of the Roman nobles or Cardinals pulled down, but violent hands were laid by the furious populace on the sacred persons of the Cardinals, and some were disgracefully injured." The same author says (Chronicles lib. vii.c.20) that Jordan, the son of Peter Leonis, was elected into the Patrician Order. "At last," he says, "falling into the hands of certain people of Tuscany, he was arrested, was brought before the Prince for examination, and at last was bound to a stake by the Prefect of the city, and, the pyre having been reduced to ashes to prevent the foolish populace from paying honour to his body, his remains were scattered upon the Tiber."

GERHON OF REICHERSBERG. (died 1169).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg: De investigatione Antichristi: published by Gretser.

Concerning the teaching of Arnold:

Quae etsi zelo forte bono, sed minori scientia prolata est.
Ut domus Dei taliter ardinata domus Dei non sit vel praesules eorum non sint episcopi, quemadmodum quidam nostro tempore Arnoldus dogmatizare ausus est, plebes a talium episcoporum obedientia dehortatus.

Concerning Arnold's death:

Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrina sua, quamvis prava, vel exilio vel carcere aut alia paena praeter mortem punitum esse vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Romana ecclesia seu curia ejus necis quaestione careret. Nam, sicut ajunt, absque ipsorum scientia et consensu a praefecto urbis Romae de sub eorum custodia, in qua tenebatur, ereptus ac pro speciali causa occisus ab ejus servis est; maximam siquidem cladem ex occasione ejusdem doctrinae (in which, therefore, it seems to be implied, that Arnold's principles had only given occasion to the tumult not that he himself had created it), idem praefectus a Romanis civibus perpersus fuerat; quare non saltem ab occisi crematione ac submersione ejus occisores metuerunt? Quatenus a domo sacerdotali sanguinis quaestio remota esset, sicut David quondam honestas Abner (II Sam.iii.) exequias providit atque ante ipsas flevit, ut sanguinem fraudulentem effusum a domo ac throno suo removeret. Sed de his ipsi viderint. Nihil enim super his nostra interest, nisi cupere matri nostrae, sanctae Romanae ecclesiae id quod bonum justum et honestum est. It was important for him to make this declaration: ne videatur neci ejus perperam actae assensum praebere. (See Gretser's Werke, T.XII. in the prolegomena to the writings against the Waldenses, f.12.

Concerning the manner of Arnold's death:

Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrina (i.e. political maxims) sua quamvis prava, vel exilio, vel carcere, aut alia poena, praeter mortem, punitum esse, vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Rom. Eccl. seu curia ejus necis quaestione careret.

(Whom I should wish - in view of his teaching, - however perverted it is, - to be punished with exile, imprisonment or some punishment other than death, or at least put to death in such a fashion that the Roman church or its court should be without accusation of his death.)

Gerhoh calls Arnold's efforts pure and noble.

Zelo forte bono, sed minori scientia....(his execution) nex perperam acta.

(Perhaps of excellent zeal but of inferior knowledge...a death wrongly accomplished.

suspensio neci traditus...crematus atque in Tyberim proiectus est, ne Rom. popul....sibi eum martyrem dedicaret.

(Delivered to death by hanging -- he was burned and thrown into the Tiber, lest the Roman people sanctify him for themselves as a martyr.)

a praef. Urbis R. de sub eorum custodia -- ereptus ac pro speciali causa occisus ab ejus servis est. Maximam siquidem cladem ex occasione ejusdem doctrinae idem Praef. a Romanis civibus perpersus fuerat. (Under their guardianship he was seized by the prefect of Rome and put to death by his servants for a special reason, since indeed by reason of the same teaching the said prefect had suffered the greatest injury at the hands of Roman citizens.)

Gregorovius: History of Rome in the Middle Ages: Vol. IV.—Part II.
page 544: Note 2: says ---

Gerhoh of Reichersberg: De Ivestig. Antichristi., i. (Gretser: Prolegom.
ad scriptor. adv. Waldenses, c.4.), expressly ascribes Arnold's death
to the Prefect of the city: a praef. Urbis R. de sub eorum custodia —
ereptus ac pro speciali causa occisus ab ejus servis est. Maximam siqui-
dam cladem ex occasione ejusdem doctrinae idem Praef. a Romanis civibus
perpressus fuerat. (((Under their guardianship he was seized by the
Prefect of Rome and put to death by his servants for a special reason.
since indeed by reason of the same teaching the said Prefect had
suffered the greatest injury at the hands of the Roman citizens.))).
I explain this passage by a document of July 17, 1158: the Prefect
(Peter) and his brothers John and Octavian certified to Adrian IV. in
Viterbo that they had received 1,000 marks, and the revenues of Civitai
Castellana, &c., as security, de damno castror., domor. — occasione
guerrae quam habuimus cum Pop. R. pro R. Ecclesia.(((for the loss of
camps, dwellings -- on account of the war which we had with the Roman
people in behalf of the Roman Church.))). The Pope promised to have
their houses in Rome restored. The Praefectus, Johannes Praefecti,
et Octavianus germani fratres, Petrus Johannis, Johannes Caparrone
(all landed proprietors in Viterbo), Petrus de Atteja (in Nepi)
constituted the kinsfolk of the Prefetti of Vico and Viterbo (Murat.,
Ant., IV. 31; Theiner, l. xxv.).

Otton de Freisingen: Gesta Friderici II, c.XX, in Mon. Germ. hist.,
Script., vol. xx, p. 404.

Reedificandum Capitolium, renovandam senatoriam dignitatem, reformandum equestrem ordinem dixit... Nihil in dispositione urbis ad romanum pontificem spectare, sufficere sibi ecclesiasticum iudicium debere.

(....In directing the city not to have regard at all for the Roman Pontif, - enough for him his ecclesiastical tribunal judgment.)

Regarding his character Otto said he was:

singularitatis amator, novitatis cupidus.

(a lover of peculiarity, eager for novelty).

Praeter haec (his views on Church property) de sacramento altaris, et baptismo parvulorum non sane dicitur sensisse.

(In addition to this, he is said to have had unsound views on the sacrament of the altar and the baptism of infants.)

Dicebat, nec Clericos proprietatem, nec Episcopos regalia, nec monachos possessiones habentes aliqua ratione salvari posse. Cuncta haec Principis esse, ab ejusque beneficentia in usum tantum laicorum cedere oportere.

(He said that clerks who had property, bishops who had rights of regalia, monks who had possessions could in no manner be saved. All these things belonged to the Prince and should pass by his beneficence to the use of the laity merely.)

Otto classes Arnold among the:

ingenia ad fabricandas haereses scismatumque perturbationes prona.

(natures (or talents) inclined to the franning of heresies and disorders of church divisions.)

Otto of Freisingen (con't.).

Arnaldus iste ex Italia, civitate Brixia oriundus, ejusdemque ecclesiae clericus ac tantum lector ordinatus, Petrum Abailardum olim praeceptorem habuerat.

(This Arnold having his origin in Italy in the city of Brescia, a clergyman with ordination only as a lector, formerly had had Peter Abelard as a teacher.).

lib. ii. c. 21: in oppido Alemanniae Turrego officium doctoris assumens, perniciosum dogma aliquot dieb. seminavit.

(Assuming the function of a teacher in Turregum (?) a city of Germany, he in a few days sowed pernicious doctrine.).

ii.c.21.: Circa principia pontificatus Eugenii pestifer Arnaldus (Arnaldus) Romam ingressus - proponens antiquior. Romanor. exempla - reaedificandum Capitolium, renovandam dignitatem senatoriam, reformandum equestrem ordinem docuit.

(About the beginning of Eugene's papacy the pestiferous Arnold entered Rome -- proposing the model of the Ancient Romans -- he taught that the Capitol should be rebuilt, the senatorial rank renewed, the order of Knights reformed.).

Otto said that Arnold was:

in Tusciae finibus captus.

(captured on Etrurian soil.).

From Otto of Freising and Frederick's letter we learn:

Romani de ponte Tyberino prosiluerunt -- Cardinalibus spoliatis, Papam capere intendebant.

(The Romans sprang forward for the bridge over the Tiber. After plundering the Cardinals they planned to capture the Pope.)

Otto of Freisingen, (con't.).

Concerning Arnold's death Otto says: principis examini reservatus est
...a praef. Urbis ligno adactus, ac rogo in pulverem funere redacto,
ne a stolidi plebe corpus ejus venerationi haberetur, in Tyberim
sparsus.

(He was reserved for the Prince's examination...by the Prefect of the
city. (ligno adactus: is literally "driven by wood". In late latin
lignum meant a cross). Driven...cross.. and the pyre, and the corpse
being reduced to ashes lest the body be held in veneration by the
stupid common folk, (the ashes) were strewn in the Tiber.).

Other accounts of Arnold's death.

From the verse of Godfrey (Pantheon, Muratori, vii. 464): strangulat
hunc laqueus, ignis et unda vehunt.

(The halter strangles him, fire and flood bear him away.).

Gerhoh of Reichersberg:

suspensio neci traditus...crematus atque in Tyberim proiectus est, ne
Rom. popul....sibi eum martyrem dedicaret.

(Delivered to death by hanging - he was burned and thrown into the
Tiber, lest the Roman people sanctify him for themselves as a martyr.).

Annal. Einsiedl. (Mon. Germ., V.), A.1155.

suspensus est. (He was hung).

Palidenses:

prefecto traditur et suspensio adjudicatur.

(He is delivered to the prefect and condemned to be hung.).

Gesta di Federigo I.(verse 860.)

ne cui reliquie superent fortasse colende.

(Lest perchance relics should survive for anyone to worship.).

Histor. pontif., c. xxxi, in Mon. Germ. hist., Script., vol. xx, p. 537.
Exinde Arnaldus post mortem domni Innocentii reversus est Italiam et
promissa satisfactione...a domno Eugenio receptus est apud Viterbium...
Ipse frequenter in Capitulo et in publicis concionibus audiebatur.
Ipse palam cardinalibus detrahebat, dicens conventum eorum, ex causa
superbiae et avariciae, hypocrisis et multimodae turpitudinis, non
esse Ecclesiam Dei, sed domum negotiationis et speluncam latronum qui
scribarum et pharisaeorum vices exercent... Ipsum papam non esse
quod profitetur, apostolicum virum et animarum pastorem, sed virum
sanguinum, qui incendiis et homicidiis praestat auctoritatem, tortorem
ecclesiarum, innocentiae concussorem, qui nihil aliud facit in mundo,
quam carnem pascere et suos replere loculos et exhaurire alienos.etc.
(Thereafter, Arnold, after the death of our Lord Innocent, returned
to Italy, and after a promise of penance was received by our Lord
Eugene at Viterbo. He was frequently heard on the Capitol and in public
assemblies. He openly reviled the Cardinals, saying that their assembly
by reason of their pride, avarice, hypocrisy and moral baseness of
many a kind, was not a Church of God, but a house of merchandise and
a den of thieves who play the part of scribes and pharisees. That the
Pope himself was not what he professed to be, an apostolic man and
shepherd of souls, but a man of blood who exhibited authority by
means of arson and murder, the tormenter of churches, the blackmailer
of innocence, who did naught else in the world than feed the flesh and
stuff his own pockets and drain those of other people.)

The Historia Pontificalis attributes to Arnold the foundation of a sect quae adhuc dicitur haeresis Lombardorum.

(which hitherto has been called the heresy of the Lombards.).

This same says that he was excommunicated tanquam haereticum, (as a heretic or as heretical).

Ipsum papam non esse quod profitetur apostolicum virum et animarum pastorem...Dicebat quod sic apostolicus est ut non apostolorum doctrinam imitetur ad vitam, et ideo ei obedientiam et reverentiam non deberi.

(That the Pope himself was not as he professes to be, an apostolic man and a shepherd of souls. He said he ^{is} so apostolic that he does not imitate the teaching of the apostles with respect to life and their obedience and reverence are not due him.).

Hominum sectam fecit, quae adhuc dicitur haeresis Lombardorum. Habuit enim continentiae sectatores, qui propter honestatis speciem et austeritatem vite placebant populo, sed maxime apud religiosas feminas inveniebant subsidium.

(He made a sect of people which till now has been called the heresy of the Lombards. For he had followers (adherents) of his faction, who by their appearance of uprightness and the austerity of their life pleased the people, but most of all found support among religious women.)

Posterea non esse homines admittendos, qui sedem Imperii fontem libertatis Romam, mundi dominam volebant subicere servituti.

(There-after men should not be admitted, who wished to reduce Rome, the fountain of Liberty, the world's ruler, to subjection.)

Qui honori urbis et reipubl. Romanor. se dicebatur obligasse prestito iuramento. Et ei popul. Roman. vicissim auxilium et consilium contra omnes homin. et nominatim contra d. Papam promisit.

(Who was said to have bound himself by an oath to the honor of the city of Rome and the Roman Republic, and to him the Roman people in turn promised help and council against all men, and especially against the Lord Pope.)

INNOCENT II.

Baronius: Annales : ad. ann. 1140. n. 10.

Innocent II called Abelard and Arnold:

perversi dogmatis fabricatores et catholicae fidei impugnatores.

(inventors of perverse doctrine and assailants of the Catholic faith.)

Eugenius III. (Baronius, Annales: ad ann. 1148.n.38).

Eugenius III treats Arnold as a heretic and a schismatic.

SOURCE MATERIAL FROM MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES.

Letter of Eugenius III.

Falax et invidius hum. generis inimicus per Arnaldum schismaticum --
effecit, ut quidam Capellani unitatem Eccle. -- dividentes, ipsius A.
sequantur errorem: et Cardinalib. atque Archipresbyteris suis
obedientiam -- contradicant -- dat. Brixiae Id. Julii.

(The deceptive and envious foe of the human race accomplished by
Arnold the schismatic that certain parish priests broke the unity of
the Church and adhered to Arnold's error, and refused obedience to
their Cardinals and Archpriests (or vicars of Bishops). Given at
Brescia, June, etc., etc.).

Eugenius to Wiebald, Ep. 383, dat. signiae XII. Kal. Oct.:

notificamus quae faciente Arnaldo haeretico rusticana quaedam turba
absque nobilium et majorum scientia nuper est in Urbe molita.

Circiter enim duo millia -- sunt secretius conjuncti, et in proximis
Kalendis Novembris centum senatores -- et duos consules -- unum autem,
quem volunt Imperatorem dicere, creare dispenunt.

(We notify of what by the doing of Arnold the heretic a rustic gang
without the knowledge of the nobles and the better classes recently
attempted in the city. For about two thousand were secretly bound
by oath and next November first they plan to create one hundred sena-
tores and two consuls, one moreover whom they wish to call Emperor.).

The harsh beginning of Adrian's rule is noticed in the Annals of
Wurzburg:

Adrianus qui dum post aliquot menses accepto apostolatu insolenter
in Romanos ageret, grave odium incurrit.

(Hadrian who while taking an insolent attitude towards the Romans some
months after he received the apostolic office incurred great hatred.).

Miscellaneous sources , (con't.).

Card. Aragon:

Girardum Cardin. tit. s. Pudentiane ad praesentiam ipsius Pontificis euntem. quidem ex ipsis haereticis -- in via sacra -- ad interitum vulneraverunt.

(Certain of the heretics themselves on the sacred Way wounded to the death Girardus, titular Cardinal of st. Pudentian when he was going to the Pope's own presence.

Tunc vero praedicti senatores compulsi a clero et populo romano -- juraverunt quod saepe dictum haereticum et reliquos ipsius sectatores de tota urbe Roma et ejus finibus sine mora expellerent.

(Then in truth the aforesaid senators compelled by the Roman clergy and people swore that without delay they would expell from the entire city and its borders the oft named heretic and the rest of his followers.)

Redderet eis. Cardinalib. Arnald. Haereticum, quem vicecomes de Campaniano abstulerant Magistro O. Diacono s. Nicolai apud Briculas, ubi eum ceperat; quem tamquam Prophetam in terra sua cum honore habebant. Rex vero -- continuo, missis apparitoribus, cepit unum de comitibus illis, qui valde perterritus eundem haereticum in manibus cardinalium statim restituit. (Card. Aragon. p.442.).

((The Emperor) should return to the custody of the same Cardinals, the heretic Arnold, whom the Vicounts of Campagnatico had spirited away from Master Oddo, Deacon of st. Nicholas at Bricola, where he had captured him; a man whom they in his own land held in honor as a prophet. The king sending agents captured one of those counts, who, greatly terrified, immediately restored the said heretic to the hands of the Cardinals.).

sources,(con't.).

Lucensis.

Propter vulnerationem unius Cardinalis totam Urbem supposuit
ecclesiastico interdicto, (says Ptolem. Lucensis, xx.c.20, in reproach).
On account of the wounding of one Cardinal he (ie. Adrian) laid the
whole city under the ecclesiastical interdict.)